



PRESPA PARK

REPORT

SIXTH REGULAR MEETING of the PRESPA PARK COORDINATION COMMITTEE

**KORCHA, ALBANIA
31 MAY - 1 JUNE 2004**

CONTENTS:

Agenda	1
Summary Minutes.....	2
Conclusions	18
Annex I – List of Abbreviations	21
Annex II – Presentation by PDF B PIU – Resen.....	22
Annex III – Report on the implementation of the Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2003 of the PPCC	23
Annex IV – Operational Plan and Programme of Activities 2004 of the PPCC.....	30
Annex V – Prespa Park Communication Work Plan 2004.....	41
Annex VI - List of Participants	45

Sixth Regular Meeting of the Prespa Park Coordination Committee

Korcha, Albania, 31 May - 1 June 2004

**Hosted by the Albanian Ministry of Environment and the Liqenas Commune -
Funded by UNDP/ GEF**

At the invitation of Mr. Zamir Dedej, Director of Nature Protection with the Ministry of Environment of Albania, representative of the Ministry to the Prespa Park Coordination Committee (PPCC), the PPCC held its sixth regular meeting at the Grand Hotel, Korcha, Albania, on 31 May-1 June 2004.

The meeting was attended by nine out of the ten members (or alternate members) of the PPCC from the three countries involved and from Ramsar/ MedWet, as well as by representatives of UNDP, KfW, GTZ, PDF B project officials and staff, and other national observers (see complete list of participants in Annex VI). Mr. Aleko Miho (PPNEA) was absent.

The meeting was opened by the Deputy Minister for Environment of Albania, Ms. Etleva Canaj, and chaired by Mr. Zamir Dedej.

Agenda

1. Opening session:

- 1.1. Welcoming by the Chairman
- 1.2. Welcome address by the Deputy Minister for Environment of Albania, the Head of District Council of Korcha and the Head of Liqenas Commune
- 1.3. Presentation of the working agenda by the Chairman and approval

2. Prespa Park PDF B project implementation

- 2.1. Presentation by the UNDP and KfW representatives on the procedures for requirements of the staff and consulting company and further steps
- 2.2. Presentations by the International Project Manager and National Project Coordinators
- 2.3. Questions and discussion
- 2.4. Working arrangements of the Committee in order to play its role in the PDF project – Introduction by MedWet
- 2.5. Discussion and conclusion

3. Strategic Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of the Prespa Park (SAP)

- 3.1. Endorsement of the final version of the SAP
- 3.2. Discussion

4. Activities since the last regular meeting in Lemos

- 4.1. Presentation of report by the Secretariat (Working Document 2)

4.2. Additional contributions from the PPCC members

5. Implementation of Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2003

- 5.1. Presentation of report and financial statement by the Secretariat (Working document 3)
- 5.2. Discussion

6. Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2004

- 6.1. Presentation of the proposal and budget by the Secretariat (Working Document 4)
- 6.2. Discussion and approval

7. Prespa Park Communication Plan

- 7.1. Presentation of the work plan for the year 2004 - Update by the Communication Officer (Working Document 5)
- 7.2. Discussion

8. Other issues

- 8.1. Brief report on GTZ programme implementation for the Prespa Park area
- 8.2. Discussion
- 8.3. Prespa-Ohrid Biosphere Reserve

9. Closure of the meeting

- 9.1. Adoption of decisions, recommendations and conclusions of the meeting
- 9.2. Date and place of the next meetings
- 9.3. Closing remarks

Summary Minutes

The acting Chairman, Mr. Zamir Dedej (Ministry of Environment, Albania - PPCC member), opened the meeting by welcoming all participants, and passed the floor to the Albanian Deputy Minister of Environment, Ms. Etleva Canaj. Ms. Canaj thanked all the representatives from the local authorities, institutions, and NGOs for their presence at the PPCC meeting and underlined the political support given from all three Governments to the Prespa Park process, aiming at giving solutions to poverty, restoring the biodiversity of the area and some damages done in the past. The Prespa lakes are a continuing priority for the Ministry of Environment of Albania, the Deputy Minister continued, and reiterated the Ministry's commitment to the PPCC process and to supporting the GEF project under way.

Then Mr. Fehmi Xhemo (Head of the Korcha District Council, Albania) took the floor and spoke of the transboundary Prespa Park, the Albanian Prespa National Park, and the Prespa-Ohrid Euroregion, and of the opportunities they represent both for environmental protection and job creation. He called for the support of the Greek state, and for the contribution of local actors from all three countries, and he expressed the readiness of the Korcha District Council to support the Liqenas Commune (Albanian Prespa) and the authorities of the Albanian Prespa National Park. Mr. Dedej thanked Mr. Xhemo and stressed the importance of having the full support of the regional government. He then passed the floor to Mr. Pandi Andoni (Head of the Liqenas Commune, Albania - PPCC member) who welcomed all participants in the name of the Prespa local community. He asked for implementation of the Strategic Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of Prespa Park (SAP), aiming to

improve living conditions as well as the environment. He asked for integration with the parts of Prespa in Greece and the FYR of Macedonia, and expressed his belief that this meeting will strengthen the process.

The Chairman then asked for some minor changes/ rearrangements in the meeting's agenda, including a short ceremony for the opening of the Korcha Project Implementation Unit (PIU) for the PDF B project. The amended agenda was approved by the PPCC members.

The Chairman then passed the floor to Mr. Keith Shawe (International Project Manager – IPM/ PDF B project), who introduced the National Project Coordinator (NPC) in Albania, Mr. Ardit Konomi. Mr. Konomi, an engineer by training, had worked previously with many international programmes, the last one being AMPEP (Albanian Macedonian People's Empowerment Programme) working with people in three communes in Albania and three communes in the FYR of Macedonia. He then introduced Ms. Elona Stefanllari, the PIU's Social Facilitator, with a background in economics and business and work experience with a mountainous areas development agency. Mr. Konomi presented the activities of the Korcha PIU, which involve office identification during the first month, as well as training, field visits, semi-structured interviews, and collection of information during the coming months.

Mr. Dedej asked Mr. Shawe his first impression on the PIU staff, and the latter expressed his satisfaction with their backgrounds and expertise. Mr. Shawe proceeded with a presentation on the Prespa Park PDF B project, aiming to give the broad picture of the project area, as well as the main project characteristics and its progress so far (due to technical reasons the full presentation cannot be included in this report). Introducing the project area and the establishment of the transboundary Prespa Park, he said that one of the PDF B project objectives would be the definition of the boundaries and the goals of the transboundary Prespa Park, and then went through biodiversity protection and conservation issues. Mr. Shawe presented the PDF B project's two main donors: the Global Environment Facility (GEF), with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as the implementing agency, and the German Bank for Reconstruction (KfW - Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau), stressing that the two partners are equal. Apart from GEF/UNDP and KfW, the three Ministries of Environment contribute with cash, and the local/ regional governments with cash or office space. He explained the main aim of the PDF B project, its outputs being the development of a full-size project proposal to the GEF, as well as feasibility studies for KfW. Main project focus is on: a) socio-economics and alternative livelihoods; b) biodiversity and Protected Areas management; and c) water management.

The IPM continued by presenting information on staffing, budgeting and the work plan, which for the first quarter included gathering of baseline data and relevant reports, identification of stakeholders, and a checklist of stakeholder interview topics, with the aim of producing a handover document for the consultants. The consultancy firm and the individual consultants are expected to take over in July, and Mr. Shawe explained that careful planning of the work is crucial, since the deadline for the submission of the Project Brief and the draft Project Document is the beginning of January 2005. He informed the participants that a GEF expert consultant is anticipated to arrive in June, and he will work for the completion of the proposal by November 2004, after which the proposal will be assessed by the donors and stakeholders. The IPM briefed the PPCC on the PIU training workshop that took place at the Resen project office in early May, and introduced the work by the NGO AMPEP, which according to his opinion, could be proven useful and help the PDF B project save a lot of time.

Mr. Shawe then passed to various subjects/ components of the PDF B project with focus on the Resen Municipality, including: livelihoods; apple production, marketing and distribution; wastewater, water supply and irrigation issues; solid waste; fisheries; alternative tourism;

and border crossings. Mr. Shawe said that a first priority would be how to divide the work plan to meet the November deadline for January 2005 submission of the proposal. The next month, he continued, will be occupied by meetings with potential co-funders, indicatively USAID, SDC, CARE International, GTZ, Soros Foundation Open Society Institute, as well as the Bratislava-based UNDP Regional Office, which is expected to contribute additional funds for complementary activities. He then referred to issues such as workshops for apple growers, diversification of livelihoods with alternative sources of income, management of natural resources, strategic development and transboundary cooperation mechanisms, stakeholder consultation processes, etc. Concluding, the IPM said that he felt that community work is vital to project success.

The Chairman thanked the IPM, and passed the floor to the NPC of the Resen PIU, Mr. Ljupco Stojanovski, who briefed the PPCC on progress with the project (see Annex II for full presentation). He then presented issues covering the socio-economic conditions of the Resen Municipality, infrastructure with emphasis to water supply, irrigation and wastewater treatment, the Urban Plans for the area, the structure of the Local Self-Government and the public enterprises in the FYR of Macedonia, the NGO sector, the business community, the donor activities in the region, and the legislative and regulatory framework.

Subsequently, Mr. Dedej gave the floor to the donors, starting with UNDP. Ms. Anita Kodzoman (UNDP Skopje) explained the situation with the selection procedure for the consultant companies, saying that in January 2004 a Letter for Expression of Interest was published, and thirteen offers from many countries arrived. Evaluation of the offers by UNDP and KfW produced a shortlist of five companies, which were given 1½ months to prepare a financial offer complete with work plan. One company from Denmark eventually did not submit a bid. Initially, two selection panels were informally established, one in Frankfurt, Germany (KfW), and one in Skopje (UNDP). A joint selection panel met at the beginning of April 2004 and discussed the findings of these two panels. According to Ms. Kodzoman, none of the four offers were in accordance with the Terms of Reference (ToRs) agreed in previous PPCC meetings. An additional problem was that some of the offers were more focused on UNDP elements, such as socio-economics, alternative livelihoods and biodiversity, whereas others were more focused on KfW elements, i.e. water issues and infrastructure. Moreover, some of the companies either did not include any national consultants, or the composition of the national consultants was not balanced. Ms. Kodzoman said that it had not been possible to single out one proposal, nor to combine two or more consulting companies. Therefore, the evaluation process was cancelled, and from that point on the PDF B project was effectively split into two parallel studies. She stressed that, regardless how this is going to be achieved, the two studies will eventually come up with complementary outputs. For that purpose, the ToRs would have to be revised and accordingly KfW will focus more on their needs for their future investments in the area. Nevertheless, the two donors will exchange all draft reports, and the IPM will coordinate all the work of the consultants, to ensure that there be minimum overlapping and that the results be complementary.

Ms. Kodzoman continued on the issue of the GEF expert, who will be recruited as soon as possible and start working for the preparation of the GEF project proposal by June in order to meet the November 2004 deadline. She added that she would consult with Mr. Nick Remple, UNDP/ GEF Regional Coordinator, with a view at extending the project until January 2005, if needed. The GEF expert will additionally help UNDP to revise the ToRs and see if specific project components, e.g. the community outreach one, could be carried out as a whole by the consultancy company or by individual consultants. Ms. Kodzoman informed the PPCC that up to that point less than 30% of the budget had been spent, and said that there are still enough funds available for the afore-mentioned extension. She further stressed the need to promote the project to other donors already present in the region, and noted that

adequate co-financing would increase the chances of the full-size GEF project proposal being approved. To this effect, the PPCC should look closely to the activities and programmes carried out by other donors in the region, and, although Mr. Shawe has already initiated this work, she deemed the contribution by the PPCC members valuable. Concerning the timeframe of the PDF B process, she gave the floor to Mr. Batkhuyag Baldangombo (UNDP Tirana).

Mr. Baldangombo stressed the need to finalise the project proposal before December 2004, ahead of submitting it to the GEF Secretariat and explained that it was not necessary to produce a full Project Document by then but simply the Project Brief. The GEF Council would review the Brief at its February session and if it approved the proposal then the full Document should be elaborated. Final approval and start of implementation of the full project should be expected by the end of December 2004.

The Chairman then asked for the position of KfW and gave the floor to Mr. Petar Gjorgjiev (KfW Skopje). Mr. Gjorgjiev said that KfW is still fully committed to the project, and introduced two other of his colleagues, Ms. Natasha Sachmaroska (KfW Skopje) and Ms. Keti Monari (KfW Tirana). He said that KfW had already revised the relevant ToR and that they would submit them to the representatives of the Ministries of Environment of Albania and the FYR of Macedonia for comments. The companies fulfilling the minimum technical requirements had already been invited, and by mid July the team would start working. The timeframe, he continued, is approximately eight months, and the company will have to submit the draft feasibility study by March 2005, the latest. The final feasibility study for the investment is expected to be completed by the end of April 2005, and in mid-2005 project appraisal mission should be organised. The final decision by the Federal Ministry on whether an investment project will be implemented or not is anticipated by the end of year 2005.

The Chairman enquired whether there would be a short-list of GEF experts and asked the UNDP representatives for more clarifications about the relevant ToRs. Ms. Kodzoman replied that the selection process will be competitive and at the end one expert will be chosen. He or she will visit the project area twice, in June together with Mr. Remple, and at the end of the project, before the draft documents are finalized. The management and coordination however will still remain with the IPM and the PIUs. The Chairman commented that the situation was far from clear, especially when taking into account that the PPCC members were expecting the consultant team to have started working.

Mr. Thymio Papayannis (Ramsar/ MedWet - PPCC alternate member) took the floor and said that Mr. Shawe's presentation was interesting, but he commented that the PPCC members had received his written report only the same morning before the meeting, and only in English. Mr. Papayannis noted that Mr. Shawe referred to "the lake", and reminded him that there are two lakes in the Prespa area. Mr. Papayannis also said that the PDF B work plan had not been in fact approved by the PPCC, contrary to what Mr. Shawe had suggested. Finally, he reminded that the SAP has been approved by the Committee and that it has been agreed with the donors that this will be the overriding document for the PDF B studies, and asked Mr. Shawe how the PDF B project intended to deal with it.

Ms. Darinka Jantinska (Ministry of the Environment, FYR of Macedonia - PPCC member) said that the project now consisted in effect of two separate processes. She noted that, according to UNDP, there would be a delay in the project of one or two months, whereas according to KfW the delay would be six months, and commented that possibly the project could end up with a delay of one year or more. She enquired about the budgetary implications of those latest developments, since the money originally planned would suffice only till November 2004, and asked the UNDP representatives' view about the budget.

Ms. Myrsini Malakou (Society for the Protection of Prespa/ SPP - PPCC member) reiterated her serious concern about the Devolli River problem, and asked the IPM whether there adequate emphasis has been put on that, and what work had been done on that issue so far. She also enquired who would carry out the various tasks of the UNDP part of the project, noting that the KfW part was much clearer on that aspect. She also asked about the role of Greece, since up to that point the UNDP representatives were seemingly discussing only with the Governments of Albania and the FYR of Macedonia on the TORs to be revised.

Mr. Dedej intervened and, concerning the budget, said that, if the project is extended, the Albanian part would be able to support the salaries, since the staff have started working later. He asked the UNDP representatives about the activities shown in the budget and how those are going to be modified after the latest developments. He questioned the idea of "parallel" processes within the project, especially since the deadlines set by UNDP (January 2005) and KfW (May 2005) were some months apart. Underlining KfW's statement that "after the feasibility studies are over, KfW would then decide about the investment", and the fact that the PPCC was asked by the donors to raise funds for the future full-size project, he asked how the funds could be raised, if one of the two donors has not decided yet whether he will proceed with the full project. He also asked who will prepare the final ToRs, UNDP or KfW, and, finally, where would the role of the PPCC as the PDF B project Steering Committee be in all this.

Ms. Vivi Roumeliotou (SPP - PPCC Secretariat member) rephrased some of Mr. Dedej's questions. She asked how the studies by KfW would be incorporated in the GEF Project Document, if they are expected to be finalised later. If the project contents are divided between UNDP and KfW and, e.g. KfW keeps the water issues, how would the latter be integrated in the full GEF project? She also enquired whether the budget left to UNDP could cover the consultancy, since the originally idea was that the main bulk of that cost would be covered by KfW. Finally, she asked if the revised ToR would be presented to the PPCC, as Ms. Kodzoman had mentioned only presenting them to the Ministries.

Mr. Shawe answered to Mr. Papayannis, by saying that the delay in the distribution of his working document was due to Internet problems, and was by no means intended, and that he assumed that by saying "the lake", it is meant both Macro and Micro Prespa lakes. He proposed to answer all the questions after lunch, in order to avoid duplication with the UNDP and KfW representatives.

After the lunch break, the Chairman gave the floor to the IPM and the representatives of the donors. On Mr. Papayannis' question regarding the SAP, Mr. Shawe said that as soon as the consultants arrive they will consider its recommendations and one of their principal tasks will be to sort them out. As far as the updated budget was concerned, the IPM said it was made available to the PPCC members and that that was a chance to express their concerns.

Mr. Baldangombo stated that the Project Brief will be formulated and submitted to the GEF Secretariat in January 2005. If the Project Brief is approved, the full-size Project Document will be formulated by May 2005. Concerning the necessity of the KfW components, he underlined that GEF funding focuses more to human resource management, and KfW contribution therefore could be considered complementary to the future GEF project but not necessary. Mr. Dedej understood that UNDP will produce the Project Brief, and enquired whether the full Project Document would be prepared too. Mr. Baldangombo replied that the GEF Technical Advisor and the Secretariat will look only at the Project Brief, but the draft Project Document would be elaborated in parallel. He said he thought that after the approval of the Project Brief, there would be still some time needed for the preparation of the Project Document.

Ms. Jantinska intervened and noted that, according to what was explained, the Project Brief would be finalised by January or February 2005. She asked Mr. Baldangombo if the Project Brief would be complete without the data and studies by KfW, since according to KfW their part of the project will require at least a couple of months more. Mr. Baldangombo replied that by December 2004 there will be enough information on that matter, and that, nevertheless, the Project Brief does not require detailed information. Therefore, sometime around May 2005 there will be an opportunity to incorporate any additional details into the proposal. He added that following his experience in Mongolia, the majority of the studies were providing only the general framework. Mr. Dedej argued that what Mr. Baldangombo was saying could mean that too much time and money - approximately \$1,000,000 - would be spent on the general framework despite the fact that the current situation is well known from the SAP study and other sources. Mr. Baldangombo replied that the PDF B process intends to select those particular points of the SAP study and other relevant material, that will be addressed as the baseline, and then proceed with the full GEF project. Ms. Kodzoman clarified that the Project Brief includes the project framework, the incremental cost analysis matrix, and other information, which was anyway not available yet. The same would apply for the indicators for measuring success of the project. She stressed that the ToRs were prepared under the assumption that the project would not start from scratch. She commented that the SAP proposals add up to a total budget of approximately €70 million, and consequently the full-size GEF project could and would not address everything. Mr. Shawe added that by looking at the project results, there are indeed specific activities, such as institutional matters, or further analysis on biodiversity, which are clearly of additional or complementary character. The Chairman said that, although personally he had still some doubts, he would accept their clarifications.

Mr. Papayannis enquired how long it would take, after approval by GEF, for the full-size project to commence. Mr. Baldangombo said that approval of the Project Brief usually takes two months, approximately; therefore, by May 2005 it should be approved. The next step would be the preparation of the Project Document, which should be signed by the respective Governments. One to three months after that, GEF would release the money and allocate 20% of the budget to the UNDP. The full-size GEF project, Mr. Baldangombo concluded, most probably could start in the fourth quarter of 2005.

Ms. Kodzoman clarified that the budget could be extended until January 2005 in order to cover staff salaries. After January, there would be no need for staff. Nevertheless, she continued, additional resources should be sought, so as to keep the PIUs operating until commencement of the full project. As in the PPCC ToRs it is stated that one of its responsibilities would be the identification and proposal of additional resources, Ms. Kodzoman urged the representatives of the central governments, the local governments, and any other stakeholders, to identify the donors and promote the project. She mentioned that UNDP would do the same thing, but stressed anyway that the PPCC ought to be active in this. She repeated that more co-financing would increase the chances for smooth approval of the project, and reminded that organisation of a workshop with potential donors is among the PDF activities.

Following Ms. Kodzoman's intervention, Mr. Dedej asked whether GTZ (Gesellschaft für technische Zusammenarbeit) could be involved in maintaining the activity of the PIUs after the end of the PDF B phase, and gave the word to Mr. Dieter Biallas (GTZ). Mr. Biallas reminded that the ongoing GTZ project would finish in May 2005 and a new project was under preparation. However, he was not in the position to make any commitments for those future activities, since he did not know the amount of money involved and the activities to be supported, but did not rule out the possibility. The Chairman accordingly concluded that GTZ will seek that possibility and will provide an answer some time soon.

Ms. Malakou then took the floor and argued that the PPCC should start looking for funds now, and not in January 2005, but it needs something more concrete. She said the Committee did not even have the IPM report before the meeting, and wondered how fundraising could be done if the ToRs could change again during another meeting. Ms. Kodzoman agreed that identification and mobilisation of co-funding could take a long time and that the PPCC should seek co-funding well in advance. On the other hand, she said, the SAP study is good enough for that purpose, provided the funding priorities were properly identified, and that discussions could be initiated on the basis of the SAP. Mr. Shawe also pointed out that concrete activities should be identified before any discussion with potential donors and that identification would be the task of the consultants. The Chairman pointed out that he could understand Ms. Malakou's worries, as well as the worries of UNDP, regarding the project and urged everybody to be open and avoid overlapping.

Mr. Papayannis said that the SAP, a study that was prepared by all three countries, expresses a common vision for the area. One way to implement it would be through the GEF project, but that would cover only a small part of the SAP. The role of the PPCC, therefore, should be to ensure that the whole plan is implemented. Mr. Dedej said that for that purpose the Committee should be strengthened, and noted that there had not been enough attention by the PDF to that issue as yet. The IPM replied by saying that in his ToRs training of the PPCC members is specifically mentioned. Training of the PIUs had already been done, and he asked the Committee members what their training should entail. He asked for a coordinated answer to that question, so that he could design the activity properly. Mr. Dedej argued that the PPCC members were professionals and not mere students and asked for another term to be used instead of "training". He proposed that the IPM and the PPCC Secretariat collaborate to prepare the relevant activities. Ms. Kodzoman intervened and repeated that the main priority should be to approach donors for co-funding. Ms. Roumeliotou asked the Chairman and the PPCC members to discuss and clarify what "strengthening the PPCC" should mean, also noting that "training" could have various forms (e.g. distance learning). The Chairman asked the MedWet to be involved in the issue.

On the issue of the PDF B project budgeting, Ms. Jantinska expressed her dissatisfaction with the answers to her question on how the donors would cover the budget for the 6 to 8 months of delay. Ms. Kodzoman argued that there would be no 6-month delay but rather 2 months, since the Project Brief would be ready by the end of January 2005, and after that time there would be no more need for the IPM and the Consultants.

On Ms. Malakou's question on the diversion of the Devolli river and the siltation of lake Micro Prespa, the IPM said that the consultants, and not the PIUs, would be the ones to look into the details. Ms. Malakou replied that the issue is very important and that the PIUs and the IPM ought to start collecting information for the consultants. She added that there is an increased interest of donors for that area, and that it would be positive if the PIUs and the PPCC cooperated on that issue and moved faster. Mr. Dedej intervened, saying that the problem is indeed serious, and concerns not only the river but also the lake, agriculture in the region, and the whole hydrological system. In the Project Document, he said, there is one directly related activity, which is the hydrological study for the whole Prespa catchment. Mr. Papayannis asked whether the KfW consulting team would deal with that issue, and Mr. Gjorgjiev responded affirmatively. The Chairman concluded that the PPCC should strongly recommend to KfW to address the river Devolli problem and treat it as a first priority after the approval of the relevant feasibility studies.

Ms. Kodzoman then took the floor and said that the ToRs sent to the Ministries of the Environment were the ones for the KfW component of the consultancy, and clarified that UNDP's ToRs would be revised and then shared with the PPCC, being the project Steering Committee, and added that everything would be done in coordination with the KfW. The

Chairman asked whether that means there would be two separate ToRs. Ms. Kodzoman said that the UNDP will assess the ToRs approved by the PPCC and adjust them, which would include postponing some of them. In this connection, the Chairman noted that the PPCC would not like to see the postponement of too many activities.

Mr. Gjorgjiev, answering Ms. Malakou's question on what would the Greek part of the project entail, he said that only developing countries are eligible for KfW bilateral aid. He would, nevertheless, ask if the revised TORs could be communicated to the PPCC. Concerning the split of the project outputs, he repeated that Output #1,2,3, and 8 would be implemented by UNDP, and Output #4,5,6, and 7 by KfW, but, he added, KfW would still need input from UNDP. He added that KfW would revise the ToRs building up on what had been agreed in the Lemos PPCC Meeting (November 2003), and asserted that from KfW's part there would be no cancellations or postponements of outputs and activities.

Mr. Papayannis expressed his relief that UNDP and KfW would work together but, since the IPM would monitor this collaboration, he asked whether his ToRs would have to be revised to reflect this. Mr. Shawe argued that this was adequately reflected in his current ToRs.

Ms. Kodzoman, on the issue of the consultants' selection, repeated that a first step would be the selection of the GEF expert, whose output would be the preparation of the Project Brief and the draft Project Document. He or she will visit the project area twice, once in the end of June, and once by the end of the project in order to present the drafts and carry out consultations in the region with the stakeholders. He will also work together with UNDP and KfW to ensure that the right directions are given to the consultants. Ms. Kodzoman pointed out that the consultancy would be carried out by a consulting company and by individual consultants, depending on the assignments. For instance, the biodiversity assessment could be carried out by a consulting company, whereas the community outreach could be done by individuals. As far as the GEF expert is concerned, she said that he or she would be paid with project funds, and that the IPM had already earmarked certain amounts for that purpose. Replying to Mr. Dedej's questions, she asserted that the revised ToRs were at the development stage and would be distributed soon. She repeated that the selection process would be competitive for both the consulting firms, and the individual expert consultants, and that UNDP would ask for expressions of interest and CVs. The short-listed candidates would then be interviewed, and the Ministries would be included in the process.

Mr. Dedej said that for small activities, with a budget of \$10,000 for instance, it would be doubtful that consulting companies would express interest. He also wondered how the selection process could be divided, since it might be difficult for government officials to travel to Skopje so many times, in order to evaluate the candidates. Ms. Kodzoman clarified that although some of the activities would have budgets of \$10,000, a total of approximately \$200,000 had nevertheless been earmarked for the consulting company, which is a sizeable amount. Concerning the invitations of the bidders, Ms. Kodzoman repeated the procedure of selection and reasserted that it would be competitive and that national staff would be included.

Mr. Papayannis noted that the Committee had spent a long time trying to understand the new scheme, and proposed that a paper explaining the new situation could be written, translated into the three national languages and then distributed to the PPCC members for their endorsement or opinion. He argued that this should have been done beforehand. Ms. Kodzoman replied that, during the previous selection process, the UNDP had received confirmation by the Ministries, the respective members of the selection panel from Albania and Greece could not attend the meeting, and that eventually the process had been carried out by UNDP and KfW. She clarified that the project is a Nationally Executed Project, so the PPCC could have a role, but that would not include endorsement. She said that the UNDP procedures for Nationally Executed Projects were to be followed, and, therefore, the Project

Brief would be circulated to the PPCC - since this would be the only way for Greece to be involved in the process too. But, she repeated, only the Governments would endorse, not the PPCC. Ms. Roumeliotou intervened, saying that what Mr. Papayannis meant, was that in order for the PPCC to do something substantial and work efficiently, the new arrangements should have been communicated in advance. Mr. Papayannis pointed out that the PPCC is the project Steering Committee, and asked the UNDP representatives how they interpreted "steering" of the project. Ms. Kodzoman replied that there had not been enough time for the communication of all those developments that took place only in May. She said that as soon as she returned to Skopje, she would incorporate all the comments by Mr. Baldangombo and Mr. Shawe and then communicate them to the PPCC. She added that in any case the respective Governments had been informed. On Mr. Papayannis question, she said that the PPCC's role was clearly defined in the project ToR.

After the break, the Chairman gave the floor to the KfW representative. Mr. Gjorgjiev reiterated the commitment of the German Government and KfW to the project and its feasibility phase and said that KfW is working towards achieving a feasible and achievable analysis. He reminded that, as it was already mentioned during the 5th PPCC Meeting (Lemos, November 2003), the Federal Republic of Germany via KfW has committed a total of €4 million during the last years - €1.5 million to the FYR of Macedonia and €2.5 million to Albania. Regarding coordination of the process between the consultants, Mr. Gjorgjiev said that KfW is going to engage consultants in Outputs #4, 5, 6, and 7, as well as in parts of the biodiversity, hydrogeology and conservation management components. He stressed again that KfW had agreed with UNDP to exchange results and experiences, either through the IPM, or directly, by means of monthly or quarterly reports. He added that KfW will provide UNDP with information sufficient for project submission to GEF, and, on their part, KfW would in turn need socio-economic data in order to justify their proposals to the German Government.

The Chairman then gave the floor to questions, and Mr. Papayannis proposed to put on paper a summary of the new structure and include it in the meeting report, so that it can be circulated thereafter. Ms. Athina Mourmouri (Head of the Department of Management of the Natural Environment and Deputy NPD for Greece, Greek Ministry of the Environment) then took the floor. She thanked the organisers for their hospitality and said that the previous discussion had been very enlightening. She noted that there is still political will and commitment by the three Governments to deal with the problems of the lakes and the region, and that the existence of the PPCC is an asset to that effect, but by dealing with specific projects there is risk to forget the dynamics of the cooperation process and of this Committee in particular. There is also the risk to forget that there is a lot of information available, inside and outside the region. Regarding the PDF B project, she made some comments: Regarding the time parameter, she said that time aspects should be taken into consideration, and that the working documents ought to be on time, for the participants to prepare themselves. Regarding the enthusiasm to gather information, she said that there is risk of duplication of work, and stressed the need for organising the next steps of the work, and especially covering the gap between the end of the PDF B phase and commencement of the full-size GEF project. She added that as far as the Greek part is concerned, important activities relevant to the project are taking place, such as the intention of the Municipality of Prespa in Greece to assist their Albanian counterparts as regards water supply, good practices in agriculture on the Greek side with the aim of reducing pesticide use, and the possibility for joint submission to the Interreg programme of a project on water issues. Ms. Mourmouri said that in order to avoid duplication, the SAP findings and recommendations should be taken into account. She thought that the semi-structured interviews proposed by the IPM would not be really useful, adding that in fact this had already been done twice at least in the Greek part of the basin. Ms. Mourmouri concluded by calling everybody to keep

the spirit of cooperation alive in spite of the fact that the project would take longer than previously anticipated.

The Chairman thanked her and passed on to agenda item 2.6. Mr. Papayannis took the floor and said that as a Ramsar/ MedWet observer he was asked to put on paper some ideas on how the PPCC could work as the project Steering Committee. These options were circulated to the PPCC members in February 2004, and included: a) all issues being discussed in the plenary, which is the most democratic option but also very time-consuming; b) the PPCC to authorise its Chairman and Secretariat, which is efficient but not very democratic; c) establishment of a smaller group, either on a national basis - each country appointing its own representative - or on a sectoral/ national basis, i.e. exactly like the selection panel for GTZ micro-projects - who would work closely and consult with the PPCC members he/she represents; d) the IPM to address all questions to all members and wait for each one to express a separate opinion, which would, however, not result in an integrated position of the PPCC. Mr. Papayannis stressed that the relation between the PPCC and the PDF project should be a win-win situation and that, if the PPCC members want the Committee to play a role, then they must improve their performance, otherwise their opinion would not be taken into account.

The Chairman opened the floor to discussion, although he expressed his belief that in the end the Ministries would be the ones to decide. Ms. Kodzoman said that UNDP, as the managers of the project, would surely circulate the draft reports as soon as the consultants take over. The question, she continued, was how the PPCC will organise its work, since UNDP wanted one, integrated feedback and not individual comments. She added that UNDP wants to be sure that each member will have the chance to express their views and that the local government represents the views of the local people. Mr. Dedej said that it was not an easy task to decide, but as the acting Chairman he would be willing to collect the opinions of the PPCC members and convey them to the IPM.

Ms. Mourmouri took the floor and said that if the PPCC members would like to have an active role as project Steering Committee, then the two options, according to her opinion, would be either to organise extraordinary meetings, or to delegate. Extraordinary meetings of the Committee would need extra money, which is required for the phase after the completion of the Project Brief. If the PPCC decides to delegate, the prerequisite would be trust. The main options of that would be to have either the Chairman, or representatives from each country, and Greece would prefer the latter option. She added that there could be a rotation scheme, and the ones representing their countries should be charged with internal communication.

Mr. Shawe said that consultant workshops could be arranged and used together with other mechanisms of communication, instead of using the IPM as the only interface between the PPCC and the consultant team. He repeated that all reports would be circulated to the PPCC anyway.

Mr. Papayannis pointed out that the PPCC should devote time if it wants to monitor project development. Mr. Dedej agreed, and added that the PPCC members are not paid but are working voluntarily. Ms. Jantinska argued that it would be difficult to find the people for that assignment and proposed to seek the budget needed for extraordinary meetings.

Ms. Kodzoman said that in the budget funds are allocated for one regular meeting till the end of the year, and additional funding for extraordinary meetings would not be available, since it is needed for the consultancy. Mr. Dedej said it would not be possible for the Albanian government to fund extraordinary meetings, since the related allocation had not been made in the beginning of the fiscal year. At that point, Ms. Jantinska enquired about the €20,000 pledge of the Albanian government as contribution to the PDF B project. Mr.

Dedej replied that he would first have to consult with the financial department of his Ministry as regards the intended use of that fund. Ms. Mourmouri clarified that the Greek proposal was under the condition that the other parties would agree, and have the necessary resources, and said that at that point the Greek part could not make any commitments about funding extraordinary meetings.

The Chairman added that the National Project Coordinators could be utilised in this regard. Ms. Kodzoman argued that the NPCs could not act as the Steering Committee, nor express the views of the Committee. Ms. Mourmouri agreed, adding that the NPCs were the executors of the project and could not take decisions in case of political questions but the NPDs could play this role instead. The latter would cooperate horizontally and consult with the PPCC members in each country, by means of telecommunication facilities, in order to express coordinated and concerted views.

Mr. Shawe's counter proposal was to have instead of a country-organised scheme an issue-organised scheme. Mr. Dedej argued that it would be too complicated, and agreed that the NPDs could play a role in coordinating the project. Mr. Papayannis said that the consultants will produce voluminous reports and proposals and asked how the processing, including translations, of the material would be done. He thought that the Secretariat could not possibly do it. Ms. Malakou agreed that it would be a heavy task for the NPDs. The PPCC decided to postpone final decision on the matter for the next day, after the necessary consultations between the delegations were over.

On agenda item 3.1 regarding the SAP, Mr. Dedej said that the comments on behalf of the FYR of Macedonia had been incorporated into the SAP and the draft was circulated to all members of the PPCC in electronic form in May 2004. The PPCC endorsed the final version of the SAP, and following Ms. Kodzoman's request Mr. Dedej asked the Secretariat to send it to the donors.

The Chairman then gave the floor to the Secretariat on the issue of endorsement of the report of the 5th Regular Meeting of the PPCC. Ms. Roumeliotou reminded that it would be redundant, since the report had been already endorsed by the previous Chairman and the matter was considered closed.

Mr. Papayannis informed the Committee that the representatives from the Neretva River Cooperation (Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia) had expressed their satisfaction about their participation in the previous meeting of the PPCC, and that they would be holding their first meeting in Metkovic in the beginning of July 2004. Mr. Papayannis said that it would be useful if the contacts between the two bodies continue.

On the second day of the meeting, the Chairman informed the participants that there had been an informal discussion with the country delegations and, since no common position had been reached on any of the options regarding working arrangements of the PPCC for the PDF B project, it was decided that the acting Chairman would represent the Committee after consulting all Committee members. He added that the NPDs would be included in the consultation process.

Ms. Jantinska announced that the government of the FYR of Macedonia could support an extraordinary meeting of the PPCC to take place in the FYR of Macedonia and would start preparing it as soon as possible. After a brief discussion, it was decided that the extraordinary meeting would be held in the first week of September.

On the next agenda item (report on activities concerning the Prespa Park, Working Document 2), the Chairman gave the floor to the Secretariat. Ms. Roumeliotou briefed the PPCC members on main developments since the last PPCC meeting. On the Albanian part of

the Prespa Park area, various infrastructure development activities through the Albanian Development Fund took place; PPNEA, with EECONET funding, provided support to the Albanian Prespa National Park (PNP). In Greece, notable developments had been: the approval of the "Operational Plan for Integrated Rural Development of Prespa and Krystallopigi Highland Area" by the Regional Authorities and the implementation of various measures; projects by the Municipality of Prespa for road construction and wastewater treatment with artificial wetlands; the establishment of a bean farmers' group for the application of the principles of "integrated agriculture"; the operation of the new Information Centre by the Prespa Management Body, which is expected to receive funding; and the SPP project proposal to DAC. In the FYR of Macedonia, important developments included the rehabilitation and extension of the sewerage networks and wastewater treatment facilities in the Resen area; the preparation of a Local Environment Action Plan (LEAP) for the municipality of Resen; and the BSPSM activities in the Ezerani reserve. The Secretariat's report also described the activities in the framework of the Prespa Park Communication Plan, the latest PDF B developments, the GTZ programme for the region, and the direct information provided to Albanian stakeholders by SPP concerning the LIFE project implemented by the Society in Lake Micro Prespa.

The Chairman, on behalf of the PPCC members, expressed the Committee's appreciation to all the donors present and active in the Prespa area. He said that the continuing contacts between the Municipalities and the cooperation on water issues were very important.

On agenda item 5, Ms. Roumeliotou briefed the Committee on the Implementation of Operational Plan and Programme of Activities for year 2003. With regard to Communication, the first axis of the PPCC activities, the PPCC either directly or through its Secretariat continued involving the authorities and the stakeholders in the Prespa Park process. Various activities were implemented through the Communication Plan. Another important activity had been the first meeting of the Mayors of Prespa (Liqenas, 19 July 2003) - an opportunity to exchange views and ideas, and to jointly pursue activities in the future. Contact persons were appointed and the development of possible projects was discussed. For that purpose, GTZ initially announced that it would provide €36,000, which was later reduced to €10,000. The Municipalities, however, had not determined the relevant activities. Another interesting activity had been the contacts between the Protected Area authorities. This was in continuation of the already established cooperation between the Protected Area authorities in Albania and the FYR of Macedonia, and the establishment of the Prespa Management Body in Greece, which is the first step towards modern management of the Greek protected area.

On the Sustainable Development axis, Ms. Roumeliotou continued, much hope was placed on the PDF B project, which was taken into consideration during the preparation of the work plan at the Oteshevo meeting of the PPCC in February 2003. Due to the delays in the implementation of the PDF B project, some of the elements in the work plan had not progressed too much. Nevertheless, the Committee had decided to proceed with other activities and/ or projects that would not require so much money or consideration. Ms. Roumeliotou pointed out that a lot had been achieved in each country separately, but not so at a transboundary level.

On the Research, Monitoring and Conservation axis, Ms. Roumeliotou said that there had been delays in every year's work plan, and that was related to the setback in the implementation of the infrastructure project by the Greek government, the hydrogeological study, and the related PDF B activities. Ms. Roumeliotou informed the PPCC on the work done in the field of transboundary fire-fighting cooperation, involving a meeting of the competent authorities in the region and general research, which culminated to a report circulated to the PPCC members.

On the financial report for the year 2003 presented to the Committee, Ms. Roumeliotou noted that it had been prepared following the pattern introduced by Mr. Spyros Kouvelis (MedWet), and added that some corrections needed to be made in order to circulate it by electronic means to the PPCC.

Mr. Dedej commented that the Secretariat had had a heavy workload, and that the NGO from the FYR of Macedonia should solve the issue of translation. Ms. Mourmouri intervened and said that in the budget the total expenditure and the total income ought to be identical, otherwise explanations should be provided. The report was endorsed by the Committee, with the instruction to correct the errors in the financial report (see Annex III).

Introducing agenda item 6, Mr. Dedej said that year 2004 would be more active, also taking into account the PDF B activities. Ms. Roumeliotou presented to the Committee the proposed Operational Plan and Programme of Activities for the Year 2004 (Working Document 4). She said that it had not been possible to plan for three years, as suggested by the Oteshevo meeting of the PPCC (February 2003), since the outcomes of the PDF B phase would largely determine the future course of the Prespa Park process and should be awaited for. Therefore, the work plan proposed by the Secretariat was for one year only. She stressed that the Secretariat has serious limitations and restrictions, and it would be even more pressed with the amount of work relating to the PDF B project. In this regard, she asked the MAP to inform the PPCC about prospects of Mr. Branko Micevski's participation in the Secretariat. Concerning contact between the Municipalities, Ms. Roumeliotou said that the Secretariat had acted as a catalyst, but from a certain point on the three Municipalities ought to take this process forward without assistance by the NGOs. Similarly, after their initial meeting, the protected area authorities should seek to further develop their collaboration. Ms. Roumeliotou, agreeing with the comments by some PPCC members, said that the Committee should not pin its hopes only on the PDF B project, but it should also be active and pursue other activities that could be complementary to the PDF B phase. Such possible activities could be in the field of water issues, nature protection, collaboration of protected area authorities etc.

Mr. Dedej informed the participants that the Albanian Ministry of Environment had produced a book containing all environmental legislation. Ms. Roumeliotou added that activities inspired by EU legislation, such as Directives 92/43, 2000/60 and 79/409, could be a good field of cooperation and transfer of experience from Greece. A concrete first activity could be the scientific study of nature in Albania and the FYR of Macedonia, and its classification according to EU standards. Potential funding sources had not been pinpointed yet, but possibly the protected areas could take some initial steps. Mr. Dedej said that in Albania there already exists a network of protected areas and that the governments target is to increase the protected areas as a percentage of the total land area from 6% to 14%. He explained that one of the difficulties Albania is facing is the overlapping jurisdiction of the Ministry of Environment and the General Directorate of Forests and Pastures (Ministry of Agriculture) for environmental protection.

Mr. Papayannis asked the IPM whether analysis of the legislation would be included in the scope of work of the consultants, and Mr. Shawe answered affirmatively. Mr. Papayannis asked Mr. Dedej about the establishment of a Ramsar site for the whole Prespa basin in Albania. Mr. Dedej answered that the application is already prepared, but there are still some elements missing, such as the electronic maps. He said that it would be hopefully approved by the end of the year 2004. He noted, however, that there is still lack of capacity, as only one person is currently working on the issue. At that point, Mr. Shawe asked whether maps could be made available to the PDF B project. SPP had elaborated some maps in the context of the SAP and Ms. Malakou said that they could be made available.

Mr. Dedej then mentioned that he had discussed with Mr. Papayannis the need to increase the role of the PPCC and its Secretariat and to create a special fund for the Prespa Park. He urged everybody to include this in their agenda and asked whether the Greek Ministry of Environment could see the possibility for such a fund. Ms. Mourmouri said that she would convey Mr. Dedej's proposal and that the Ministry would respond later and after checking the possibilities. Ms. Jantinska agreed that the Ministries should seek to find some funds and proposed that the PPCC seek to organise a meeting at a Ministerial level, where a trilateral agreement or a memorandum could be signed. Mr. Dedej fully supported Ms. Jantinska's proposal and said that Albania and the FYR of Macedonia had already signed a memorandum of understanding. He noted that the Albanian Ministry's legal expert should be consulted on this and that it would be possible to arrange the Ministerial meeting during the December meeting of the PPCC. Ms. Jantinska said that all three countries do have bilateral agreements, and clarified that she was talking specifically about the Prespa Park. The Committee agreed to explore the possibility of concluding some trilateral agreement on the Prespa area and of holding a Ministers' meeting by the end of 2004.

At that point, Ms. Pandorka Nikusheva (MAP - PPCC member) took the floor and announced that she would no longer represent MAP in the PPCC and thanked everybody for the fruitful moments she shared in the Prespa Park process. On the previous issues, she said that it was difficult for the Secretariat to work without money. She pointed out that the NGO sector was very important for the Prespa Park and should not be underestimated. The Chairman said to Ms. Nikusheva that all PPCC members appreciated her presence in the Committee and the proposed work plan was approved, with the instruction to correct any errors in the budget (see Annex IV).

After the break, the Chairman introduced agenda item 7.1 and gave the floor to the Prespa Park Communication Officer, Ms. Aferdita Ponari. Ms. Ponari presented the communication activities since the last PPCC meeting. She reminded that the PPCC had stressed that the Communication Officer should have closer contact with the local population. She said that during February 2004 there were weather restrictions for some of the communication activities for the celebration of the World Wetlands Day and the anniversary of the Prespa Park. Other activities included the organisation of round tables for journalists, drawing competitions for school children in Prespa, and a meeting of the environmental NGOs (Korcha, May 2004). Ms. Ponari said that she intended to organise a second follow-up meeting, and asked the support of Mr. Shawe in order to include PDF B representatives in the event. In May 2004, Ms. Ponari continued, the Prespa Park poster was prepared, and the 2nd issue of the Prespa Park Newsletter was published. She announced that on 5 June 2004 a meeting of the heads of the protected areas in Prespa from all three countries would take place. On the Prespa Park website, she said that it was the 5th most visited site in the MedWet domain and asked all the PPCC members to make their best and give their contributions and information needed in order to update the website and keep it highly visited. She proposed to organise a second meeting of the Prespa environmental NGOs in September/ October 2004 and publish postcards with the paintings by the school children. Concerning the 5th anniversary of the Prespa Park, she proposed to prepare a TV-spot or a film documentary, but noted that that would cost a lot of money and that funding would be needed.

The Chairman then gave the floor to GTZ, the sponsor of communication activities. Mr. Biallas said that in the last meeting he had been sceptical about the Communication Plan and its activities, but at that point, he congratulated Ms. Ponari for the work done and for her proposals. He said, however, that, according to the plan, full -time work was not required; therefore, GTZ had decided to cut the budget down and the amount saved would be earmarked for the PPCC to cover various expenses and activities. He asked the PPCC whether they would agree with that shift. The Chairman said according to his personal

opinion the results were satisfactory and asked the PPCC members' opinion. Ms. Roumeliotou expressed her concern regarding the decrease in funding, since Ms. Ponari would have to work part-time, and she asked whether the activities could be carried out successfully. If the funds were not enough for all the activities, then the PPCC ought to identify priorities.

Mr. Papayannis's question was what the interface between the Communication Officer and the Social Facilitators of the PDF B project would be. Ms. Ponari intervened and said that the PDF B project had not provided data and information for the Prespa Park website and other activities. She added that cooperation between the Communication Officer and the PDF B project offices can be easy and without need for additional funds. Mr. Shawe replied that the PDF B project staff did not know what was expected by Ms. Ponari. He apologised for not participating in the NGO meeting held in Korcha in May 2004 and said that he would need to be informed one week in advance for any such event and that communications problems prevented him from notifying Ms. Ponari on that specific occasion.

Mr. Papayannis clarified that his question was how to create synergy between the activities of the Prespa Park Communication Officer and the PDF B Social Facilitators working in the PIUs. Mr. Dedej said that Ms. Ponari's request was right and that she should work together with the Social Facilitators in Albania and the FYR of Macedonia. He added that three people could now be involved rather than one but he also stressed the need for coordination and asked the IPM how he intended to proceed with that. Mr. Shawe replied that the Social Facilitators and the Communication Officer should perhaps sit down together and Mr. Dedej suggested the elaboration of a common work plan. Ms. Jantinska added that that plan should include a budget and not plain activities. Mr. Dedej agreed that that was needed in order to avoid overlapping of activities. With these added remarks, the proposed Communication work plan was approved (see Annex V).

On agenda item 8, the Chairman passed the floor to Mr. Biallas who presented a report on implementation of the GTZ programme in the Prespa Park area. Mr. Biallas made some general remarks concerning GTZ's financial situation. He explained that due to more general restrictions in German Government spending for international assistance, the Ministry of Finance would reclaim funds that had not been clearly earmarked. Consequently, all GTZ projects ought to show appropriate expenditure, as well as commitment in kind. Concerning in kind contributions, Mr. Biallas said that in good years they could be higher even than the earmarked funds. During the previous PPCC meeting, GTZ had pledged to finance various activities, and this could be done, for example, through reducing Ms. Ponari's fee and retaining the funds left for core expenses. He said that, in general, GTZ's services would be provided, despite the overall cuts in the budget. Regarding GTZ's programme for micro-projects in the region, he said that it is phasing out and that there would no new call for proposals. As far as the support to the Local Self Governments is concerned, Mr. Biallas said that the original amount had been €36,000 and it had now been reduced to €10,000. Since there had been no request to use this money, the federal Government would reclaim it, and he urged the Municipalities to come forward with proposals.

Mr. Biallas then briefed the PPCC on GTZ's activities on tourism, which included participation to tourist fairs, development of infrastructure, marking of trails, as well as development of institutions. One of GTZ's intentions would be the establishment of a regional tourism association. Mr. Biallas, finally, announced that a conference between the Mayors and the CEOs of the public enterprises and the communal services of the municipalities would take place on 17 and 18 June 2004 and the Prespa Mayors would soon receive their invitations.

The Chairman said that the Municipalities should try to write down their ideas and absorb the money. Mr. Papayannis thanked GTZ for providing money for specific, concrete activities that would keep the Prespa Park spirit alive. Ms. Roumeliotou asked Mr. Biallas to verify that

these amounts would go to Local Self Government partnerships, and not to national activities. Mr. Biallas clarified that these funds would go only to trilateral cooperation. Concerning the programme in general, he said that the total budget of GTZ was in the order of €200,000, and the programme would end in March 2005. After that period, Mr. Biallas said that the German Government would continue to support cross border cooperation in the context of the Euroregion for two years, extendable to three. Mr. Biallas did not rule out the possibility of supporting NGOs too. The Chairman thanked Mr. Biallas and asked GTZ to make information available to all levels, so that GTZ funding could be applied for.

On the last item of the agenda, Mr. Papayannis brought the participation of MedWet to the attention of the PPCC. He reminded that, although MedWet does not have a voting right, it contributes a lot with its own expenses. He said that he found it strange that UNDP did not consider it a member of the Committee. Mr. Bldangombo, on behalf of UNDP, said that it had been a misunderstanding and restated that UNDP regarded all PPCC members as members of the project Steering Committee. Mr. Dedej noted that the UNDP funds for the PPCC meeting were only received one week in advance, and asked the UNDP representatives and the IPM to look into that issue. Mr. Shawe clarified that there were not enough funds available for PPCC meetings and said that there is need to review the submission times concerning budget issues.

The Chairman then raised the issue of the establishment of a Prespa-Ohrid Biosphere Reserve. He said that Albania had been trying to promote the issue and that he would attend an UNESCO meeting in Belgrade, Serbia and Montenegro, the coming week and ask the UNESCO representatives how to proceed. The Chairman asked the Committee's opinion on this. Ms. Jantinska said that she would participate in that meeting too. Ms. Mourmouri took the floor and said that she was not very aware of the details of establishing a Biosphere Reserve and that she could express any official support, if there were no concrete proposals. Mr. Dedej noted that the issue had been discussed during the last PPCC meeting in Lemos, and that, according to his opinion, Prespa and Ohrid do fulfil the requirements. He said, however, that he could understand the reasons why Greece was not interested, but proposed to further discuss the issue and possibly put it on the Committee's agenda. Mr. Papayannis informed the Committee that the Belgrade meeting was organised by UNESCO and IUCN and that he would facilitate it. He said that further information would be available, and that he would be able to report to the PPCC on the issue. In this connection, Mr. Dedej informed the Committee that IUCN had opened an office in the Balkans, based in Belgrade.

On the date of the next PPCC meeting, the Chairman proposed the last week of November 2004. The IPM intervened and said that the Project Brief would be available possibly by the 15th of December. Mr. Papayannis pointed out that the relevant reports on the Project Brief should be available to the PPCC members at least two weeks in advance, otherwise they would not be able to contribute properly. Mr. Baldangombo said that a draft of approximately 20 pages would probably be available by November. The IPM informed the participants that he would report to the PPCC in July, after the consultants arrive. The PPCC members then agreed to set the regular meeting in the second week of December 2004 and an extraordinary meeting with relation to the PDF B project in the first week of September.

Subsequently, the Committee members adopted the conclusions, and following that, the Chairman thanked all participants for their contribution, expressed the Committee's gratitude to the donor community for their continuous interest in the Prespa Park, to UNDP/GEF for their kind financial support, and to the Ministry of Environment of Albania, the Korcha PDF B project staff and the Ligenas Commune for the organisation of this meeting and their warm hospitality, and declared the meeting closed.

Conclusions

1. At its Sixth Regular Meeting, the PPCC discussed in detail the issue of PDF B project implementation. The IPM and the UNDP and KfW representatives explained the current situation with regard to the operation of PIUs and the selection of the consultants that has not been completed yet. The new approach of the donors with regard to the consultancy was also explained in detail.

Five consulting companies were invited to tender but only four companies submitted a bid. The KfW and UNDP-MoE (AL & MK) representatives of the joint evaluation panel carried out preliminary evaluations of these bids separately before the joint panel was held. During this process KfW concluded that two of the four companies had not reached the minimum technical requirements and so could not be included in the evaluation process. All four companies were deemed to have met the minimum technical requirements by the UNDP-MoE representatives.

After consulting with KfW and UNDP Head Quarters it was decided that the two donors would proceed in parallel as follows:

- i. The TORs for the work will be split between the donors and funded separately.
- ii. Each donor will evaluate the TORs and make minor adjustments, if necessary, but there will be no substantive changes to the respective part of the original TORs.
- iii. Each Donor will identify consulting firms/individuals based on the readjusted TORs.
- iv. UNDP will employ a GEF expert in June. The services of the GEF expert were foreseen in the original TORs. This consultant will now be employed before the consulting company/individuals have been selected in order to assist with the adjustment of the TORs for the UNDP/GEF - funded components.
- v. Each donor will strive to mobilize the consulting firms/individuals by late July 2004 so that fieldwork can start as soon as possible.
- vi. All findings, reports and other materials prepared by the consulting firms and individual consultants will be shared between the two donors as soon as they are available.
- vii. The flow of information between the two donors will be coordinated by the IPM.
- viii. The IPM will also ensure that the draft reports submitted by the consulting companies/individuals are made available to the PPCC for comments. The mechanism for this is to be decided by the PPCC, but will initially be through the Chairman and Secretariat.
- ix. It is anticipated that the UNDP Project Brief will be ready in December 2004, and will be submitted to the GEF Secretariat in January 2005. The Brief will fully incorporate the main findings of the baseline assessment carried out by KfW.
- x. It is also anticipated that the final recommendations and findings of KfW will be reflected in the full-size Project Document. This Project Document will be finalized in the second half of 2005 subject to approval of the Project Brief.

In this connection, the Committee concluded that:

- a. The TORs for the UNDP GEF expert and the redrafted consultancy TORs will be communicated to the Committee by KfW and UNDP as soon as possible.
 - b. The Committee expressed its concern about the implications of the new scheme on the timeframe and budget of the project and requested special attention to be given to appropriate coordination between the donors in order to achieve good quality outputs of the project.
 - c. The Committee kindly requested GTZ and World Bank to explore the possibility to fund the continuation of the operation of the project offices after the expiration of the PDF B project and until the full GEF project commences.
 - d. The Committee asked its Secretariat to collaborate with the IPM in order to formulate the content of a capacity-building programme for the PPCC and Secretariat, with the assistance of MedWet.
 - e. Finally, the PPCC strongly recommended that KfW treat the hydrogeological problems of the area, especially the Devolli problem, as a priority during the feasibility studies to be undertaken.
2. The PPCC discussed in detail the issue of organisation of its work in order to fulfil its role as the Steering Committee of the PDF B project. The acting chairperson was entrusted with the task of representing the Committee for project purposes, after consulting with all Committee members by appropriate means. In this connection, the importance of receiving timely and complete information on project activities and results was stressed.
 3. The final version of the Prespa Park Strategic Action Plan, complete with additional contributions from the FYR of Macedonia, was unanimously endorsed. The SAP will be forwarded to the PDF B Consultants so as to serve as a basis for their work.
 4. The PPCC heard a report on activities since its last regular meeting in Lemos and noted with appreciation the fact that various activities with regard to infrastructure consistent with transboundary strategic planning for the region have been implemented in the three countries.
 5. The Committee heard the report on the implementation of its work plan for 2003. It particularly noted that - despite delays - positive work has been done in 2003, especially with regard to communication, and coordination between different stakeholders (local authorities, NGOs, etc).
 6. The Committee endorsed the proposed Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2004 and stressed in particular the need to proceed to specific transboundary activities that will take the Prespa Park initiative forward. In this context, the possibility of concluding some trilateral agreement on the Prespa area and of holding a Ministers' meeting by the end of 2004 will be explored.
 7. The Committee heard a report on Communication activities carried out in the first part of the current year and the work plan for the remainder and noted the progress achieved since its last regular meeting.
 - a. The Committee was informed on the cuts in the Communication budget decided by the GTZ and requested the Communication Officer to prepare a detailed budget in order to evaluate whether the funds available would suffice.
 - b. The PP Communication Officer asked for better coordination with the PDF-B in order to plan communication and community outreach activities

appropriately and create synergies. A meeting for that purpose should be organised between the two sides.

8. The GTZ representative explained the current situation with regard to their programme for the Prespa region and especially the cuts in the budget that have taken effect since the beginning of the year. The PPCC thanked the GTZ for the valuable support it has provided to the Prespa Park for the past years and expressed its hope that the German Government considers continuing its support after the current programme expires in March 2005.
9. The PPCC will explore funding opportunities allowing for the implementation of all activities planned for the year 2004, as well as the full-size GEF project.
10. The Committee decided to hold its seventh regular meeting in Resen on the second week of December 2004. An extraordinary meeting of the Committee with relation to the PDF B project will be organised with funding from the Government of the FYR of Macedonia in the first week of September. The exact date and venue of the meetings will be determined later.
11. Finally, the PPCC expressed its thanks to all participants for their contribution, to the donor community for their continuous interest in the Prespa Park, to UNDP/GEF for their kind financial support, and to the Ministry of Environment of Albania, the Korcha PDF B project staff and the Liqenas Commune for the organisation of this meeting and their warm hospitality.

Annex I – List of Abbreviations

AMPEP	Albanian Macedonian People’s Empowerment Programme
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GTZ	Gesellschaft für technische Zusammenarbeit – German Technical Assistance Agency
IPM	International Project Manager/ PDF B project
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau – German Bank for Reconstruction
MAP	Macedonian Alliance for Prespa (NGO)
MedWet	Mediterranean Wetlands Initiative
MoE	Ministry of Environment
MoEPP	Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, FYR of Macedonia
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPC	National Project Coordinator/ PDF B project
NPD	National Project Director/ PDF B project
PDF B	Project Development Facility, Block B
PIU	Project Implementation Unit/ PDF B project
PPCC	Prespa Park Coordination Committee
PPNEA	Protection and Preservation of Natural Environment in Albania (NGO)
SAP	Strategic Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of the Prespa Park
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SPP	Society for the Protection of Prespa (NGO)
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	US Agency for International Development

**Prespa Park PDF B
Project Implementation
(PIU Resen, Macedonia)**

Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Trans-
Boundary Prespa Park Region
Korca, 31May – 1 June 2004
6th Prespa Park Coordination Committee Meeting

[double-click to view presentation]

Annex III – Report on the implementation of the Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2003 of the PPCC

According to the Oteshevo meeting decisions, the work of the Prespa Park Coordination Committee during its third year of operation continued along the same axes as in the previous years and focussed on Communication, Sustainable Development and Research, Monitoring and Conservation activities. Some of the elements of the 2003 work plan progressed at a satisfactory pace, whereas others have been delayed:

1. With regard to **Communication**, the PPCC agreed to continue the effort to organise the collection and dissemination of information on activities of any kind that may have a direct or indirect effect on the natural or socio-economic status of the Prespa Park area; establish and maintain a communication channel with all bodies and organisations that have an interest in Prespa, including national authorities and services, NGOs, universities, international organisations etc.; and promote the Prespa Park initiative at the local, national and international level. To this effect,
 - a. As instructed, the Secretariat continued to inform all local, regional, national, and international authorities and organisations concerned with Prespa of the establishment of the Committee, ask for their collaboration, and organise relevant meetings and contacts.
 - b. The Secretariat also continued collecting information on activities that may have a direct or indirect effect on the natural or socio-economic status of the Prespa Park area, which are all reported regularly to the Committee (see Working Document 2). Systematic recording and completion of relevant information is expected to be achieved during the PDF B project and this would be a significant contribution to the PPCC work irrespective of the specific project's outcome.
 - c. The Secretariat worked for the implementation of the comprehensive Communication Plan, as initially approved by the Committee at the Psarades meeting. Throughout the year, the Prespa Park Communication Officer worked on the basis of her updated work plan. An international competition for the Prespa Park logo was carried out in May 2003 and in late June the winning entry was selected by the Committee members. The first issue of the Prespa Park newsletter was also prepared during the same period and published in late September 2003. Finally, the Prespa Park website hosted at the MedWet domain has been under preparation throughout this period and launched in late November. These and other activities that took place in 2003 have been reported and discussed at the Lemos meeting last November. The new term of office of the Communication Officer started in December 2003 with the kind support of GTZ.
 - d. Pursuant to the 2003 work plan, the local authorities should be encouraged to build closer ties and identify possible fields of joint action. On 19 July 2003, the first working meeting of Prespa basin Mayors, Mr. Andoni, Mr. Nalpantidis and Dr. Toskovski, took place in Liqenas, Albania. The three Mayors had the opportunity to discuss their role in the Prespa Park and in particular the PDF B project, exchange views on crucial issues of concern to local societies such as water management, social and economic development, better communication

between the three sides of the basin, and assessed the possibilities for the organization of joint activities. The report of the meeting with all conclusions reached has already been distributed to the PPCC members.

Furthermore, during the Lemos meeting the GTZ announced that it had earmarked €36,000 for the next 18 months for local authority partnerships in the Prespa area. However, no concrete project proposal has been elaborated yet by the Municipalities, despite the Secretariat's efforts to facilitate a meeting of the contact persons appointed by the three local authorities. This, together with overall GTZ budget restrictions has resulted in a decrease in available funding, which will be up to €10,000 until the end of 2004.

- e. According to the 2003 work plan, the protected area authorities in the three countries were urged to negotiate further exchanges of experience in nature protection, forest and wildlife management, on the basis of the Albanian NP/ Galichitsa NP cooperation. No relevant developments were noted during the year, which was marked by the establishment of a new protected area authority, the Prespa Management Body in Greece.
2. With regard to the **Sustainable Development** work axis, work towards completion of the Strategic Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of the Prespa Park (SAP) continued in 2003.
 - a. The additional proposals from the FYR of Macedonia have been recently circulated and the Plan has been finally endorsed at the present meeting.
 - b. According to the 2003 work plan, further elaboration of sustainable development activities proposed in the SAP was expected in the context of the PDF B project. However, the delay in the approval and commencement of the project has postponed this action.
 - c. Moreover, prioritisation of SAP proposals and identification of possible funding sources should have taken place in each country through national consultations; this has to some extent taken place and the relevant activities on the three sides of Prespa have been reported in Working Document 2.
 - d. The task of identification of transboundary activities/ projects proposed by the SAP that are either unlikely to be included in the full GEF project or that are simple, mature and urgent and could be implemented before or in parallel with the full GEF project, due to have been discussed at the Fifth Regular PPCC Meeting has not taken place and should be achieved in 2004 (see Work Plan 2004).
 3. With regard to the **Research, Monitoring and Conservation** axis of the Operational Plan and Programme of Activities of the Coordination Committee,
 - a. Implementation of the two delayed projects, namely the infrastructure and the hydrogeological project, has not started in 2003.

The Greek Government acknowledges the big delay in implementation of the former; in view of the time that has already passed since its inception, the Greek Government would like to await the PDF B recommendations with regard to the subject-matter of the infrastructure project, including protected area infrastructure needs, joint monitoring needs etc. in order to make sure that all

future funding for the Prespa Park area is consistent with the comprehensive planning of activities to be achieved through the PDF B project.

Finally, the first phase of the hydrogeological project is due to be executed in the context of PDF B activities during the current year.

- b. Further elaboration of specific research, monitoring and conservation activities proposed in the SAP in the context of the PDF B project has not been achieved during 2003 since approval and implementation of the project was delayed.
 - c. The Secretariat continued updating the data base with scientists/ experts on Prespa and relevant publications
 - d. Finally, as far as trilateral contingency cooperation is concerned, on 30 October 2003, a working meeting of fire-fighting authorities competent for the Prespa area was held at the office of the Municipality of Prespa in Lemos, Greece. Discussion concerned the current status and future prospects of fire-fighting cooperation among the three countries and the fire-fighting needs and prospects in Prespa in particular. The participants agreed on the establishment of initial contacts and meetings and, as a first step in this regard, they designated contact persons from each country who will co-operate for the preparation of a joint contingency plan. A report on the status and future development of fire-fighting cooperation in the Prespa Park, which falls under the mandate of the PPCC, was prepared by the SPP and circulated on 17 May 2003.
4. Lastly, with regard to **Funding**:
- a. As instructed, the Secretariat continued collecting information on possible funding sources at a national, European and international level to enable implementation of the Prespa Park activities.
 - b. The main development in this connection during the reporting period was the approval of the Prespa Park PDF B project request on 5 June 2003.
 - c. Finally, the three Governments have allocated part of the earmarked minimum core funding for the implementation of the Prespa Park Coordination Committee work plan, as shown in the financial report for 2003.

Prespa Park Financial Report - 2003

The structure of this financial report follows that of the 2003 budget, approved at the Ag. Germanos Second Extraordinary meeting of the PPCC. Hence, the expenditure part of the report is divided into two sections, namely I. Core Activities that refer to the basic institutional functioning of the Prespa Park process, and more specifically to PPCC meetings and the basic work of its Secretariat – constant elements of each annual work plan, and II. Non-core activities that refer to specific actions implemented in 2003, and, more specifically, Communication Plan activities, Mayors' meeting, fire-fighting cooperation and PDF B project activities – for reasons of consistency, despite the fact that the PDF B project had not effectively started until the end of 2003.

The expenditure is further broken down into actual funding in cash and contribution in kind. The distinction between support in cash and in kind serves to depict more accurately the nature of the actual contribution of each party. Thus, the SPP appears as contributing cash since it has effectively secured WWF Greece funds for the Prespa Park – besides Government contribution channelled through the SPP, while the other two NGOs appear as contributing in kind to the process, since they either use volunteer work or offer part of their own resources to the Prespa Park raised for other purposes/ projects etc.

(in euro)

Part A. Implementation of 2003 Work plan

Expenditure	Contribution in cash		Contribution in Kind	
		Donor		Donor
I. CORE ACTIVITIES				
<u>I.A. Coordination Committee meetings</u>				
4th regular meeting (Oteshevo)				
Travel & Accommodation	5,009.51			
Interpretation	1,463.22			
Events & Other costs	3,784.93			
	10,257.66	Greek MFA/ WWF GR		
5th regular meeting (Lemos)				
Travel & Accommodation	10,820.01			
Interpretation	8,838.21			
Events & Other costs	1,082.45			
	20,740.67	Greek MoE/ WWF GR		
2nd extraordinary meeting (Ag.Germanos)				
Travel & Accommodation	3,600.00			
Interpretation	1,050.00			
Events & Other costs	2,000.00			

Expenditure	Contribution in cash		Contribution in Kind	
			Donor	Donor
		6,650.00	Municipality of Prespa	
SUBTOTAL I.A		37,648.33		
<u>I.B. Secretariat</u>				
<u>I.B1. Secretariat Remuneration</u>				
SPP	14,465.00	Greek MFA/ WWF GR		
PPNEA	6,000.00	Greek MFA/ WWF GR		
MAP	n/a ⁽³⁾			MAP
Communication officer	10,380.00	GTZ		
<i>Subtotal I.B1</i>		30,845.00		
<u>I.B2. Administration & Office costs</u>				
SPP	27,019.44 ⁽¹⁾	Greek MFA/ WWF GR		
PPNEA	3,700.00	Greek MFA/ WWF GR	800.00	PPNEA
MAP	n/a			MAP
<i>Subtotal I.B2</i>		30,719.44		
<u>I.B3. Travel</u>				
SPP	1,074.71	Greek MFA/ WWF GR		
PPNEA	300.00	Greek MFA/ WWF GR	200.00	PPNEA
MAP	n/a			MAP
Communication Officer ⁽²⁾	1,320.00	GTZ		
<i>Subtotal I.B3</i>		2,694.71		
SUBTOTAL I.B		64,259.15		1,000.00
TOTAL I		101,907.48		1,000.00
II. NON-CORE ACTIVITIES				
<u>II.A. Communication Plan</u>				
Newsletter	2,785.00			
Logo	1,010.00			
Website	2,260.00			
Overheads	2,380.00			
SUBTOTAL II.A		8,435.00	GTZ	

⁽¹⁾ Including part of the salaries of the SPP Prespa Park programme assistants, Ms.Daphne Mantziou and Mr.Miltos Gletsos, and other SPP administrative staff.

⁽²⁾ Including per diem and accommodation

⁽³⁾ Data not available

Expenditure	Contribution in cash		Contribution in Kind	
		Donor		Donor
<u>II.B Prespa Mayors' working meeting</u>				
Travel & Accommodation	2,776.93			
Interpretation	1,580.00			
Other costs	1,533.27			
SUBTOTAL II.B	5,890.20	Greek MFA/ WWF GR		
<u>II.C Transboundary cooperation in fire-fighting</u>				
Working meeting:				
Travel & Accommodation	1,511.62			
Interpretation	1,580.00			
Other costs	2,420.00			
Preparatory activities and Reporting costs	4,808.08			
SUBTOTAL II.C	10,319.70	Greek MFA/ WWF GR		
<u>II.D SAP additions in the FYR of Macedonia</u>				
Adaptation and translation	1,180.00			
Other costs			1,500.00	
SUBTOTAL II.D	1,180.00	MoEPP	1,500.00	MoEPP
<u>II.E Miscellaneous activities</u>				
Support to Public Water Management Enterprise, Resen	4,920.00			
Support to Local Self Government, Resen	1,640.00			
Informing the public and consultations	1,000.00			
Support to the preparation of LEAP for Resen Municipality	5,740.00			
Albanian Ministry cost			3,000.00	
SUBTOTAL II.E	13,300.00	MoEPP	3,000.00	AL MoE
<u>II.F PDF B activities</u>				
	-			
SUBTOTAL II.F	-			
TOTAL II	39,124.90		4,500.00	
PART A - GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURE	141,032.38		5,500.00	

Income	Contribution in cash	Contribution in Kind
I. Albania		
Ministry of Environment		3,000.00
II. FYR of Macedonia		
Ministry of Environment	14,480.00	1,500.00
III. Greece		
Ministry of Environment	18,000.00	
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	67,172.70	
Municipality of Prespa	6,650.00	
IV. NGOs		
WWF Greece (SPP)	14,594.68	
PPNEA		1,000.00
MAP		n/a
V. Development Agencies		
UNDP		
GTZ	20,135.00	
KfW		
PART A - GRAND TOTAL INCOME	141,032.38	5,500.00

Part B: Parallel Activities in the Prespa Park Region – GTZ Micro-projects

Income	Contribution in cash	Contribution in kind
I. Development Agencies		
GTZ	211,000.00	
II. NGOs and other actors		n/a
PART B - GRAND TOTAL	211,000.00	

Annex IV – Operational Plan and Programme of Activities 2004 of the PPCC

At its Fourth Regular meeting in Oteshevo, the PPCC decided that starting from the 2004 work plan the planning period should be expanded to three years (Oteshevo meeting report, Conclusion 5). However, this decision was informed by the belief that the PDF B project would have been at its final stages and, therefore, concrete medium-term planning for the Prespa Park area in general, and for the PPCC as an international body in particular, would have been produced. It should also be reminded that "strengthening of the PPCC and its Secretariat" is among the immediate objectives of the PDF B project and that includes training to the Secretariat and Committee members, as well as "support [to] the PPCC and its Secretariat in the performance of their project related tasks", which was expected to increase the capacity of the Committee and its Secretariat to carry out its tasks more effectively. Delays noted in the implementation of the PDF B project create a different situation than the one envisaged and it is thus decided to postpone the said extension of the planning period until after the PDF B project will have produced results. The present work plan accordingly refers to the year 2004.

As was seen under agenda item 5, Implementation of Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2003, some of the elements of the 2003 work plan progressed at a satisfactory pace, whereas others have been delayed. It is decided that, during 2004, the work of the PPCC will continue to focus on three main axes, Communication, Sustainable Development and Research, Monitoring and Conservation.

Moreover, in view of the fact that the workload is expected to increase considerably with the PDF B activities and the Secretariat of the Coordination Committee has rather limited capabilities and a number of restrictions at the moment, it becomes increasingly important that stakeholders other than the NGOs, namely the Governments and the local municipalities, become more active in carrying out specific tasks laid down in the Prespa Park work plan.

In this context, special attention should be given to the "identification of transboundary activities/ programmes proposed by the SAP that are either unlikely to be included in the full GEF project or that are simple, mature and urgent and could be implemented before or in parallel with the full GEF project", a task already included in the 2003 work plan but not adequately worked upon. In order to take the Prespa Park initiative forward and renew its momentum, it would thus be desirable to take specific initiatives at a political or other appropriate levels during 2004. A possible area of interest in this connection could be to explore the possibility of joint activities in the Prespa Park area inspired by Community legislation in the field of nature protection, water management or other fields of choice. This discussion relates to item 4 of the Sustainable Development axis below, but could also be relevant to the Research, Monitoring and Conservation axis of the PPCC programme of activities.

Lastly, specific activities, other than the core ones, that are included in the work plan should be organised as separate projects with a specific project proposal and guaranteed funding, on the pattern of the Communication Plan as developed in 2002-2003, in order to enable the Secretariat or any other responsible party to carry them out effectively.

With regard to funding, it is also reaffirmed that:

- a. The Secretariat should continue collecting information on possible funding sources at a national, European and international level to enable implementation of the current work plan, as well as future activities in the framework of the

Prespa Park. For this purpose, it would be greatly assisted by the activities for identification and mobilisation of co-financing sources that are envisaged to take place in the PDF context.

- b. The three Governments will allocate the earmarked minimum core funding for the implementation of the PPCC work plan, and will further consider their co-financing contributions to the full GEF project.

Taking these considerations into account, the following work plan is adopted:

A. Communication

Aim: To organise the collection and dissemination of information on activities of any kind that may have a direct or indirect effect on the natural or socio-economic status of the Prespa Park area, promote the Prespa Park initiative at the local, national and international levels, and establish and maintain a communication channel with all bodies and organisations that have an interest in Prespa, including national authorities and services, NGOs, universities, international organisations and the wider public.

Activities:

Activity	Tools	Responsible	Funding	Timeframe
1. Provision of information to local, regional, national, and international authorities and organisations of the establishment and operation of the PP and the PP CC	Meetings Contacts	Secretariat	Secretariat core funding	January - December 2004
2. Gathering of information on activities that may have a direct or indirect effect on the natural or socio-economic status of the PP area	Update inventory	Secretariat PDF B project staff	Secretariat core funding	January - December 2004
3. Implementation of Communication Plan More detailed discussion of the Communication Plan implementation has been carried out under Agenda item 7	1. Newsletter 2. Meetings 3. Other activities	Communication Officer	€22,221 GTZ	January - December 2004

Activity	Tools	Responsible	Funding	Timeframe
4. Cooperation of Prespa Municipalities in order to build closer ties and identify possible fields of joint action	Working meeting of the Municipality contact persons Other activities, as will be decided	Prespa Mayors, assisted by the Secretariat	€10,000 GTZ	June - December 2004
5. Cooperation between protected area authorities in the three countries	Meetings Regular contacts	Protected area authorities, assisted by the Secretariat and the Communication Officer	Not secured	May – December 2004
	First meeting scheduled for 5 June 2004 and organised by the PP Communication Officer			

B. Sustainable Development

Aim: To promote sustainable development programmes and projects in the Prespa basin on the basis of the Strategic Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of the Prespa Park.

Activities:

After the final version of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) is endorsed, the first priority actions identified therein must be further elaborated and implemented. This has already been under way separately in each country and should continue, whereas at the Coordination Committee level the same process should start with regard to purely transboundary activities and programmes. One area

Activity	Tools	Responsible	Funding	Timeframe
1. Endorsement of the SAP by the PP CC	Not required	Chairman	Not required	Sixth regular meeting of the PP CC (May 2004)
2. Further elaboration of specific sustainable development activities proposed in the SAP	PDF studies (Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, Socio-Economic Analysis, Actual and Alternative Livelihoods Analysis, Infrastructure Investment Analysis etc.)	PP CC Consultants	PDF B project (UNDP/ KfW)	July – December 2004
3. Prioritisation of SAP proposals in each country - Identification of funding sources and implementation of mature projects and programmes	National consultations – meetings	PP CC national members	Not required	January – December 2004
4. Identification of transboundary activities/ programmes proposed by the SAP that are either unlikely to be included in the full GEF project or that are simple, mature and urgent and could be implemented before or in parallel with the full GEF project.	Discussion at the sixth regular PPCC meeting Further contacts and meetings	Chairman - Secretariat	Not required	May – December 2004

C. Research, Monitoring and Conservation

Aim: To follow and coordinate environmental scientific research, monitoring and conservation activities in the Prespa Park area and undertake relevant initiatives/ projects of a transboundary nature.

Activities:

Activity	Tools	Responsible	Funding	Timeframe
1. Further elaboration of specific research, monitoring and conservation activities proposed in the SAP	PDF studies (Biodiversity and Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, Studies on the Protected Areas needs and management plans, on the legal, regulatory and institutional arrangements needed at the national and trilateral level etc.)	PP CC Consultants	PDF B project (UNDP/ KfW)	July – December 2004
2. Implementation of the Prespa catchment hydrogeological study	PDF activity	PP CC Consultants	PDF B project (UNDP/ KfW)	July – December 2004
4. Gathering of information on scientists/ experts on Prespa and relevant publications	Update database	Secretariat	Secretariat core funding	January – December 2004

Prespa Park Budget - 2004

(in euro)

Part A: Implementation of 2004 Workplan

Expenditure	Secured Funding (cash)		Contribution in Kind		Unsecured funds
		Donor		Donor	
I. CORE ACTIVITIES					
I.A. Coordination Committee meetings					
6 th regular meeting (Korcha)					
Travel & Accommodation	4,875				
Interpretation	1,560				
Events & Other costs	2,045				
	8,480	UNDP/ GEF			
3 rd extraordinary meeting (Resen)					
Travel & Accommodation	3,180				
Interpretation	1,560				
Events & Other costs	1,560				
	6,300	MoEPP			
7 th regular meeting (FYR of Macedonia)					
Travel & Accommodation					5,000
Interpretation					1,500
Events & Other costs					4,000
					10,500
SUBTOTAL I.A	14,780				10,500
I.B. Secretariat					
I.B1. Secretariat Remuneration					
SPP	15,040	WWF GR			
PPNEA			6,000	PPNEA	
MAP			6,625	MAP	
Communication officer	8,300	GTZ			
<i>Subtotal I.B1</i>	23,340		12,625		
I.B2. Administration & Office costs					
SPP	28,100	WWF GR			
PPNEA			6,200	PPNEA	
MAP			6,625	MAP	
<i>Subtotal I.B2</i>	28,100		12,825		

Expenditure	Secured Funding (cash)		Contribution in Kind		Unsecured funds
	Donor		Donor		
<u>I.B3. Travel</u>					
	SPP	1,120	WWF GR		
	PPNEA			2,000	PPNEA
	MAP			2,755	MAP
	Communication Officer	1,500	GTZ		
<i>Subtotal I.B3</i>		2,620		4,755	
SUBTOTAL I.B		54,060		30,205	
TOTAL I		68,840		30,205	10,500
II. NON-CORE ACTIVITIES IN THE WORKPLAN					
<u>II.A. Communication Plan</u>					
	Activities	9,000			
	Overheads	1,500			
	Contingency	1,000			
SUBTOTAL II.A		11,500	GTZ		
<u>II.B SAP additions in the FYR of Macedonia</u>					
	Preparation and Adaptation	1,505			
SUBTOTAL II.B		1,505	MoEPP		
<u>II.C PDF B activities^{1 2}</u>					
	Project activities: project outputs	313,333	UNDP/GEF		
	Project activities ³ : lump sum	362,318	KfW		
	Co-financing	8,333	MoEPP ⁴	8,333	MoEPP
		8,333	AL - MoE	8,333	AL - MoE
		44,000	GR - MoE		
		16,666	UNDP Albania, UNDP Macedonia		
				5,000	Municipality of Resen
				2,500	Municipality of Prespa
				5,000	PNP- Albania
				7,500	NGOs

¹ Data taken from the PDF B Project Document

² PDF B entries have been converted from US\$ to € using the conversion rate 1€=1.2US\$ (as of 18 May 2004)

³ KfW contribution not finalised yet

⁴ MoEPP has already allocated €5,197 (cash) and €2,500 (in-kind) for office equipment of the Resen PIU

Expenditure	Secured Funding (cash)		Contribution in Kind		Unsecured funds
	Donor		Donor		
				(PPNEA, MAP, SPP)	
SUBTOTAL II.C	752,983		36,666		
II.D Miscellaneous activities					
Support to Local Self Government partnerships	10,000	GTZ			
Support to the Public Water Management Enterprise, Resen	2,460	MoEPP			
Support to SAP and small projects (not specified yet)	5,938	MoEPP			
Albanian Ministry costs			2,000	AL-MoE	
SUBTOTAL II.D	18,398		2,000		
TOTAL II	784,386		38,666		
PART A - GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURE	853,226		68,871		10,500

Income	Funding in cash	Contribution in kind
I. Albania		
Ministry of Environment	8,333	10,333
PNP-Albania		5,000
II. FYR of Macedonia		
Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning	24,536	8,333
Municipality of Resen		5,000
III. Greece		
Ministry of Environment	44,000	
Municipality of Prespa		2,500
IV. NGOs		
WWF Greece (SPP)	44,260	
PPNEA		16,700
MAP		18,505
SPP		2,500
V. Development Agencies		
UNDP/GEF	321,813	
UNDP Albania and UNDP Macedonia	16,666	
KfW	362,318	
GTZ	31,300	
PART A - GRAND TOTAL INCOME	853,226	68,871

Unsecured costs: €10,500 corresponding to the estimated cost of the seventh regular meeting of the PPCC in the FYR of Macedonia

Part B: Parallel Activities in the Prespa Park Region – GTZ Micro-projects

Expenditure	Secured funding (cash)		Contribution in kind		Outstanding in 2004
	Donor		Donor		
I. FYR of Macedonia					
1. Featuring the LSG institutional framework	21,350	GTZ	3,600	CIBC, Kozani	14,600
2. Joint activities umbrella – supporting economic cross border cooperation	30,000	GTZ	3,600	CIBC, Kozani	6,000
3. Sustainable solid waste management in Prespa – MK + AL	26,180	GTZ	10,120	NGO Civil environmental Forum, Skopje	14,510
4. Screening for cervical cancer in the rural areas in Prespa	29,940	GTZ	3,300	GP and Gynecological Surgery "Zaharievski"	3,035
5. Grafting our future onto old roots	25,523	GTZ	4,545	NGO ALLCOOP, Ohrid	10,523
6. Together for better Prespa	9,930	GTZ	3,300	KUD "Tase Miloskeski"	5,320
7. Traditional red peppers recepies	23,901	GTZ	3,000	Cultural Triangle of Prespa, Ag. Germanos	17,401
8. Traditional fishing in Prespa	8,600	GTZ	0		4,760
9. Together against respiratory diseases	10,200	GTZ	350	Centre for prevention of respiratory diseases	10,200
TOTAL I	185,624		31,815		86,349
II. Albania					
1. Medicinal plants	11,600	GTZ	1,300	NGO-Albaflor-Korca	5,634
2. Forest ecosystem rehabilitation	23,550	GTZ	1,930	NGO-Center for sustainable development of Prespa	12,729
3. Capacities building of women NGO-s	15,314	GTZ	2,750	NGO Refleksione Pogradec	4,314
4. Reconstruction of the fishing and tourist boat in Gollmboc Prespa	2,800	GTZ	1,000	NGO Zaveri-Prespa	882
5. Birds tower in Zaveri Place	7,100	GTZ	2,240	NGO ALCOOP - Ohrid	1,935
6. Rivers watershed rehabilitation	21,010	GTZ	14,890	Environmental Albanian center"	11568
7. Building bridges-First	15,400	GTZ	2,160	NGO Tourism	10,510

Expenditure	Secured funding (cash)		Contribution in kind		Outstanding in 2004
	Donor		Donor		
Eurocamp in Prespa				and Environment -Pogradec	
8. Simbioza	8,057	GTZ	525	NGO-SUN Prespa	5,105
9. Nitrates and Phosphorous monitoring in agriculture	18,930	GTZ	3,690	Centre for prevention of respiratory diseases	6,860
Total II	102,688		30,485		59,537
Total I+II	288,312		62,300		145,884
PART B - GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURE					145,884

Income	Funding in cash	Contribution in kind
I. Development Agencies		
GTZ	145,884	
II. NGOs		
		n/a
PART B - GRAND TOTAL INCOME	145,884	n/a

Annex V – Prespa Park Communication Work Plan 2004

Following the fifth regular meeting of the Prespa Park Coordination Committee held in Lemos (13-15 November 2003), in the conclusion 6 relating to the Prespa Park Communication Officer it was stressed that a special focus on communication with the local population, and on appropriate coordination with the Social Facilitators and the Community Outreach Programme must be developed within the PDF B project.

Working on the basis of an updated workplan for communication from January 2004 up to now there are implemented the following **activities:**

On 31.01.2004 a round table of the local journalists of the Prespa Park region was organized in Korcha on the occasion of the World Wetlands Day 2004. Representatives of the Albanian local press, TV and radio media were present, however the very bad weather conditions prevented journalists of the two neighbouring countries from attending the meeting. In this meeting to the journalist it was made a short presentation about the Prespa Park initiative by the Communication Officer, and it was talked about the contribution of mass media in environmental conservation. Following the above, Dr. S. Shumka, Prespa Park Secretariat member, elaborated on the joint projects undertaken in the region, making special reference to the launching of the PDF B project in the three countries. The roundtable, which constituted the first such event in the region, was warmly welcomed by all participants, who committed themselves in supporting the transboundary collaboration and promoting the Prespa Park activities through the media. On this occasion there were given also interviews to the local TV's by the Communication Officer.

During January-February 2004 a drawing competition among schoolchildren in all three regions sharing the Prespa basin was organised on the occasion of the World Wetlands Day 2004 with the topic "Our Prespa". The competition involved all 7-11 year-old groups of the primary schools of Liqenas in Albania, of Ag.Germanos in Greece and of Resen, in the FYR of Macedonia. Every single participant received a T-shirt and a sticker with the Prespa Park logo. The three winners proclaimed in each country were given a photo camera, an educational play game and a children's book on nature respectively. All drawings will be collected and will then be presented in all schools that were involved in the competition during October 2004.

On 7 May 2004, in Korcha, the Communication Officer organised a Prespa area environmental NGOs meeting, aiming to give them the opportunity for an initial exchange of experiences, information and ideas. In this meeting, the representatives of the participating NGOs, decided to include in the Prespa Park website a short description of their main activities and to appoint a contact person in this regard. They also welcomed the idea of the follow up of such an initiative in the future. A second meeting of the active environmental NGOs, can be organized during end of September 2004, in close cooperation with the social facilitators of the PDF B.

In May 2004 it was published the Prespa Park poster "Three peoples, two lakes, one future". In this regard, the Communication officer – responsible person for this publication - was involved in the collection of the proper photos that are included in the poster in order to emphasise to the general public the image of the Prespa Park in all its aspects (nature, water and human activities).

The second issue of the Prespa Park published in May 2004, due to the technical problems that we were faced with, was delayed, having successfully all the four languages "at one". It reflects to the public relevant information about what is actually happening in the Prespa Park.

During the period January – May 2004, the Communication Officer has also done visits and meetings in the Prespa Park with different stakeholders in the region (NGO's, local authorities, PIUs staff – Resen office), and also has participated in other activities that are held for different issues relevant to Prespa initiative.

The Prespa Park website, was further elaborated and updated. In this regard, it's to be stressed that in accordance with the Web Traffic Report of MedWet, the Prespa Park link was ranked as the 5th most visited link (April figures).

On 12-13 May 2004, the Communication Officer has an in-house training in Athens by MedWet, SPP and WWF Greece about the working experience of their Communications Officers and has an input for the elaboration and implementation of the Communication work plan.

ANNUAL COMMUNICATION WORK PLAN FOR THE PRESPA PARK – 2004

ACTIVITY	Month											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Prespa Park website updating	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2. Prespa Park Newsletter (2nd issue)												
2.1 Collection of materials- editing	X											
2.2 Circulation to the Secretariat and CC for approval		X										
2.3 Translation in the three local languages			X									
2.4 Design and publication of the newsletter				X								
2.5 Distribution of the 2 nd issue of the Prespa Park Newsletter				X	X							
3. Organization of a roundtable with the journalists of the three countries around Prespa Park area (in the frame of the 2nd February - WWD).	X											
4. Organization of a children-drawing competition in Prespa Park region schools (in the frame of the 2nd February - WWD).	X	X										
5. Organization of an environmental NGOs meeting from the three countries around Prespa, in cooperation with the PPNEA. (more information is given to the Report on activities January – May 2004).			X	X				X	X			
6. Publication of the Prespa Park Poster				X	X							
7. Organization of a meeting of the three National Park authorities in the frame of 5th June – World Environment Day				X	X	X						

ACTIVITY	Month											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
8. Prespa Park Newsletter (3rd issue)												
8.1 Collection of materials- editing						X						
8.2 Circulation to the Secretariat and CC for approval							X					
8.3 Translation in the three local languages									X			
8.4 Design and publication of the newsletter										X		
8.5 Distribution of the 3 rd issue of the Prespa Park Newsletter											X	
9. The organization of an exhibition with the drawings of the children in the three countries around the Prespa basin.										X	X	
10. Publication of a calendar for 2005 with views from the Prespa area.											X	X
11. Publication of postcards with the best paintings selected by the children competition.											X	X
12. Development of a TV spot and a film documentary about the Prespa values in the three countries. (planned to be finalized on the occasion of the 5th anniversary of the Prespa Park establishment)											X	X
13. Miscellaneous –visits and meetings in the region, PPNEA and GTZ office, press coverage, activities in coordination with the PDF social facilitators, interviews and meetings with the local populations in the three countries, etc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Annex VI - List of Participants

Prespa Park Coordination Committee Members

Albania	Mr. Zamir Dedej (Government) Director, Nature Protection Directorate Ministry of Environment Rr. « Durresi » Nr. 27 Tirana	T: +355 4 270624 F: +355 4 27 0624 E: zamir@cep.tirana.al
	Mr. Pandi Andoni (Local authority) Head of the Prespa Commune Liqenas Korçe	T: + 355 68 23 67 028 F: E:
Greece	Mr. Spyros Plessas (Government) Department of Management of the Natural Environment Directorate of Environmental Planning Ministry of Environment, Spatial Planning and Public Works Triklon 36 11526 Athens	T: +30 210 6916301 F: +30 210 6918487 E: splessas@edpp.gr plessas@minenv.gr
	Mr. Lazaros Nalpantidis (Local authority) Mayor of Prespa Municipality of Prespa Lemos, Prespa 53077 Aghios Germanos	T: +30 23850 51433 F: +30 23850 51435 E: prespa@otenet.gr
	Ms. Myrsini Malakou (NGO) Director Society for the Protection of Prespa Aghios Germanos, Prespa 53077 Aghios Germanos	T: +30 23850 51211 F: +30 23850 51343 E: spp@line.gr
FYR of Macedonia	Ms. Darinka Jantinska (Government) Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning Drezdenska 52 1000 Skopje	T: +389 2 3066930 ext. 118 F: +389 2 3066931 E: D.Jantinska@moepp.gov.mk
	Mr. Dimko Toskovski (Local authority) Mayor Municipality of Resen Marshal Tito Square, No. 20 7310 Resen	T: +389 96 451450 F: +389 96 451450
	Ms. Pandorka Nikusheva (NGO) Macedonian Alliance for Prespa Vasil Gorgov bb, block 6 1000 Skopje	T: +389 2 220518 F: +389 2 128075 E: nikus@freemail.org.mk
MedWet	Mr. Thymio Papayannis (MedWet - alternate member) Senior Advisor on Mediterranean Wetlands The MedWet Initiative, Convention on Wetlands 23 Voucourestiou Str. 10671 Athens, Greece	T: +30 210 3600711-714, F: +30 210 3629338 E: thymiop@hol.gr

PPCC Secretariat members and Communication Officer

Albania	Mr. Spase Shumka (Secretariat member) PPNEA Blv. "Zogu I", Pall.97/1/5 Tirana	T: +355 4 249571 F: +355 4 249571 E: sprespa@yahoo.co.uk
Greece	Ms. Vivi Roumeliotou (Secretariat member) Society for the Protection of Prespa c/o WWF Greece 26 Filellinon Str. 10558 Athens	T: +30 210 3311988 ext.126 F: +30 210 3247578 E: v.roumeliotou@wwf.gr
	Ms. Aferdita Ponari (Communication Officer) PPNEA Blv. "Zogu I", Pall.97/1/5 Tirana, Albania	T: +355 4 249571 F: +355 4 249571 E: aponari@yahoo.com

Invited Observers

Albania	Ms. Eteleva Canaj Deputy Minister of Environment of Albania Rr. "Durrresi" Nr. 27 Tirana	T : +355 4 225 134 F : +355 4 270 625 E: etlevamoe@abissnet.com.al
	Mr. Pellumb Abeshi Secretary General of the Ministry of Environment - NPD/ PDF B programme Rr. « Durrresi » Nr. 27 Tirana	T : +355 4 270 623 F : +355 270 623 E : pabeshi@abissnet.com.al
	Mr. Fehmi Xhemo Head of District Council Korcha Korcha	T: +355 68 20 52885
	Mr. Mitro Nedelko Responsible for the International Relations Korcha Prefecture Korcha	T: +355 68 2283845
	Mr. Kristaq Shore Director Korcha Forestry Service Korcha	T: +355 82 42 569 F: +355 82 42 569 E:
	Mr. Pirro Pojani Director Prespa National Park Korcha	T: +355 82 43566 F: +355 82 42 569 E:
Greece	Ms. Athina Mourmouri Head of the Department of Management of the Natural Environment – Deputy NPD/ PDF B project Directorate of Environmental Planning Ministry of Environment, Spatial Planning and Public Works Triakalon 36 11526 Athens	T: +30 210 6917620 F: +30 210 6918487 E: a.mourmouri@dpers.minen.v.gr

	Mr. Eleftherios Proios General Consul of Greece Hellenic Consulate in Korcha Pavlo Katro N.4 Korcha, Albania	T: +355 82 45731-4 F: +355 82 45052
	Ms. Daphne Mantziou Society for the Protection of Prespa c/o WWF Greece 26 Filellinon Str. 10558 Athens	T: +30 210 3311988 ext.136 F: +30 210 3247578 E: d.mantziou@wwf.gr
	Mr. Miltos Gletsos Society for the Protection of Prespa c/o WWF Greece 26 Filellinon Str. 10558 Athens	T: +30 210 3311988 ext.118 F: +30 210 3247578 E: m.gletsos@wwf.gr
FYR of Macedonia	Mr. Kiril Nasteski State Secretary – NPD/ PDF B programme Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning Drezdenska 52 1000 Skopje	T: +389 2 366 930 F: +389 2 366 931
UNDP	Mr. Batkhuyag Baldangombo UNDP Tirana Deshmoret e 4 Shkurtit Street, No. 35 Tirana, Albania	T: +355 4 233122/148/149 F: +355 4 232075/234 448 E: batkhuyag.baldangombo@undp.org
	Ms. Anita Kodzoman Programme Officer in Environment UNDP Skopje Dimitrie Cupovski 8 1000 Skopje, FYR of Macedonia	T: +389 2 3116335 (ext.118) F: +389 2 3118261 E: anita.kodzoman@undp.org
	Mr. Keith Shawe PDF B project - International Project Manager Municipality of Resen, Marshal Tito Square, No. 20 7310 Resen, FYR of Macedonia	T: +389 47 455190 F: +389 47 455186 E: kgshawe@mac.com keith.shawe@undp.org.mk
	Mr. Ardit Ikonomi National Project Coordinator/ PDF B project Shetitorja " Vangjush Miho" Pallati Kultures Korcha, Albania	T: +355 68 20 54 724 F: E: arditikonomi@hotmail.com
	Ms. Elona Stefanllari Social Facilitator/ PDF B project Shetitorja " Vangjush Miho" Pallati Kultures Korcha, Albania	T: + 355 69 21 33 009 F: E:
	Mr. Ljupco Stojanovski National Project Coordinator/ PDF B project Municipality of Resen, Marshal Tito Square, No. 20 7310 Resen, FYR of Macedonia	T: +389 47 455195 F: +389 47 455185 E: ljupco.stojanovski@undp.org.mk
	Mr. Dimitrija Sekovski Social Facilitator/ PDF B project Municipality of Resen, Marshal Tito Square, No. 20 7310 Resen, FYR of Macedonia	T: +389 47 455185 F: +389 47 455185 E: dimitar.sekovski@undp.org.mk

KfW	Mr. Petar Gjorgjiev Project Coordinator KfW-Skopje	T: +389 2 3109241 F: +389 2 3212466 E: kfw@unet.com.mk
	Ms. Natasha Sachmaroska Project Coordinator KfW-Skopje.	T: +389 2 3109241 F: +389 2 3212466 E: kfw@unet.com.mk
	Ms. Keti Monari KfW – Albania Rr. Mihal Grameno, Pall. 3/3 Tirana, Albania	T: +355 43 340 017 F: +355 43 340 017 E: kfwalbania@interalb.net
GTZ	Mr. Dieter Biallas Senior Advisor Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5 Postfach 51 80 65726 Eschborn, Germany	T: +49 40 482067 F: +49 40 46069350 E: dbiallas@GMX.de
	Ms. Anica Palazzo GTZ Ohrid Vangel Nikoloski 33 6000 Ohrid, FYR of Macedonia	T: +389 46 231910 F: +389 46 231912 E: gtzohrid@mt.net.mk
	Ms. Anula Guda GTZ Albania - Co-ordinator Tirana, Albania	T: +355 42 50032 F: E: gtzofficetir@albaniaonline.net