



PRESPA PARK

REPORT

**SEVENTH REGULAR MEETING of the PRESPA
PARK COORDINATION COMMITTEE**

**OTESHEVO, RESEN, FYR OF MACEDONIA
6-7 MARCH 2005**

CONTENTS:

Agenda	1
Summary Minutes	2
Conclusions	16
Annex I – List of Abbreviations.....	18
Annex II – Draft outcomes and outputs for Project Brief	19
Annex III – Presentation of KfW feasibility study and proposed interventions.....	25
Annex IV – UNDP Work plan for the submission of a GEF Project Brief	26
Annex V - Report on the implementation of the PPCC Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2004.....	27
Annex VI – PPCC Operational Plan and Programme of Activities - 2005.....	37
Annex VII – Presentation by UNESCO-ROSTE on Biosphere Reserves.....	46
Annex VIII - List of Participants.....	47

Seventh Regular Meeting of the Prespa Park Coordination Committee

Oteshevo, Resen, FYR of Macedonia, 6-7 March 2005

**Hosted by the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning of the FYR of Macedonia
and the Municipality of Resen –
Funded by UNDP/ GEF**

At the invitation of Ms. Darinka Jantinska, Head of Division for Bilateral Cooperation, Department for European Integration, Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning of the FYR of Macedonia, representative of the Ministry to the Prespa Park Coordination Committee (PPCC), the PPCC held its seventh regular meeting at the Hotel, Evropa, Oteshevo, FYR of Macedonia, on 6-7 March 2005.

The meeting was attended by nine out of the ten members (or alternative members) of the PPCC from the three countries involved and from Ramsar/ MedWet, as well as by representatives of UNDP, KfW, UNESCO-ROSTE, WWF International, EURONATUR, PDF B project officials and staff, and other national observers (see complete list of participants in Annex VIII). Mr. Aleko Miho (PPNEA) and Mr. Spyros Kouvelis (MedWet Coordinator) were not able to attend.

The meeting was opened by the State Secretary of the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning of the FYR of Macedonia, Ms. Lindita Shakiri Atanasova, and chaired by Ms. Darinka Jantinska.

Agenda

1. Opening session:

- 1.1. Welcoming by the Chairperson
- 1.2. Welcoming by the State Secretary, MoEPP - Ms. Lindita Shakiri Atanasova
- 1.3. Welcome address by the Mayor of Resen – Dr. Dimko Toskovski
- 1.4. Presentation of the working agenda by the Chairperson and approval

2. Prespa Park PDF B project:

- 2.1. Draft outcomes and outputs for Project Brief - Presentation by Mr. Jeffrey Griffin, UNDP (Working Document 1)
- 2.2. KfW feasibility study and proposed interventions - Presentation by Ms. Susanne Pecher (GFA Terra)
- 2.3. Questions and discussion
- 2.4. UNDP Work plan for submission of Project Brief - Presentation by Mr. Jeffrey Griffin, UNDP
- 2.5. Discussion and conclusion

3. Activities since the last regular meeting in Korcha:

- 3.1. Presentation of report by the Secretariat (Working Document 2)
- 3.2. Additional contributions from the PPCC members

4. Implementation of Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2004:

- 4.1. Presentation of report and financial statement by the Secretariat (Working document 3)
- 4.2. Discussion and approval

5. Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2005:

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

6. Prespa Park Communication Plan:

- 6.1. Presentation of Communication activities report and proposals for the year 2005 by the Secretariat (Working Document 5)
- 6.2. Discussion and approval

7. Possible designation of the area as a Biosphere Reserve:

- 7.1. Presentation by Mr. Giorgio Andrian, UNESCO – ROSTE
- 7.2. Questions and discussion

8. Closure of the meeting:

- 8.1. Adoption of decisions, recommendations and conclusions of the meeting
- 8.2. Date and place of the next meetings
- 8.3. Closing remarks

Summary Minutes

The Chairwoman, Ms. Darinka Jantinska (Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning of the FYR of Macedonia (MoEPP) – PPCC member) opened the meeting by welcoming all participants. The Chairwoman passed the floor to Ms. Lindita Shakiri Atanasova, State Secretary of the MoEPP of the FYR of Macedonia, and National Project Director (NPD) for the PDF B project. Ms. Atanasova thanked the PPCC members, the donor community and the observers for their presence, and confirmed the Ministry's ongoing support to the Prespa Park initiative. Several proposed plans and activities for the area, she continued, have already been included in the Strategic Action Plan for the sustainable development of the Prespa Park (SAP), and the next step should be their implementation. Ms. Atanasova welcomed the reports prepared by the PDF B project teams and the national and international consultants, and said that joint efforts and financial support could contribute to

the further development of the Prespa Park, the first transboundary protected area in the Balkans.

The Chairwoman then passed the floor to Mr. Dimko Toskovski (Mayor of Resen – PPCC member). Mr. Toskovski spoke of the important values, natural and cultural, of the Prespa region, and the Declaration of the three Prime Ministers for the establishment of the Prespa Park on 2 February 2000. He said that much had been done in those years, referring to the previous activities of the PPCC, and expressed the view that a lot more could be done. He informed the PPCC that this was going to be his last time as Mayor of Resen in PPCC meetings, since he would not be a candidate in the coming Municipal Elections. Mr. Toskovski made reference to the successful establishment of the PDF B Project Implementation Unit in Resen; the Prespa Park communication activities; the collaboration between the three Mayors of the Prespa region; the various projects running in the Resen area; the implementation of the SAP; the planned Ministerial Meeting for the Prespa Park; and the decentralisation process in the FYR of Macedonia and its consequences to the Prespa Park.

Ms. Jantinska thanked the Mayor for his contribution and expressed the wish that he would continue his involvement in the Prespa Park process. The Chairwoman then went through the agenda of the meeting, which was approved by the PPCC.

On agenda item 2, "*Prespa Park PDF B project*", the Chairwoman gave the floor to Ms. Anita Kodzoman (UNDP-Skopje). Ms. Kodzoman expressed the hope for an open and fruitful discussion addressing all issues of the PDF B project and providing clarifications. She made a brief review of the activities since the previous PPCC meeting (Korcha, Albania, June 2004), including the split of the PDF B project activities between the two donors, UNDP/GEF and KfW, the selection of national and international consultants, and the workshop for the review of the consultant reports. The workshop concluded that due to some information gaps, submission to the GEF should be postponed and a new timeframe should be prepared. Ms. Kodzoman outlined the milestone dates in the new timeframe, including submission of the problem analysis and logical framework (24 March), of the advanced draft (20 May), and of the final version of the project document (15 June). Approval of the Prespa Park GEF project would be decided during the July session of the GEF Council.

Ms. Kodzoman went on to say that the UNDP Country Offices in Skopje and Tirana continued working for the mobilisation of additional resources, and as a result the UNDP Regional Environmental Programme (based in Bratislava) allocated \$220,000 to Albania and the FYR of Macedonia for a project concerning the environmental impacts of agriculture. Ms. Kodzoman added that since this is a transboundary activity, the Greek side would be involved too. Additionally, \$350,000 was allocated by SDC (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation) for a project addressing solid waste problems with the extension of solid waste services in rural communities.

The Chairwoman then passed the floor to Ms. Natasha Sachmaroska (KfW Skopje), who presented the main KfW activities since the last PPCC meeting. Ms. Sachmaroska said that after the review of the project terms of reference, KfW made a contract with one consultant company, GFA Terra. The experts started working in the area in early October 2004 with the assistance and support of national consultants. The first phase was finished in December and the report was then distributed to KfW's partners - that is the Ministry of Environment of Albania and the MoEPP of the FYR of Macedonia - as well as to the UNDP. Negotiations and talks took place with the two Ministries, Ms. Sachmaroska continued, and at that moment KfW had a clear picture ahead of the second phase of the project. She said that KfW has decided its priorities and wishes to discuss them with the two Ministries. The second phase of project preparation would finish by the end of July 2005 and the final report will then be

distributed to KfW's partners. Finally, in autumn this year a KfW appraisal mission would visit the region as the last stage before signing the contracts with the recipient governments.

Mr. Jeffrey Griffin (GEF expert for the UNDP project team) presented a draft for discussion entitled "*An outline of full project outcomes, outputs and activities*" (the paper is included in Annex II below). He said that the GEF believes that Prespa area is very interesting, not only because of the Prespa Park initiative, but also because of the challenges in "mainstreaming" biodiversity objectives and activities into production sectors, such as agriculture, forestry or fisheries. Mr. Griffin said that the presented outcomes and outputs were only an outline, and that would be an opportunity for open discussion during the meeting, as well as for written comments in the future.

Mr. Griffin then proceeded with analysis of the outcomes and outputs in the draft paper.

Outcome 1 is entitled "*National-level Watershed management Institution Established and Operational, Coordinating Cross-Sectoral Resource management in the Albanian, Greek, and FYR-Macedonian areas of the Prespa Basin*". Mr. Griffin said that the idea behind effective transboundary management is to first tackle management issues at a national level. The GEF project will build upon emerging laws and policies basically in Albania and the FYR of Macedonia, including establishing and staffing management organisations, strengthening their capacity, and demonstrating water management plans in priority rivers. Mr. Griffin underlined the fact that the ongoing decentralisation in Albania and the FYR of Macedonia is very interesting to GEF.

Outcome 2, entitled "*Demonstration: National-Level ecosystem-oriented Resource Management in the Prespa Basin measurably reduces pesticide inputs, increases habitat heterogeneity, and Improves the status of target species and communities*", involves: UNDP-funded agricultural interventions for the reduction of environmental impacts, as introduced before by Ms. Kodzoman; forest management; small-scale waste water treatment facilities, still under discussion with co-funders; fisheries management plans; and pre-emptive measures for industrial pollution, applying mainly to the FYR of Macedonian part of the basin. Mr. Griffin said that some of the above outputs might be funded entirely by KfW.

The first two project Outcomes, Mr. Griffin noted, are focused at the national level.

Outcome 3, "*Demonstration: Trans-Boundary Level Ecosystem Oriented Resource management Reduces stress on Prespa Ecosystem and Generates Valuable experience with trans-boundary cooperation*", includes: strengthening capacity of the PPCC; transboundary fisheries management; transboundary conservation and protected area management (traditional conservation activities, monitoring and evaluation, landscape-scale conservation, maps and databases); strengthening of baseline information and monitoring; and developing a tri-national tourism strategy. Mr. Griffin said that Outcome 3 would be essentially a realistic step towards transboundary management.

Outcome 4 is entitled "*Robust Trans-Boundary Diagnostic Analysis of Stress on the Prespa Lakes Basin Ecosystem Accepted by Governments and enables Successful Tri-lateral negotiation and commitment to a Prespa Basin Strategic Action Program at the Highest level of Government in the three Littoral States*". It involves a supplementary diagnostic analysis in order to fill in existing gaps, as well as the preparation of a Strategic Action Programme. Mr. Griffin said that the latter will be a political document, to be negotiated between the three countries and commit the respective national governments, and added that the PDF B phase did not have the time to implement it.

After the break, the Chairwoman passed the floor to Ms. Susanne Pecher (GFA Terra Team Leader) who made a presentation on the KfW feasibility study in the framework of the

UNDP/KfW supported project preparation phase for the development of the Prespa Park Project (for presentation, see Annex II below). The study objective was the identification of options for KfW investments contributing to the protection of the biodiversity in Prespa. The current phase of the study consisted of situation analysis, assessment of impacts and threats, and identification of options for interventions, and was done in cooperation with the Ministries of the recipient countries, and with UNDP. Ms. Pecher presented a GIS 3-dimensional model and a map of the study area, the latter delineating the Prespa Park watershed, as well as the two National Parks (Galichica and Pelister) that lie partly within the watershed.

Ms. Pecher proceeded with the situation analysis, starting with an overview of demographics and economy. According to the report, biodiversity is a very important factor for household economy, as an income source (e.g. through collection of medicinal plants) or as expenditure (e.g. fuel wood). Tourism is another important factor, mainly for Greece and the FYR of Macedonia. The report dealt in detail with water quality and quantity issues, despite the limited availability of data. An estimation of inflows and outflows of Lake Macro Prespa, including abstractions due to irrigation, was made. On water quality, the report put emphasis on the sewerage, as well on the impact of agrochemicals, and less so on the impact of industry. Forest cover was partly assessed by use of satellite information, and the issues of forest succession over meadows in the FYROM, overgrazing in Albania, and stress on shoreline vegetation were also tackled. The global importance of Prespa area was justified by its rich biodiversity, with emphasis on habitats, migrating, threatened, and endemic species (more detailed description is available in the KfW presentation, Annex III).

Ms. Pecher then presented the threat-impact analysis, but added that according to KfW's opinion, it would not be possible to make a ranking of the threats, since most factors were interlinked. She presented the major threats for the project area, including sedimentation, water abstraction, pollution, land-use issues, and over-harvest of forest timber and non-timber resources. She concluded that the continuing degradation of the ecosystems is linked to socioeconomic development issues, and therefore an integrated strategy would be needed. The formulated criteria for KfW's project options proposed by the report were: duration of 3-5 years; complementarity, but at the same time self-containment, of projects; direct contribution to biodiversity conservation; clear institutional setup; lower risk; and expected impact on local economic development.

Ms. Pecher concluded with the list of the 10 project interventions proposed by the report:

- 1) Support to Prespa National Park, Albania
- 2) Support to Galichica National Park, FYR of Macedonia
- 3) Wetland and shoreline management
- 4) Sustainable apple production
- 5) Sustainable forestry management
- 6) Study on the sustainable irrigation of Korcha plain
- 7, 8) Water management plans (Albania and FYR of Macedonia)
- 9) Decentralized wastewater treatment
- 10) Integrated conservation planning

Ms. Pecher underlined that KfW together with the Ministries of the recipient countries would agree which of the above options to follow.

Mr. Thymio Papayannis (MedWet representative – alternative PPCC member) reminded that the Prime Ministers of the three countries agreed on equitable collaboration of the three countries, that the PPCC was established with participation of all three levels (Ministries, LSGs, NGOs), and that a point agreed before was that the PPCC would serve as the project Steering Committee, the latter without objections by KfW and UNDP. He said that KfW's

activities and today's reporting was very satisfactory, but noted that the PPCC has been left uninformed by KfW. He inquired about progress with coordination between KfW and UNDP, and asked, whether the project proposal submitted to the GEF would be one single proposal consisting of both UNDP and KfW components, or merely the UNDP part. Mr. Papayannis underlined the PPCC's eagerness to serve and facilitate project preparation, but said that 2 or 3 weeks would be needed for the PPCC to express its coordinated views.

Mr. Griffin said that all GEF projects are packages of interventions, with outcomes and outputs funded by both the GEF and other donors, such as KfW, with emphasis on complementarity. KfW, he noted, will, however, retain its independence. But in the end, he said, one single project proposal would be submitted.

Mr. Dedej took the floor and presented a list of questions concerning UNDP's and KfW's reports. He asked whether Ms. Kodzoman represented UNDP-Skopje only, or UNDP as a whole, since UNDP-Tirana were absent from the meeting. He said that according to UNDP, there had not been enough data for the preparation of the project, and questioned the fact that one year was needed to realise this, while, on the other hand, outputs and outcomes were actually presented in the end. He noted that there was a new workplan, but the PPCC had not been informed about that development. According to that workplan, he added, most of the deadlines seemed to be concentrated in the month of May, and asked if that was realistic. Regarding the project on impacts of agriculture, he said that the details and procedures were missing, at least for the Albanian part of the project. Mr. Dedej said that the analysis prepared by Mr. Griffin only related to the FYR of Macedonian part of the basin, and that data on Albania was very deficient. He repeated Mr. Papayannis question about the cooperation between the two agencies, KfW and UNDP. Concerning the proposed project working groups, such as the committee for water management, he said that too many structures would perhaps be superfluous. He reiterated that one and a half year was a long time for those outputs, and said that he expected to see, apart from studies and strategy, some concrete works and measures. Finally, Mr. Dedej referring to KfW's report, raised the Devolli issue again, and expressed the hope to find a solution to this pending problem.

Mr. Branko Micevski, member of the Ezerani Nature Reserve Management Board, referred to the border of the project area, which according to KfW should include the parts of Galichica NP and Pelister NP outside the Prespa watershed and extending into Ohrid and Bitola areas. He said that that was never discussed nor accepted by the PPCC and argued that if management issues of the Ohrid area were mixed up with the Prespa Park project, things would become complicated. Mr. Micevski expressed the view that sensitisation of the local population, cultural heritage, and ecotourism issues, should be strengthened in the UNDP project proposal. On KfW's reports, he argued that the evaluation of the project options should be more justified.

The Chairwoman then gave the floor to Ms. Kodzoman, who first clarified that in the meeting she represented UNDP as project implementing agency, and that the UNDP-Tirana and UNDP-Skopje Country Offices were coordinating their activities. She explained that UNDP-Skopje had the main responsibility for overall project management, but on national level the respective Country Offices were responsible. On the results of the project preparation phase, she said that the main output is the Project Brief and the Project Document, and reminded that the project was "Nationally Executed" and accordingly the Ministries in the two countries as executing agencies have the responsibility to support the project, while UNDP as implementing agency has the role to facilitate the process. She admitted that there were indeed some problems in the process, such as selection of the consultants, deadlines, support from state institutions, or data gaps. On the deadlines, she said that the new work plan was communicated to the PPCC members in December and stated that the UNDP believes it is achievable, but also urged the PPCC to give their support

to the process and submit comments on time. Answering to Mr. Micevski, Ms. Kodzoman said that there has been enough work done and now there are results that can be presented at local level. Regarding the project on the impact of agriculture, she said that it had already started in the FYR of Macedonia, and is about to start in Albania and explained that it is a regional project, managed by UNDP Regional Environmental Programme in Bratislava, and stressed its importance as co-funding. On the Albanian side, she added, UNDP-Tirana would be involved.

Mr. Griffin then took the floor. Regarding the data deficiencies, he said that that was not unusual with other GEF projects as well, and stressed the importance of data analysis. Regarding the work plan, he said that they were trying to make it as realistic as possible. On the cooperation between UNDP and KfW, he said that discussions between them would continue. Mr. Griffin said that there had been one meeting with Lake Ohrid Conservation Project that was interesting as far as lessons learnt were concerned. On Mr. Dedej's point about the need for concrete measures, Mr. Griffin said that planning, collaboration, discussions and capacity building were also needed. Answering to Mr. Micevski, he said that as far as GEF was concerned, the watershed boundary declared by the three Prime Ministers would be OK, it being a good ecosystem boundary.

Mr. Dedej asked for Mr. Griffin's views on the duration of the project preparation phase. Mr. Griffin said that although it takes enough time in general to prepare GEF projects, there were some issues, such as the split between UNDP and KfW, that were finally overcome, but resulted in loss of time. Mr. Dedej commented that, to his understanding, the documents and the conclusions of the project mainly referred to the FYR of Macedonia, and Mr. Griffin admitted that for various reasons more attention was paid to the FYR of Macedonia, and that considerable effort was made by UNDP to sort this problem out. Ms. Pecher spoke about the River Devolli issue. She said that KfW is aware it is a major problem for Albania and would have to go back to the hydrological experts at the second phase of their study. On the borderline, she said that in her presentation she referred to the "study area" and not to the "project area" for the Prespa Park project; but, nevertheless, she added that when undertaking a problem assessment and analysing systems, all factors should be taken into account, and that would include existent management structures. Finally, on KfW's project options, she explained that they were presented only very shortly, and that they tried to limit them down to the feasible and important ones, while also looking at the criteria of the different donors involved. Ms. Sachmaroska (KfW) said that KfW always worked in a transparent way and delivered the progress reports to all three Ministries and added that KfW's proposed project options were not defined, and that they would be discussed with the Ministries.

Ms. Athena Mourmouri (Ministry of Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works, Greece) was given the floor and said that the Greek part are aware that their position is different, since Greece is not eligible for funding, but on the other hand, they are still members of the PPCC, and would minimally expect that the rules were observed and that they would be at least informed on the activities. The major concern, according to Ms. Mourmouri, was related to the procedures. Apart from the delays in the selection of the experts and in the finalisation of the documents, Ms. Mourmouri noted that the documents were received by the participants in the PPCC meeting only 2-5 days before the meeting, and one of them was even received on that same day. In that way, she said, they were not in the position to comment in substance seriously, and asked that this be respected in the future, otherwise the PPCC would only be decorative. She said that they could not give their consent during the meeting, and in order to be helpful for the project, two weeks would be needed for PPCC's comments. Ms. Mourmouri said the Greek Ministry never received KfW's progress report. Ms. Sachmaroska intervened and said that they would send it. Ms. Mourmouri also commented that there was some overlapping between KfW's and UNDP's

work. Concerning UNDP's documents, Ms. Mourmouri noted that they did not appear to take into account existing work, such as the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) or the Concept Paper, and asked which the link with those two documents was. She said that gaps should be filled, but there should be no impression that they started from scratch. Ms. Mourmouri also expressed her concern about the deadlines, and the fact that in this context again very little time was given to PPCC members for their comments.

Mr. Griffin apologised for the delays in informing the PPCC, and added that a lot of additional material was being assembled, and that only the core of the project outcomes and activities were presented. He said that the Greek side could be engaged more actively, and that the link with the SAP could be made more explicit, noting that he only received the full version of it just recently. He explained in GEF terms the difference between outputs and outcomes. Concerning the deadlines, he reiterated that they would be met, and clarified that GEF requires a framework with indicative activities, targets, and indicators in the Project Brief, and further detail will be implemented during project implementation.

Mr. Dedej commented again on the dual responsibility of the Ministries and UNDP in a nationally executed project like that, and repeated that some time would be needed for consultations before comments are given by the PPCC members. He said that there was a risk of losing credibility in front of the local population unless the project produces concrete, on-the-ground, results. Ms. Myrsini Malakou (Society for the Protection of Prespa (SPP) – PPCC member) asked KfW representatives whether those project options not funded by KfW in the end, were going to be included in the GEF project proposal. Ms. Pecher said that there was an ongoing discussion between UNDP and KfW on how to take into account project proposals not funded by KfW. Ms. Kodzoman and Mr. Dedej further exchanged views on the role of national experts versus international experts in the development of the project proposal.

Following the lunch break, the Chairwoman asked the participants to continue with and close the morning discussion. Mr. Papayannis said that all participants were eager to see the successful completion of this effort, and proposed to allocate at least one week for comments by the PPCC members, and one more week that would be needed by the PPCC Chairwoman for organising and submitting the comments to UNDP. Ms. Jantinska noted that that proposal could be included in the meeting conclusions.

At that point, Mr. Dedej asked for the position of the FYR of Macedonia. Ms. Jantinska said that from the beginning of the discussion she had agreed in general with the comments made by Mr. Papayannis that two weeks would be needed for consultations and an opinion from her Ministry for both UNDP and KfW documents. She commented that Prespa and Ohrid were two separate projects, and pointed out that the issues of cooperation in Prespa would be clarified in the tripartite Prespa Park agreement. Mr. Dedej argued that it would be useful to relate issues of Ohrid and Prespa, and that although they are different basins, they have a connection and the Prespa process should take into account the Ohrid experience. Mr. Micevski intervened and supported the trilateral agreement for the Prespa Park, adding that the Ohrid issue should perhaps be discussed in another context and not during that meeting. He also underlined the need for concrete, base activities in the project region and repeated that the Prespa catchment should be kept as the basis of discussion.

Ms. Mourmouri agreed that it would be better to build upon new structures instead of inventing new ones, but she argued that the issue of extending the project area to include Ohrid was not foreseen and said she had understood that the preparation of the GEF project was the issue of discussion. She proposed that, apart from the two weeks needed for comments - as Mr. Papayannis and Ms. Jantinska suggested - some technical assistance, e.g. from the MedWet or the NGOs in the PPCC Secretariat, and especially the Society for the Protection of Prespa, could also be used to help the Chairwoman handle the comments.

She also inquired if July 2005 was indeed the last deadline for submission of the project proposal. The Chairwoman expressed her wish that the MedWet and the Secretariat members could assist, and Mr. Papayannis replied positively on behalf of MedWet. On the latest deadline, Mr. Griffin and Ms. Kodzoman said that according to a new GEF policy, all projects would be terminated after three years in the pipeline, and therefore July 2005 would be the last deadline for the Prespa Park project proposal, explaining that that news was communicated one week before the PPCC meeting. Mr. Dedej said that, apart from the project outputs, outcomes and activities, the PPCC would wish to comment on the project implementation and management arrangements. Mr. Papayannis remarked that it would be useful to have concrete comments, not only on the present documents, but also on the documents that will actually be submitted to the GEF.

At that point, Mr. Griffin presented his current work plan. Its main points were: submission of problem analysis (March 24th); circulation of draft Project Brief to the PPCC (May 9th); submission of the advanced draft to UNDP/GEF New York (May 20th); independent analysis by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP review); securing co-funding and endorsement letters; circulation to the PPCC (May 30th); incorporation of comments (June 13th); submission of final version to UNDP/GEF New York (June 15th); endorsement and submission to GEF Secretariat (June 17th); comments by GEF agencies; clearance by GEF and circulation to GEF council members for approval (July 27th). Mr. Griffin said that the period 30th May-21st July could be effectively used for additional comments.

Mr. Papayannis proposed to add arrangements in the work plan, so that the PPCC could express its views in an efficient way. Mr. Dedej commented that he had received the work plan only two weeks before the meeting, and Ms. Kodzoman clarified that the main deadlines and milestones were the same as in the previous work plan circulated in December 2004. Mr. Ljupco Stojanovski, PDF B National Project Coordinator in the FYR of Macedonia, took the floor and said that the project and the contributions of the PPCC members should be discussed instead. Ms. Malakou said that the SPP was ready to help, not only through that phase, but until completion of the proposal. She argued that the PPCC should have supported more the GEF expert, and said that additional proposals on livelihoods, demonstration projects, or water management, could be added, subject to compatibility. Ms. Mourmouri expressed the willingness to assist in the preparation of the proposal, but raised the issue of timely circulation of the working documents again. Mr. Dedej, answering to Mr. Stojanovski, said that the National Project Coordinators should look carefully at their responsibilities, and noted that the delays could bring the government representatives in an awkward position.

Mr. Papayannis said that since Greece is not a beneficiary, consultations with the Greek side should be made to ensure funding by other sources for activities on the Greek side. Ms. Kodzoman replied that UNDP had had several meetings in the look for additional resources, and would continue to do so.

Mr. Dedej asked for clarification for the reference to KfW in the document as a co-funder. Mr. Griffin explained that the document was a draft for discussion and that agreements with KfW had not been reached at that time, though there were indications to that. Ms. Sachmaroska said that KfW did not want to have overlapping and was discussing with the Ministries of the two countries, and with UNDP/GEF. However, at that moment they were not in the position to answer definitively, since they needed the green light from the Ministries. Ms. Mourmouri asked KfW for clarifications about the number of options to be funded. She added that Greece would finance activities on the Greek part of the lake, but she was not in the position at the moment to say whether Greece would have the possibility to co-finance other projects. Ms. Sachmaroska said that KfW had allocated €1.5 million for the FYR of Macedonia and €2.5 million for Albania, and that was a limiting factor, therefore

KfW would have to prioritise. Ms. Sachmaroska added that KfW would continue being active in the region and would work together with UNDP to avoid overlapping.

Mr. Dedej asked how much time it will be needed to make the drafts more consistent, and said that he was not ready to make comments himself, without wishing however to stop other countries from making comments. Mr. Griffin offered to present a modified work plan on the next day and Ms. Jantinska said that the PPCC would wait for Mr. Griffin's clarifications.

Mr. Micevski intervened and questioned KfW's pledge for the FYR of Macedonia and Albania, arguing that since the former covers the largest part of the Prespa area and hosts the majority of the population, the arrangement should be different. Ms. Jantinska reminded him that those arrangements had been made three years ago.

On agenda item 3, "*Activities concerning the Prespa Park since the last regular PPCC meeting in Korcha*", the Chairwoman gave the floor to the Secretariat. Ms. Vivi Roumeliotou (SPP – Secretariat member) presented the relevant report. She noted that the report could give an optimistic perspective of progress in the Prespa Park area, because the stakeholders had provided more information, but also because there was more interest and funding being directed to the protection and development of the Prespa basin. Ms. Roumeliotou mentioned the work done for the preparation of a draft trilateral agreement for the Prespa Park and the planning of a Ministerial Meeting, which was unfortunately postponed. Another notable development was the approval of a project for the study of the interaction between River Devolli and Lake Micro Prespa and the impacts of the diversion, funded by Hellenic Aid (Greek Development Assistance) and implemented by the NGOs SPP and PPNEA together with a team of international experts. Apart from that project, a variety of smaller or larger activities, ranging from soft activities to hard infrastructure, took place in all three countries, continued Ms. Roumeliotou. In Albania, they included improvement of roads, drinking and wastewater works and the ongoing support to Prespa National Park provided by PPNEA with EECNET funding. On the Greek side, projects including improvement of infrastructure, wastewater treatment, upgrading of roads, rural development issues, and sectors of social infrastructure, had progressed significantly. Ms. Roumeliotou also referred to the completion of the sluice gate at Koula, connecting Lakes Micro and Macro Prespa, and the developments concerning the draft Joint Ministerial Decision on the Protected Area in Greek Prespa. In the FYR of Macedonia, there were a significant number of activities, including the UNDP-funded project for the reduction of the impacts of agriculture, and an SDC funded project on solid waste management. The developments with regard to the PDF B project were already discussed, and Mr. Roumeliotou also mentioned the GTZ programme, which had offered modest but very crucial and symbolic funding to the Prespa Park process for many years. At that point, she said that the Municipalities around Prespa were not in the position to take advantage of the funds allocated for their cooperation, but expressed the hope that that could be done during the next phase of the GTZ programme. Ms. Roumeliotou briefly mentioned the representation of the Prespa Park in international events, and introduced the new persons in the Prespa Park institutions, representatives of the local NGOs from the Resen area: Mr. Kungulovski from NGO "Resen" (PPCC member); Mr. Petkovski from NGO "Fokus" (PPCC alternative member); and Ms. Spirovska from NGO "Eco-protection", representing an alliance of environmental NGOs (Secretariat member). Finally, she referred briefly to the information provided by KfW Tirana and KfW Skopje on their projects under preparation in the two countries.

Ms. Pecher asked for the timeframe of the Devolli study, and Ms. Roumeliotou said that it started in January 2005 and had duration of 18 months. Mr. Dedej and Mr. Papayannis referred to important international IUCN and Ramsar events, where the Prespa Park had been presented and agreed that international presence was very important. Nevertheless,

Mr. Papayannis remarked that, though the Prespa Park is considered to be a very successful example of cooperation, when it comes to the results and outputs more should be expected. Mr. Demetres Karavellas (WWF Greece representing WWF International) took the floor and said that WWF tries to promote the Prespa Park in international fora, but there is need for more activities on the ground, and added that a very specific target could be to go to the next Ramsar Conference of Parties, November 2005, having secured the trilateral agreement for the Prespa Park. Mr. Dedej said that the support by the Ramsar Convention would be much needed, and expressed the wish to continue the fruitful collaboration with MedWet and the MedWet Coordinator, Mr. Spyros Kouvelis, who could not attend that meeting. Ms. Malakou informed the PPCC members that the SPP had secured funding for the accomplishment of spatial planning of the Greek side of Prespa for the Municipality of Prespa. Moreover, the SPP would establish the Prespa Centre for Nature and Anthropos, a research centre for the relation between Man and Nature in Prespa.

The Chairwoman asked the Secretariat to proceed with agenda item 4, *"Implementation of Operational Plan and Programme of Activities for the year 2004"*. Mr. Spase Shumka (Preservation and Protection of the Natural Environment in Albania/PPNEA – Secretariat member) presented working document 3 to the PPCC members. In the Communication axis, Mr. Shumka presented relevant activities, which included informing the local and regional authorities and stakeholders, and the organisation of a working meeting of the Prespa Protected Area authorities by the Communication Officer. In the Sustainable Development axis, main developments included the publication by SPP of the final version of the Strategic Action Plan, and the preparation of the trilateral agreement, and on the Research, Monitoring and Conservation, the implementation of the PDF B project. Mr. Shumka also presented the financial report for 2004. Mr. Papayannis's comment was that the budget indicated a weakness to allocate money for the work of the Secretariat from sources other than the NGOs. At that point, Ms. Jantinska said that the MoEPP of the FYR of Macedonia was prepared to allocate some amount of money this year for the FYR of Macedonia Secretariat members. The report was approved and can be found in Annex V below.

On the second day of the meeting, the Chairwoman informed the participants that Mr. Griffin would present the modified work plan later during the day, and then she asked the Secretariat to proceed with agenda item 5, *"Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2005"*. Ms. Roumeliotou took the floor and presented Working Document 4. The PPCC work plan and activities for the year 2005 included two landmarks, the submission of the GEF project proposal, and the conclusion of a trilateral agreement at a trilateral ministerial meeting. On the Communication axis, the main bulk of activity would be carried out by the Secretariat, and additionally cooperation of the local authorities and the Protected Area authorities would be pursued. However, Ms. Roumeliotou noted that funding was not secured at that moment. On the Sustainable Development axis, the publication of the SAP in the two remaining languages should be included in the work plan, as well as activities relating to the GEF project, and the implementation of SAP components at national level. But, again, the highlight for the year 2005 should be the adoption of a trilateral Prespa Park agreement. The Research, Monitoring and Conservation axis was proposed to include activities relating to GEF project preparation, the Devolli project undertaken by SPP and PPNEA, the submission to the Hellenic Aid Agency of a project proposal on basin-wide environmental monitoring by SPP, which would also be a component of the GEF project, as well as the day-to-day work of the Secretariat. Concerning the budget, Ms. Roumeliotou noted that there are still a lot of gaps and activities with unsecured funding and asked the donors to state their intentions.

Mr. Papayannis on behalf of MedWet praised the Secretariat's work, but stressed that up to that moment only the Greek part of the Secretariat was funded, and that was made through the contribution of an NGO, SPP/ WWF-Greece, and consequently asked the government

representatives to see to the problem, and added that the PPCC needs technical support. On the priorities for the year 2005, Mr. Papayannis reminded that the 9th Ramsar Conference of Parties would take place later this year, and said that a proposal by the three governments to declare a transboundary Ramsar site in Prespa could be included in the year's programming. Mr. Dedej agreed with Mr. Papayannis but as far as the scientific support of the Secretariat was concerned, he noted that there was a shortage of funds. On the trilateral meeting, he said that political issues might be obstacles for its realisation. At that point Mr. Dedej brought forward the issue of the budget of the PPCC meetings.

Ms. Mourmouri took the floor and said that budgeting has always been a problem in international cooperation schemes. She reminded that the host country had always covered a part of the expenses, and Greece would consequently secure funding for the coming PPCC meeting in Greek Prespa. She said that the Greek Ministry's view was that regular funding for the Secretariat and the PPCC could not be secured unless an agreement setting up the terms of the cooperation was signed. She noted that the process for finalising technicalities in the text of the agreement was underway, and expressed the hope to have some outcomes by the next PPCC meeting. She proposed to combine the PPCC meeting with the Ministerial meeting, since the Ministry could not afford the cost of two meetings, and added that if there were any results before the Ramsar COP, then it would be possible to make announcements on that occasion. On the Communication axis, she said that international communication activities were carried out and that the real issue was how to involve the local population of Prespa, and proposed that the Secretariat played that role, at least for a while. Mr. Papayannis said that WWF who has been funding the SPP Secretariat work should be asked. Mr. Karavellas agreed with the two landmarks for the 2005 work plan and concerning the issue of funding he said that WWF would continue supporting the process, but this could not be carried on in the long term. He reminded that 5 years had passed since the Prespa Park Declaration and the three governments should show their commitment. Ms. Jantinska said she would expect from the Secretariat to propose a plan for funding and that the MoEPP was trying to secure funds for the publication of the SAP in Albanian and Macedonian. She agreed that the PPCC meeting and the Ministerial meeting could be managed together, and that a declarative meeting could perhaps be done before that. Ms. Mourmouri repeated that the text should be prepared appropriately before the Ministerial meeting is decided.

At that point, Mr. Lazaros Nalpantidis, the Mayor of Greek Prespa, took the floor and made a proposal for an informal meeting of the three Ministers of Environment in Greek Prespa. He said that two good opportunities for that would be either the inauguration of the Koula sluice in mid-May 2005, or the annual festival "Prespeia" in July 2005. Ms. Jantinska expressed her delight for the invitation.

Mr. Micevski intervened again and said that the PPCC is a political body and is strongly in need of a technical committee consisting of scientists and other experts. He also said that the element of sustainable development is missing from the GEF project proposal and asked for better representation of, and support to, the Protected Areas around Prespa. Ms. Jantinska replied that the Protected Area authorities could anytime apply for support at the Ministry of Environment, according to the standard procedures. As far as the GEF project documents were concerned, she said that they were prepared by scientists and the scientific approach was not missing at all, and that the issue to be discussed was the project outputs and outcomes, and not the scientific integrity of the documents. Mr. Dedej said that he is not a political person, but a technical civil servant, and nevertheless the political umbrella over Prespa Park was necessary. He reminded that the Director of Albanian Prespa National Park was present in the meeting.

Regarding the trilateral meeting, the Chairwoman said that each of the three countries should collect the comments from the competent authorities, integrate them and then send them to the Secretariat. Ms. Mourmouri clarified that the comments by Ms. Malakou could be considered as the technical point of view, but nevertheless consultations in Greece were not finished at that time. She said that there was no need to discuss possible scenarios, but time was needed in order to have replies to any questions.

Mr. Dedej informed the PPCC members that there were general elections in Albania in June 2005, and in the case the Minister changes, he could not make any promises beyond that time.

He added that the Mayor's proposal was very interesting and that the three Ministers could perhaps meet over lunch or coffee, if the conclusion of an agreement were not possible at that time. Ms. Jantinska also expressed her support for the Mayor's idea. Mr. Nalpantidis clarified that in any case, invitations would be sent a reasonable time before the event, and thought that the meeting could be informal, without a protocol. Ms. Mourmouri made clear that from the Greek side the Deputy Minister would participate in the inauguration of the Koula sluice.

The work plan for 2005 was accordingly approved and is included in Annex VI below.

The Chairwoman asked the Secretariat to proceed with agenda item 7, "*Prespa Park Communication Plan*" and Mr. Shumka presented Working Document 5. Mr. Shumka went briefly through the history of the Prespa Park communication activities and underlined that since August 2004 practically no action had been taken and the situation was unclear with no active Communication Officer, lack of allocated funds, and problems with the function of the Prespa Park website hosted by MedWet. According to Mr. Shumka, the PPCC would have to decide between two options: either the preparation and implementation of a modest communication work plan by the Secretariat itself; or the identification of funds and donor, and the selection of a new Communication Officer who would in turn prepare and implement a communication work plan. He stressed that in any case special attention should be given to the outreach to the local inhabitants of Prespa in all countries, and informed the PPCC that the SPP had submitted an Interreg IIIA project proposal aiming at providing communication tools and promoting eco-tourism in the Prespa basin by means of awareness raising and provision of information to visitors, local bodies and the local population.

The Chairwoman recognised the problem and said that the Ministries ought to try to allocate funds for communication, and then gave the floor to comments. Mr. Papayannis said that communication was a very important element, and its focus should be the local communities where the visibility of the Prespa Park initiative is quite low. He recognised that permanent government funding for the Secretariat could not be secured before the tripartite Prespa Park agreement was signed, and called for an opportunistic approach to the communication activities, including the implementation of a modest work plan by the Secretariat. Ms. Roumeliotou, on behalf of the Secretariat, explained that the history of communication was presented so that the PPCC could make an evaluation of the communication activities and plans so far. Mr. Dedej said that personally he was not satisfied with the concrete results during the previous 2 years, although there were some interesting outputs, such as the Prespa Park newsletter and website. He reminded the failed attempt to link Prespa Park communication with PDF B project communication activities, suggested that a total budget for communication be presented to the three Ministries, instead of an opportunistic approach for various activities, and reminded that the Albanian Ministry of Environment did not have the budget. Ms. Malakou intervened and said that apart from funding itself, there is need to manage the resources appropriately, and repeated that there is need for technical support, perhaps through the establishment of working groups on various issues (PDF B,

communication, etc.). Mr. Dedej argued that that would increase the need for funding. Ms. Malakou said that Prespa is very appropriate area for attracting funding sources.

Mr. Papayannis made the distinction between funding the operation of the Secretariat on one side, and implementing projects on the other side, and said that in the latter case the contribution of scientists should be thought in the preparation stage. Ms. Mourmouri shared the view that technical guidance is a key point for projects, but argued that a negative point with establishing working groups was the associated cost for covering the expenses of their meetings. She said that scientists could provide voluntary assistance, and that the PPCC ought to make good use of this potential. Ms. Jantinska said that most experts would not provide their contribution voluntarily, and asked Mr. Micevski if he would do so. The Chairwoman concluded that the PPCC would ask the Secretariat to provisionally cover the communication and technical support needs of the PPCC until a more permanent arrangement is made within the tripartite Prespa Park agreement.

The Chairwoman then gave the floor to Mr. Gabriel Schwaderer, representing Euronatur. Mr. Schwaderer said that Euronatur had been active in the region for quite a few years, and expressed his pleasure to participate for the first time in a PPCC meeting. Concerning the previous discussion, he said that although there is a definite need for governmental funding and support to the Secretariat, Euronatur could also offer its help to the Albanian and Macedonian NGOs for the identification of funding sources for Secretariat support and communication. The Chairwoman thanked Euronatur for its approach.

After the coffee break, Mr. Dedej raised the issue of covering the costs of selected invited observers. Ms. Kodzoman said that, as a standard practice, travel and accommodation costs were covered for the PPCC and Secretariat members. Mr. Dedej insisted that the Protected Area authorities are very important for the Prespa Park meetings and the costs of their representatives should therefore be reimbursed. Finally, Mr. Papayannis intervened and asked the Secretariat to communicate in writing the rules and practice on coverage of costs for delegations attending PPCC meetings followed so far in order to clarify the issue.

Mr. Griffin then took the floor and presented the revised work plan for the GEF project proposal preparation (see Annex IV below). The revisions were the following:

- 18 March: deadline for comments by the PPCC members on the Problem Analysis (first stage);
- 4-12 April: GEF expert's mission to Greece (2 days), mission to Albania (7 days);
- 13-14 April: meeting with GFA Terra consultants and KfW;
- 27 April: circulation of draft Project Brief to PPCC members;
- 18 May: deadline for comments by the PPCC;
- 20 May: internal UNDP review;
- 10 June: co-funding and support letters;

The rest of the work plan activities and deadlines would remain the same, Mr. Griffin said. Ms. Mourmouri remarked that the time for PPCC comments coincided with Greek Orthodox Easter, and asked to move the deadline for another 10 days. Mr. Griffin acknowledged that the process was dynamic, and proposed to move the deadline for PPCC comments to 25 May. Mr. Dedej thanked the GEF expert and stated that Albania will not release a letter of support without comments by the Greek side.

On the next agenda item, the Chairwoman gave the floor to Mr. Giorgio Andrian, representative of UNESCO ROSTE, Venice. Mr. Andrian thanked the PPCC for the invitation and made a presentation on UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere (MAB) programme and the possibility of a Transboundary "Biosphere Reserve" (BR) designation for Prespa Park (see Annex VII below). Mr. Andrian went forward to explain that the BR is an adaptable tool with flexible zoning, that the initiative has to come from the governments, and that UNESCO

ROSTE usually platforms donors for BRs. He informed the PPCC that there are already 6 transboundary BRs around the world, and that although the general approach used to be to designate BRs at national level first and then proceed with transboundary designation, today the joint designation is the preferred procedure. Two alternatives presented by Mr. Andrian were, either to transform Prespa Park into a transboundary BR, or to opt for a larger transboundary BR that would also include Lake Ohrid area.

Ms. Jantinska noted that Greece already has a MAB Committee, while the FYR of Macedonia does not. Mr. Andrian said that the existence of a MAB Committee would not be so crucial if a request was received. Mr. Dedej expressed his full support for such a designation. Ms. Mourmouri took the floor and said that work in the region should be done preferably with a step-by-step approach. Ms. Malakou underlined that not much has been done in connection with the Prespa Park 5 years after its establishment, and thus it would be difficult to communicate the new designation and zonation to the local people. Mr. Micevski intervened and said that, according to his opinion, the discussion should refer to Prespa area only, and not to Prespa and Ohrid. Ms. Jantinska said that efforts should be done at national level first. Ms. Mourmouri inquired about the criteria for the definition of the border of a BR. Mr. Andrian said that the criteria and indicators used by UNESCO are very broad and flexible. The PPCC concluded to further consider the issue of the designation of a transboundary BR in Prespa, as well as the relevant designation criteria.

At that point, the Mayor of Greek Prespa, Mr. Nalpantidis, took the floor. He expressed the concern of the people of Prespa for the future of the region, and the need to overcome the minor differences and to persuade the governments to keep up their work and diverge. An important issue, he added, was that there were not enough concrete works implemented in the area. He said the Municipality of Prespa, Greece, together with SPP intended to proceed with the reconstruction of the building of the elementary school in the village of Zagradec, Albanian Micro Prespa.

Regarding the place and date of the next regular PPCC meeting, it was noted that the next meeting would be held in the Greek Prespa. Ms. Roumeliotou on behalf of the Secretariat asked the PPCC members to set a precise date for this meeting. Ms. Mourmouri said that the next PPCC meeting would be scheduled in October or November 2005, but argued that the exact date should be defined later on.

The PPCC members then proceeded with the approval of the meeting's conclusions. Finally, the Chairwoman thanked the participants for their fruitful contributions and declared the meeting closed.

Conclusions

1. At its Seventh regular meeting, the PPCC discussed in detail the issue of the PDF B project. In this connection, it heard information from the UNDP and KfW representatives on the results of their studies and a presentation of a draft outline of outcomes and outputs of the Project Brief. Based on the presentation the PPCC members expressed major concerns and discussed about:
 - The lack of integration of the two studies in the project proposal that would be submitted to the GEF;
 - The limited time given to the PPCC members in order to contribute substantially with comments and opinions to the proposal under preparation;
 - Whether the results of the PDF B project accurately reflect the situation and the needs of the area and the need for mobilization and involvement of the local population in the project;
 - The possibility to use existing institutional set up as the water management structure for the Prespa area;
 - The possibility to include the cultural heritage in the context of wetlands in the areas of future interventions;
 - Whether the proposals presented have taken into account past work and especially the Prespa Park SAP;
 - The need to include activities on the Greek territory as an integral part of the full project for the area, part of which will be financed by GEF.
2. The UNDP also presented a work plan for final submission of the full Project Brief and informed the Committee of the new GEF rules in place, according to which the proposal should be submitted by July or else the project would be terminated. The PPCC expressed its regret for not being informed on time for this important change of schedule, fact that results in limiting considerably its possibilities for substantive comments on the proposal to be submitted. The PPCC also expressed serious concerns on whether the work plan presented is realistic and whether the strict deadline could be met. However, all the Committee members expressed their willingness and readiness to cooperate with the donors and contribute to the successful and timely submission of a good project proposal. To that effect, and according to a revised work plan (see annex I), the Committee agreed to submit comments on the Problem Analysis already circulated by 18 March and asked the UNDP, in coordination with KfW, to prepare and distribute a more elaborated draft Project Brief until 28 April, after which the Committee will communicate its comments to UNDP by 25 May. The Chairperson, assisted by MedWet and the Secretariat, will be responsible for collecting, synthesizing and communicating the Committee's views to the donors.
3. On the occasion of this discussion, the PPCC expressed the wish to be informed timely and have a saying on project proposals for the area related to the objectives of the tripartite cooperation, regardless of the beneficiary and the donor.
4. The Committee also heard a report on activities since its last regular meeting in Korcha and noted that positive work has been done in all three countries towards protection and sustainable development of the area. It also noted that the Prespa Park is increasingly

presented in international fora as a model of transboundary cooperation, which underlines the need for more tangible results on the ground.

5. The Committee heard and approved a report on the implementation of its work plan for 2004 and a financial report for this year.
6. The Committee endorsed the proposed Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2005. The two landmarks that should be pursued this year are the successful submission of a full GEF project and the adoption of a trilateral agreement at a Ministerial meeting that could be combined with the next regular PPCC meeting. The Committee welcomed the proposal by the Mayor of Prespa, Greece, to hold an informal meeting of the three Ministers of Environment on the occasion of the inauguration of the Koula sluice gate on the 15th of May.
7. The need to provide support and funding to the Secretariat and scientific and technical support to the Committee by the three Governments was stressed, as well as to cover the remaining needs of the core budget of the Committee. The regular funding of the scheduled activities and operations of the trilateral cooperation will be addressed after the signature of the above-mentioned agreement. As regards the needs of the current year, the Ministry of Environment of Greece is expected to cover the cost of the next regular PPCC meeting to be held in Greece, as a standard practice. Furthermore, the Ministry of Environment of the FYR of Macedonia promised to proceed with the publication of SAP in the two remaining national languages and to provide financial support to the local NGOs participating in the Secretariat. Moreover, WWF Greece stated their intention to continue financing the operation of the Secretariat through SPP this year but also underlined the need for the three Governments to create a sustainable funding mechanism for trilateral cooperation in Prespa as soon as possible.
8. The Committee heard a brief report on Communication activities in the past two years and discussed the current situation where the Prespa Park has no Communication Officer and no specific funding for implementing its Communication Plan. It decided to adopt a transitional solution to the problem for the year 2005, until the full GEF project begins and/or the trilateral agreement is signed, and asked its Secretariat to put together and, after it is approved by the Committee, implement a modest yearly work plan that should include minimum press coverage of major events, updating of the News page of the PP website and local community communication activities.
9. The Committee heard an interesting presentation by UNESCO-ROSTE on the possibility to establish a Transboundary Biosphere Reserve in the Prespa Park area under the UNESCO Man and Biosphere Programme (MAB) and decided to consider the matter and the criteria involved in such a designation further.
10. The Committee decided to hold its eighth regular meeting in the Municipality of Prespa, Greece, at the beginning of November 2005.
11. Finally, the PPCC expressed its thanks to all participants for their contribution, to the donor community, and especially UNDP and KfW, for their continuous interest in the Prespa Park, to UNDP for funding this meeting and to the Municipality of Resen and the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning of the FYR of Macedonia for the organization of the meeting and their warm hospitality.

Annex I – List of Abbreviations

BR	Biosphere Reserve, UNESCO
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographical Information Systems
GTZ	Gesellschaft für technische Zusammenarbeit – German Technical Assistance Agency
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau – German Bank for Reconstruction
LSG	Local Self Government
MAB	Man and the Biosphere Programme, UNESCO
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
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Annex II – Draft outcomes and outputs for Project Brief

4 March 2005

DRAFT

A UNDP-GEF and KfW funded Preparatory Project by the Governments of Albania, FYR-Macedonia and Greece

Integrated Ecosystem Management
in the
Prespa Lakes Basin
of
FYR-Macedonia, Albania and Greece

Draft For Discussion:

AN OUTLINE OF FULL PROJECT OUTCOMES, OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES

OUTCOME 1: NATIONAL-LEVEL WATERSHED MANAGEMENT INSTITUTION ESTABLISHED AND OPERATIONAL, COORDINATING CROSS-SECTORAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN THE ALBANIAN, GREEK, AND FYR-MACEDONIAN AREAS OF THE PRESPA BASIN. (First Step)

Output 1.1. Establishment of Prespa watershed management organizations under new water laws in Macedonia, Albania (and Greece)? (GEF and co-funder)

The watershed management organizations would serve as the mechanism for cross-sectoral collaboration and participatory planning in each national sector of Prespa.

- ⇒ Elaborate policy basis for watershed management entities and cross-sectoral collaboration for primary sectors influencing water quality and ecosystem health
- ⇒ Staff watershed management entity and establish and equip modest offices.

Output 1.2. Capacity of new watershed management entities built at local level and within host national agency. (GEF and Co-funder)

- ⇒ Cross-sectoral governance strengthening for new watershed management entity and other local level offices of partner sectoral agencies such as MoE, MoA, Municipalities, and NGOs.
- ⇒ Training: Best practices for watershed management shared with key management institutions, stakeholder groups, and local media.
- ⇒ Training: Train key staff in aquatic ecosystem management principles through workshops, study tours, and other educational activities.

Output 1.3. Watershed management plans devised with water quality targets and priority habitat conservation actions formulated and approved for priority sub-watersheds. (GEF and Co-funder)

- ⇒ Secure water management/water use agreement w/key water users for each watershed in order to ensure rational water use and in-stream flows for native species of fish.
- ⇒ Development of long-term land-use plan for each national sector of the Prespa Lakes Basin.
- ⇒ Formulate integrated landscape scale conservation plan for each national sector of Prespa Basin

OUTCOME 2: DEMONSTRATION: NATIONAL-LEVEL ECOSYSTEM-ORIENTED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN THE PRESPA BASIN MEASURABLY REDUCES PESTICIDE INPUTS, INCREASES HABITAT HETEROGENEITY, AND IMPROVES THE STATUS OF TARGET SPECIES AND COMMUNITIES.

Output 2.1. Albania and Macedonia – Reduced environmental impacts of agriculture in the Prespa Basin – (UNDP)

- ⇒ Constraints on extension services to disseminate information and provide services assessed; barriers identified.
- ⇒ Capacity of growers associations and agricultural extension services to better assess and provide for local growers needs, including improving local growers' capacity to apply integrated pest management practices.
- ⇒ Strengthen the capacity of farmers to monitor agrochemical and water usage.
- ⇒ Mechanisms for improved trans-boundary cooperation and transfer of best practices introduced, including Selected cross border best practice pilot projects implemented and Support provided for regional agricultural extension service/farmers group network

Note: Need to confirm the activities to be implemented in Albania under this project "Reducing environmental impact of agriculture in the Prespa Region."

Output 2.2 Forest managed for native species composition and forest stand heterogeneity. (Albania, Macedonia, Greece). (GEF and Co-funder¹)

- ⇒ New forest management plans developed with increased level of public participation.
- ⇒ Pilot areas demonstrate improved management of forest to maximize species and age structure composition of the forest.
- ⇒ Community forests revitalized in Albania.
- ⇒ Forest restoration - hectares of forest replanted with native species in Albania.

Output 2.3 Appropriate small-scale wastewater treatment facilities measurable reduce eutrophying inputs to Lakes Prespa (Albania, Greece, Macedonia) – (Main funder² w/GEF co-funding)

- ⇒ Demonstration of decentralized and wetland-based wastewater treatment options in two sites - one household-level treatment (name village) and one wetland (name village).
- ⇒ Building upon the improved understanding of environment-friendly wastewater treatment options, demonstrate their feasibility.
- ⇒ Decentralized, household level treatment is proposed in ---.
- ⇒ Wetland-based treatment is proposed in ---.
- ⇒ Replicate decentralized wastewater treatment in remaining villages.

Output 2.4 Fishery management plans for each national territory emphasize maintaining aquatic ecosystem health and the natural diversity of fish and other species. (GEF and Co-funder)

- ⇒ Need to discuss what is possible here w/respect to policy and management.

¹ Possibly KfW

² Possibly KfW

Output 2.5 Proactive prevention of industrial pollution through application of new local permitting procedures. (UNDP?)

⇒ Support industry in their ability to comply with new pollution prevention requirements via the piloting of the integrated pollution prevention permit "B."

OUTCOME 3: DEMONSTRATION: TRANS-BOUNDARY LEVEL ECOSYSTEM ORIENTED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT REDUCES STRESS ON PRESPA ECOSYSTEM AND GENERATES VALUABLE EXPERIENCE WITH TRANS-BOUNDARY COOPERATION.

Output 3.1. Strengthened capacity of existing transboundary coordination body

⇒ Strengthened institutional capacity that is complimentary to emerging cross-sectoral institutions in each Prespa littoral state.

⇒ Secure long-term government commitment to appropriate and professional transboundary coordination body.

⇒ Strengthened web-based access to information on transboundary management information.

Output 3.2. Cooperative Ecosystem-oriented Fishery Management Practices applied by all three littoral states. (GEF and Co-funder)

⇒ Cooperative trans-boundary fishery management actions agreed and implemented.

⇒ Basic information needs on fishery agreed upon and filled.

⇒ Specific actions to strengthen collaborative enforcement across boundaries taken.

Output 3.3. Cooperative Transboundary Conservation and Protected Area Management (GEF)

⇒ Strengthened management and operational capacity of key protected areas:

- Elaborate modern management plans for National Park Prespa, Galicica NP, Ezerani.

- Strengthen basic capacity of each reserve through modest infrastructure improvements and basic PA management training.

- Apply METT to management baseline.

⇒ Trans-boundary planning for key plant and animal communities.

- Agree upon target species, communities and initial trans-boundary conservation measures.

- Build upon integrated landscape scale conservation plans developed under Outcome 2.

- ⇒ Training in transboundary conservation best practice – study tour, etc..
- ⇒ Improved maps and data sets for key biodiversity parameters.

Output 3.4 Trans-boundary monitoring of ecosystem health parameters. (GEF & Co-funders)

- ⇒ Designation of institutions to do the monitoring; additional equipment and training.
- ⇒ Agreement of key parameters to be monitored; survey and monitoring protocols established; training conducted; monitoring criteria and refinement of information baseline on those parameters.
- ⇒ Establishment of web-based database and information management system.

Output 3.5 Tri-national tourism and visitation strategy and management plan designed and approved by stakeholders. (GEF and Co-funder)

- ⇒ Enable targeted group of leaders within the tourism sector to become more knowledgeable of the benefits of well-managed, environmentally friendly tourism and related key concepts and best practices.
- ⇒ Develop a tourism/visitation management plan.
- ⇒ Demonstrate effective spatial management. More effective management of tourism pressure will minimize impact on sensitive areas.
- ⇒ Share best practices in sustainable visitation management and the application of carrying capacity concepts.

OUTCOME 4: ROBUST TRANS-BOUNDARY DIAGNOSTIC ANALYSIS OF STRESS ON THE PRESPA LAKES BASIN ECOSYSTEM ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENTS AND ENABLES SUCCESSFUL TRI-LATERAL NEGOTIATION AND COMMITMENT TO A PRESPA BASIN STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAM AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT IN THE THREE LITTORAL STATES.

Output 4.1. Supplementary diagnostic analysis fills gaps in existing analysis of environmental stress, related socio-economic consequences and transboundary coordination requirements. (GEF)

Activities under this output will not replicate the diagnostic analysis already conducted by the Prespa Strategic Action Plan, the UNDP-GEF Block B work, and KfW's preparatory work. Instead work under this activity will simply strengthen and fill in weak areas of this analysis in order to better support a long-term investment plan for Prespa Basin. This would be done during the first 8-12 months of the project.

Strengthen the analysis of impacts of environmental problems and the assessment of their socio-economic consequences.

- ⇒ Clarification of environmental impacts; e.g. measure concentrations of nutrients and

pesticides in Golema Reka and the Stara River during stormwater runoff events. Assess sublethal effects of this runoff on selected species of fish larvae.

- ⇒ Assessment of socio-economic consequences of environmental degradation, including total economic valuation of such consequences (lost recreation, water quality/ public health, reduced fish populations and costs thereof to the fishery and livelihoods etc.)
- ⇒ Analyze strengths and weaknesses of PPCC vis-à-vis international lessons learned on transboundary water management and recommended specific transboundary institutional arrangement, taking into account also the emerging water management policies and institutions in the littoral states.

Output 4.2. Strategic Action Program for Prespa Lakes Basin developed and negotiated and committed to by highest levels of Government in Albania, Greece and Macedonia. (GEF)

Drawing upon conclusions from the Block B process, the TDA and action program recommendations from the existing Strategic Action Plan, activities under this output will produce a Strategic Action Program that identifies investments, as well as policy, legal, and institutional reforms needed to address priority transboundary problems in the Prespa Basin.

Endorsed at the highest level, a GEF SAP requires countries to make specific commitments to solving transboundary environmental problems and strengthening transboundary management.

Kinds of activities conducted under this output:

- ⇒ Technical Task Team proposes long term Ecosystematic Quality Objectives (EcoQO) AND Identify and develop options for achieving these EcoQO.
- ⇒ Appoint transboundary and national SAP formulation teams.
- ⇒ Conduct feasibility study of programmatic options, Governments reach political decisions on intent to implement options.
- ⇒ Establish 5-10 year operational objectives.
- ⇒ Final agreement upon new or strengthened national/trans-boundary institutional framework.
- ⇒ Prepare M&E indicators for process, stress reduction, and environmental status.
- ⇒ Stakeholder consultations and national endorsement of draft SAP and PPCC recommendation for Ministerial level endorsement.
- ⇒ Develop additional GEF interventions and conduct donor partnership conference to secure funding for SAP.
- ⇒ Ministerial conference formalizes national government commitment to the transboundary SAP.



KfW funded
Feasibility Study
to the

UNDP / KfW supported Project
Preparation and Development of the
Transboundary Prespa Park Project
Phase I: 29.9.2004-15.1.2005

[double-click to view presentation]

Annex IV – UNDP Work plan for the submission of a GEF Project Brief

Activities	March	April	May	June	July
1. PPCC meeting - March 6-7.	X				
2. PPCC members' comments on problem analysis submitted to UNDP by March 18.					
3. Finalize baseline figures related to existing programs in key sectors of interest to the project in Prespa.					
4. Internal review of problem analysis by UNDP. (March 24)		X			
5. Mission to Albania/Greece to flesh out outputs and indicative activities, implementation arrangements. (April 4-12)					
6. Meeting with GFA team and KfW to discuss KfW/GEF cofunding on outputs/activities. (April 13-14)					
7. Circulate draft project brief to PPCC for review on or before April 27.					
8. PPCC review of draft brief - April 28 - May 25. Comments given to UNDP on May 25.					
9. Internal UNDP review of advanced draft at UNDP-GEF NY (May 20)				X	
10. UNDP-GEF NY responds with comments. (May 27)					
11. STAP Review of draft brief; incorporate comments.					
12. Deadline to secure co-funding and endorsement letters from GoA, GoM, and GoG (June 10).					
13. Submit final version to UNDP-NY (June 13). Final version submitted to GEF Sec (June 15)					
14. NY Registry submits project to GEF Sec (June 17)					
15. GEF Implementing Agencies comment, GEF Sec comments.					
16. Incorporation of those comments and submission of revised version to GEF Sec. (July 21).					X
17. Final clearance by GEF and circulation to GEF Council Members for approval - July 27.					X

Annex V - Report on the implementation of the PPCC Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2004

According to the Sixth PPCC meeting decisions, the work of the Prespa Park Coordination Committee during its fourth 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 2004 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 operation 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 also Working Document 2). Systematic recording and completion of relevant information was due to be carried out 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. During the first six months of 2004, the Prespa Park Communication Officer worked on the basis of her updated work plan endorsed at the Sixth PPCC meeting, while at the second half of the year no specific communication activities took place. The issue will be presented and discussed in detail under agenda item 6.
 - d. Pursuant to the 2004 work plan, the local authorities should be encouraged to build closer ties and identify possible fields of joint action. To this effect, the GTZ had earmarked the amount of €10,000 for the year 2004. With the facilitation of the PPCC Secretariat, the three local authorities of the Prespa region explored the possibility of submitting a project proposal to GTZ, in November 2004. The project proposal concerned a short visit and contacts of the three Mayors with a municipality in Southern France having similar characteristics to Prespa and exhibiting successful experiences in the field of sustainable development. Both the delays in the organisation of the proposal, and the new planning by GTZ for the year 2005, deferred the submission of a project proposal to another phase of the GTZ programme.

- e. According to the 2004 work plan, contacts and cooperation between the protected area authorities in the three countries was a priority. On 5 June 2004, the first trilateral protected area meeting was organised by the Communication Officer (see Working document 2, para.8); a follow-up meeting due to take place in autumn did not materialise due to the overall problems in the Communication officer's work.
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) ended in 2004.
 - a. The final version of the Plan's Executive Summary, complete with proposed activities in the FYR of Macedonia was endorsed at the Sixth PPCC meeting and a booklet with the English text was published by SPP in January 2005.
 - b. According to the 2004 work plan, further elaboration of sustainable development activities proposed in the SAP was expected in the context of the PDF B project. This has indeed happened even if not completed yet but, at the time of writing, the results of this elaboration have not been communicated to the PPCC. A relevant discussion is foreseen under agenda item 2.
 - 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 are described in Working Document 2.
 - d. The task of identifying 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 progressed at the Sixth PPCC meeting, where it was decided to explore the possibility of concluding a trilateral agreement on the Prespa area and of holding a relevant Ministerial meeting by the end of 2004. Although, as reported in Working Document 2, the Ministerial meeting was not held in 2004, a draft agreement has been prepared and subject to consultations in the three countries.
3. With regard to the **Research, Monitoring and Conservation** axis of the Operational Plan and Programme of Activities of the Coordination Committee,
 - a. Further elaboration of specific research, monitoring and conservation activities proposed in the SAP in the context of the PDF B project was indeed carried out during 2004; however, the precise results of this exercise are again not known at the time of writing of this report.
 - b. According to the 2004 work plan and the TORs of the PDF B project, the first phase of the Prespa basin hydrogeological study was due to be executed in the context of PDF B activities. However, due to the new scheme for the implementation of the project adopted in the middle of the year and the resulting serious time restrictions this has not happened.
 - c. The Secretariat continued updating the data base with scientists/ experts on Prespa and relevant publications
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 and the collaborating NGOS have submitted relevant proposals (see Working document 2).
- b. The main development in this connection during the reporting period was the implementation of the Prespa Park PDF B project, which is a preparatory phase aiming at securing substantial international funding for the area.
- 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 will be further explained when the financial report for 2004 will be discussed.

Prespa Park Financial Report - 2004

The structure of this financial report follows that of the previous year. Hence, the report is divided into two Parts, A. Implementation of the 2004 Work plan and B. Parallel activities in the Prespa Park region. Part A is divided in 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 2004, and, more specifically, Communication Plan activities, SAP adaptation and PDF B project activities.

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, 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.

Some of the parties that have actually contributed financially to the Prespa Park process have not provided relevant data at the stage of preparation of this report, which has not allowed for a complete report. The missing information may still be provided during the PPCC meeting in order to have a more accurate picture of the costs actually incurred during 2004.

Part B includes activities that do not directly relate to the work plan of the PPCC but contribute to the more general objectives of the Prespa Park. The list is only indicative; it could potentially include all projects and activities in the Prespa Park region in the fields of environmental protection, sustainable development and transboundary cooperation, i.e. activities related directly or indirectly to the general scope and aims of the Prespa Park. The activities listed are only those for which financial data was made available. But nevertheless the list can be updated by additional contributions by the actors in the Prespa region.

(in euro)

Part A. Implementation of 2004 Work plan

Expenditure	Contribution in cash		Contribution in Kind	
		Donor		Donor
I. CORE ACTIVITIES				
<u>I.A. Coordination Committee</u>				
6th regular meeting (Korcha)				
Travel & Accommodation	4,500.00			
Interpretation	2,200.00			
Events & Other costs	2,000.00			
	8,700.00	UNDP/GEF, GTZ		
Chairperson's work			4,000.00	MoE-AL
SUBTOTAL I.A	8,700.00		4,000.00	
<u>I.B. Secretariat</u>				
<u>I.B1. Secretariat Remuneration</u>				
SPP	18,024.04	WWF GR		
PPNEA			6,000.00	PPNEA
MAP			n/a	MAP
Communication officer	7,228.00	GTZ		
<i>Subtotal I.B1</i>	25,252.04		6,000.00	
<u>I.B2. Administration & Office costs</u>				
SPP	26,742.43 ⁽¹⁾	WWF GR		
PPNEA			6,200.00	PPNEA
MAP			n/a	MAP
<i>Subtotal I.B2</i>	26,742.43		6,200.00	
<u>I.B3. Travel</u>				
SPP	916.50	WWF GR		
PPNEA		PPNEA	3,000.00	PPNEA
MAP			n/a	MAP
Communication Officer ⁽²⁾	2,500.00	GTZ		
<i>Subtotal I.B3</i>	3,416.50		3,000.00	
SUBTOTAL I.B	55,410.97		15,200.00	
TOTAL I	64,110.97		19,200.00	

⁽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

Expenditure	Contribution in cash		Contribution in Kind	
		Donor		Donor
II. NON-CORE ACTIVITIES				
<u>II.A. Communication Plan</u>				
Meetings, Events (NGOs, Protected Area authorities, drawing competition)	6,000.00			
Overheads	1,500.00			
Other costs	800.00			
SUBTOTAL II.A	8,300.00	GTZ		
<u>II.B SAP</u>				
<u>II.B1 SAP publication in Greece</u>				
Publication in English (400 copies)	3,181.28			
Publication in Greek (100 copies)	1,290.92			
Other costs (editing)	500.00			
<i>Subtotal II.B1</i>	4,972.20	WWF GR		
<u>II.B2 SAP adaptation in the FYR of Macedonia</u>				
Preparation	955.00			
Adaptation	550.00			
<i>Subtotal II.B2</i>	1,505.00	MoEPP		
SUBTOTAL II.B	6,477.20			
<u>II.C PDF B activities</u>				
PDF B project outputs ³	216,280.97	UNDP/GEF		
KfW feasibility study	appr.400,000.00	KfW		
Co-financing:	6,000.00	AL-MoE	8,333.00	AL-MoE
	44,000.00	GR-MoE		
Furniture of the project office in Resen	5,197.00	MoEPP	2,500.00	MoEPP
Miscellaneous expenses	7,598.21	UNDP-Macedonia		
Office costs			2,000.00	Munic. of Resen
SUBTOTAL II.C	679,076.18		12,833.00	
TOTAL II	693,853.38		12,833.00	
PART A - GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURE	757,964.35		32,033.00	

³ PDF B entries were converted from US\$ to € at the rate 1€=1.3161US\$ (as of 25 February 2005)

Income	Contribution in cash	Contribution in Kind
I. Albania		
Ministry of Environment	6,000.00	12,333.00
Prespa NP		n/a
II. FYR of Macedonia		
Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning (MoEPP)	6,702.00	2,500.00
Municipality of Resen		2,000.00
III. Greece		
Ministry of Environment	44,000.00	
Municipality of Prespa		n/a
IV. NGOs		
WWF Greece (SPP)	50,655.17	
PPNEA		15,200.00
MAP		n/a
V. Development Agencies		
UNDP	223,980.97	
UNDP-Macedonia	7,598.21	
GTZ	19,028.00	
KfW	appr. 400,000.00	
PART A - GRAND TOTAL INCOME	757,964.35	32,033.00

Part B: Parallel Activities in the Prespa Park Region

Expenditure	Contribution in cash		Contribution in Kind	
		Donor		Donor
Albania:				
Micro-Projects in the Prespa-Ohrid region (Medicinal plants; forest ecosystem rehabilitation; women NGO capacity building and economic improvement; Reconstruction of a fishing boat in Gollomboc; bird tower in Zhaveri; "Rivers"; euro camp in Prespa; phosphorus & nitrates monitoring in agriculture)	46,217.00	GTZ		
Support to Prespa National Park (Albania)	26,000.00	EAF		
Water supply in Albanian Macro Prespa	65,000.00	AL Min. of Terr. Plan. and Tourism		
Reconstruction/ rehabilitation of roads in Liqenas	64,000.00	AL Min. of Loc. Gov.		
Reconstruction/ rehabilitation of roads in Albanian Macro Prespa	198,000.00	KfW		
Collection of rain- and waste-water in Albanian Macro Prespa	110,000.00	KfW		
Forest works in Albanian NP	115,000.00	KfW		
Rehabilitation of hospital in Liqenas	18,000.00	Bavaria Rotary Club		
Construction of landfills and a sports centre in Albanian Macro Prespa	22,000.00	SNV		
Greece:				
Technical study for water supply of Pyli-Aghios Achillios	41,000.00	Local Development Fund		
Final study for the rehabilitation of the traditional settlement of Psarades	234,000.00	Min. of National Economy		
SPP Prespa Park programme (excluding PPCC Secretariat and SAP publication)	44,140.93	WWF Greece		
SPP LIFE project	510,176.00	European Commission		
	340,117.00	WWF Greece		
SPP Restoration of traditional building	56,299.59	Luc Hoffmann		
Other SPP programmes and activities	179,022.41	WWF Greece		

FYR of Macedonia:				
Micro-Projects in the Prespa-Ohrid region (Sustainable solid waste management in Prespa; screening for cervical cancer in the rural areas in Prespa; "grafting our future onto old roots"; "together for a better Prespa"; traditional red peppers recipes; Traditional fishing in Prespa; "together against respiratory diseases"; LSG institutional framework)	59,756.00	GTZ		
Various projects (Prespa apple-picking festival, Tourist Info Centre, reconstruction of buildings etc., support to enterprises, infrastructure for water supply, ping-pong equipment)	99,000.00	World Bank		
Sewerage system in one settlement in Resen	32,150.00	Min.of Transport		
Citizen Info Centre	40,840.00	EAR		
Youth Sports Recreation Centre	15,000.00	CBI/ UNDP		
Brochure with city info				
Reconstruction of old cinema hall	74,000.00	CBI		
	20,000.00	UNDP		
	48,000.00	USAID		
Support to Public Water Management Enterprise, Resen	4,860.00	MoEPP		
Support to Municipality of Resen (cleaning beaches)	16,900.00	MoEPP		
Support to NGO "Society of the citizens of Resen" (solid waste, public awareness)	2,800.00	MoEPP		
Study of Lake Macro Prespa using nuclear and related techniques (the FYR of Macedonia)	2,400.00	MoEPP		
Study on seaweed community as biological monitors to the eutrophication of Lake Macro Prespa (the FYR of Macedonia)	13,700.00	MoEPP		
Project environmental protection of Lake Macro Prespa (rehabilitation and extension of the existing sewerage network in Resen area)	data for 2004 n/a (total: appr. 2,700,000)	KfW		
PART B - GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURE	2,498,378.93		0.00	

Income	Contribution in cash	Contribution in kind
I. Albania		
Ministry of Territory Planning and Tourism	65,000.00	
Ministry of Local Government	64,000.00	
II. Greece		
Local Development Fund (Pref. of Florina)	41,000.00	
Ministry of Nat. Economy	234,000.00	
III. FYR of Macedonia		
Ministry of Transport	32,150.00	
Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning (MoEPP)	40,660.00	
IV. Development Agencies, NGOs and other actors		
Bavaria Rotary Club	18,000.00	
CBI	74,000.00	
CBI/UNDP	15,000.00	
EAf	26,000.00	
EAR	40,840.00	
European Commission	510,176.00	
GTZ	105,973.00	
KfW	(data for Resen wastewater treatment not avail. for 2004) 423,000.00	
Luc Hoffmann – private donor	56,299.59	
SNV	22,000.00	
UNDP	20,000.00	
USAID	48,000.00	
World Bank	99,000.00	
WWF Greece	563,280.34	
PART B - GRAND TOTAL	2,498,378.93	

Annex VI – PPCC Operational Plan and Programme of Activities - 2005

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 the said extension of the planning period has been postponed until after the PDF B project will have produced results. The present work plan accordingly refers to the year 2005.

As was seen under agenda item 4, Implementation of Operational Plan and Programme of Activities – 2004, some of the elements of the 2004 work plan progressed at a satisfactory pace, whereas others have been delayed. It is decided that, during 2005, the work of the PPCC should continue to focus on three main axes, Communication, Sustainable Development and Research, Monitoring and Conservation.

Moreover, in view of the fact that the PP workload is constantly increasing and the Secretariat of the Coordination Committee has rather limited capabilities and a number of restrictions, it should again be stressed that stakeholders other than the NGOs, namely the Governments and the local municipalities, should become more active in carrying out specific tasks laid down in the Prespa Park work plan.

In this context, this year special attention should be given to taking the Prespa Park initiative forward and renewing its momentum, five years after its launch. In this connection, two landmarks are set: the successful submission and approval of a full GEF project for the area and the adoption of a trilateral agreement for the Prespa Park are at a high-level political meeting of the three countries involved, both by the end of the year.

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. This approach has been followed with the two projects of SPP and PPNEA that are included under the Research, Monitoring and Conservation axis.

With regard to funding, it is also decided 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 have taken and are still taking 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.
- c. Finally, the three Governments shall make every effort in order to submit and secure approval of a proposal for a full GEF project for the Prespa Park area.

Taking these considerations into account, it is thus proposed that the following work plan be 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 operation of the PP and the PP CC	Meetings Contacts	Secretariat	Secretariat core funding	January - December 2005
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	Acquire access to the organised information gathered during the PDF B project Update information	Secretariat PDF B project staff	Secretariat core funding	January - December 2005
3. Implementation of a new Communication Plan More detailed discussion of the Communication Plan implementation will be carried out under Agenda item 6 (Working Document 5)	1. Website 2. Newsletter 3. Meetings 4. Publications 5. Other activities	Secretariat MedWet Com.Officer SPP	Secretariat core funding MedWet Interreg project (if approved)	January - December 2005
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	GTZ ?	January - December 2005
5. Cooperation between protected area authorities in the three countries	Meetings Regular contacts	Protected area authorities, assisted by the Secretariat	Not secured	January – December 2005

B. Sustainable Development

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

Activities:

After the endorsement of the final version of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP), 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 transboundary level the target set for 2005 should be the conclusion of a trilateral agreement for the Prespa Park area at a high-level political meeting of the three states concerned. Such a development would signify the beginning of a new more mature phase of the PP initiative, with the formalisation of trilateral institutions - up to now informal and with no legal status, and with the launching of sectoral, issue-specific cooperation in crucial areas such as water management in the Prespa basin. The implementation of a large GEF project – if approved – would be greatly facilitated by such an evolution of transboundary cooperation in the area.

Activity	Tools	Responsible	Funding	Timeframe
1. Publication of the SAP Executive Summary in the remaining two languages	Not required	MoEPP - MK	MoEPP - MK	July - December 2005
2. Identification of specific national and transboundary activities to be included in the full GEF project	PDF B project mechanism	PP CC UNDP KfW	PDF B project (UNDP)	January – June 2005
3. Prioritisation of SAP proposals in each country - Identification of funding sources and implementation of mature projects and programmes (may be relevant to p.2 above)	National consultations – meetings	PP CC national members	Not required	January – December 2005
4. Further elaboration and adoption of trilateral agreement – organisation of Ministerial meeting	Consultations and meetings	Chairwoman - Secretariat	Not required	January – November 2005

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. Identification of specific national and transboundary research, monitoring and conservation activities to be included in the full GEF project	PDF B project mechanism	PP CC UNDP KfW	PDF B project (UNDP)	January – June 2005
2. Implementation of the project "Study of the interaction between River Devolli and Lake Micro Prespa"		SPP - PPNEA	120,000 GR MFA 40,000 WWF GR	January 2005 – July 2006
3. Implementation of the project "Organisation of a basin-wide environmental monitoring system of basic biotic and abiotic parameters in the Prespa Park area" (If approved)		SPP – PPNEA – Macedonian Ecological Society	GR MFA Funding not secured	Second semester 2005 - 2007
4. Gathering of information on scientists/ experts on Prespa and relevant publications	Update database	Secretariat	Secretariat core funding	January – December 2005

Prespa Park Budget - 2005

[n/a = data not available]

(in euro)

Part A: Implementation of 2005 Work plan

Expenditure	Secured Funding (cash)		Contribution in Kind		Unsecured funds
		Donor		Donor	
I. CORE ACTIVITIES					
<u>I.A. Coordination Committee</u>					
7th regular meeting (Oteshevo)					
Travel & Accommodation	5,410				
Interpretation	1,580				
Events & Other costs	4,088				
	11,078	UNDP/ GEF			
8th regular meeting (Greek Prespa)					
Travel & Accommodation	11,635				
Interpretation	9,504				
Events & Other costs	1,164				
	22,303	MoE-GR			
Participation in Committee's work			4,000	MoE-AL	
SUBTOTAL I.A	33,381		4,000		
<u>I.B. Secretariat</u>					
I.B1. Secretariat Remuneration					
SPP	18,745	WWF GR			
PPNEA			6,240	PPNEA	
RESEN			6,890	RESEN	
<i>Subtotal I.B1</i>	18,745		13,130		
I.B2. Administration & Office costs					
SPP	27,812 ⁽¹⁾	WWF GR			
PPNEA			6,448	PPNEA	
RESEN			6,890	RESEN	
<i>Subtotal I.B2</i>	27,812		13,338		

⁽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.

Expenditure	Secured Funding (cash)		Contribution in Kind		Unsecured funds
	Donor		Donor		
<u>I.B3. Travel</u>					
SPP	953	WWF GR			
PPNEA			3,120	PPNEA	
RESEN			1,000	RESEN	
<i>Subtotal I.B3</i>	953		4,120		
SUBTOTAL I.B	47,510		30,588		
TOTAL I	80,891		34,588		
II. NON-CORE ACTIVITIES IN THE WORKPLAN					
	Secured Funding (cash)		Contribution in kind		Unsecured funds
	Donor		Donor		
<u>II.A. Communication Plan</u>					
Implementation of a new Communication Plan	n/a ⁽²⁾	MedWet			n/a ⁽³⁾
SUBTOTAL II.A					
<u>II.B SAP publication</u>					
Publication of the SAP in Albanian (100 copies)	798 ⁽⁴⁾				
Publication of the SAP in Macedonian (100 copies)	798 ⁽⁴⁾				
SUBTOTAL II.B	1,596				
<u>II.C PDF B activities</u>					
Project activities-UNDP/GEF ⁽⁵⁾	34,209	GEF Trustee			
Project activities-KfW	n/a		n/a		n/a
Co-financing (Ministries, Municipalities, UNDP national or regional offices, NGOs)	2,333	MoE-AL	n/a		n/a
SUBTOTAL II.C	36,542				

⁽²⁾ Cost of hosting the Prespa Park website.

⁽³⁾ The amount needed will depend on the scheme to be chosen by the PPCC for this year's communication activities.

⁽⁴⁾ Rough estimation.

⁽⁵⁾ PDF B entries were converted from US\$ to € at the rate 1€=1.3161US\$ (as of 25 February 2005).

Expenditure	Secured Funding (cash)		Contribution in Kind		Unsecured funds
	Donor		Donor		
II.D Study on R.Devolli - L.Micro Prespa interaction					
Implementation of the project "Study of the interaction between River Devolli and Lake Micro Prespa"	120,000	GR MFA			
	40,000	WWF-GR			
SUBTOTAL II.D	160,000⁽⁶⁾				
II.E Organisation of a basin-wide monitoring system					
Implementation of the project "Organisation of a basin-wide environmental monitoring system of basic biotic and abiotic parameters in the Prespa Park area" (funding by Greek MFA and WWF Greece, if approved)					300,000 ⁽⁴⁾
SUBTOTAL II.E					300,000
II.F Cooperation of Prespa Municipalities					
Cooperation of Prespa Municipalities in order to build closer ties and identify possible fields of joint action (working meetings, other activities to be specified; funding by GTZ, if approved)					15,000 ⁽⁴⁾
SUBTOTAL II.F					15,000
II.G Cooperation of Protected Area Authorities					
Cooperation between protected area authorities in the three countries (meetings, regular contacts)					10,000 ⁽⁴⁾
SUBTOTAL II.G					10,000
II.H Miscellaneous					
Funding by MoEPP for activities in the Prespa Park work plan, as well as parallel activities to be specified later	20,000	MoEPP			
SUBTOTAL II.H	20,000				
TOTAL II	218,138		n/a		325,000
GRAND TOTAL Part A EXPENDITURE	299,029		34,588		325,000

⁽⁶⁾ Project ends June 2006. Total budget is shown. Sums for the year 2005 only are not specified.

Income	Funding in cash	Contribution in kind
I. Albania		
Ministry of Environment	2,333	4,000
PNP-Albania	n/a	
II. FYR of Macedonia		
Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning	21,596	
Municipality of Resen	n/a	
III. Greece		
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	120,000	
Ministry of Environment	22,303	
Municipality of Prespa	n/a	
IV. NGOs		
WWF Greece	87,510	
PPNEA		15,808
NGO "RESEN"		14,780
V. Development Agencies		
UNDP/GEF	11,078	
GEF Trustee	34,209	
UNDP Albania	n/a	
UNDP Macedonia	n/a	
KfW	n/a	
GTZ	n/a	
GRAND TOTAL Part A INCOME	299,029	34,588

Annex VII – Presentation by UNESCO-ROSTE on Biosphere Reserves



UNESCO-ROSTE presentation.pdf

[double-click to view presentation]

Annex VIII - 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 2367 028 F: E:
Greece	Mr. Spyros Plessas (Government) Department of Nature Management Directorate of Environmental Planning Ministry of Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works Triakalon 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) Head of Division for Bilateral Cooperation Department for European Integration 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
	Ms. Biljana Puleska (Government – alternative member) Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning Drezdenska 52 1000 Skopje	T: +389 2 3066930 ext. 128 F: +389 2 3066931 E: B.Puleska@moepp.gov.mk
	Mr. Dimko Toskovski (Local authority) Mayor Municipality of Resen Marsal Tito str., No.20 7310 Resen	T: +389 96 451450 F: +389 96 451450
	Mr. Dzoko Kungulovski (NGO – Resen) Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics St. Gazi Baba b.b, P Fah 162 1000, Skopje	T: +389 2 311 70 55 F: +389 2 322 81 41 E: djokok@iunona.pmf.ukim.edu.mk
	Mr. Tome Petkovski (NGO - FOKUS -alternative member) St.Nikola Kanev 55 7310 Resen	T: +389 75 415 665 F: E: tomepetkovski@mt.net.mk

MedWet	Mr. Thymio Papayannis (MedWet - alternative member) Senior Advisor on Mediterranean Wetlands The MedWet Initiative, Convention on Wetlands 23 Voucourestiou Str. GR-10671 Athens, Greece	T: +30 210 3600711-714, F: +30 210 3629338 E: thymiop@hol.gr
---------------	--	--

PPCC Secretariat members

Albania	Mr. Spase Shumka PPNEA Blv. "Zogu I", Pall.97/1/5 Tirana, Albania	T: +355 4 249571 F: +355 4 249571 E: sprespa@yahoo.co.uk
Greece	Ms. Vivi Roumeliotou Society for the Protection of Prespa c/o WWF Greece 26 Filellinon Str. 10558 Athens, Greece	T: +30 210 3311988 ext.126 F: +30 210 3247578 E: v.roumeliotou@wwf.gr
FYR of Macedonia	Ms. Sonja Spirovska NGO-Ecoprotection Doctor spec., Public Health Institution St Koco Racin bb 7310 Resen	T: +389 47 452 922 F: +389 47 452 922 E: dr_spirovska@yahoo.com or sksonja@freemail.com.mk

Invited Observers

Albania	Mr. Pellumb Abeshi Secretary General of the Ministry of Environment - NPD/ PDF B programme Rr. « Durresi » Nr. 27 Tirana	T : + 355 4 270 623 F : + 355 4 270 623 E : p_abeshi@abissnet.com.al
	Mr. Genti Kromidha Director of Protected Areas Management General Directory of Forestry and Pastures	T: + 355 4 256786 F: + 355 4 256784 E: gkromidha@dppk.com
	Mr. Gezim Hadri Director Korcha Forestry Service Korçe	T: +355 82 42569 F: +355 82 42569 M: +355 682140676 E:
	Mr. Shaban Mero Director Prespa National Park Korçe	T: + 355 82 43566 F: + 355 82 42569 E: csdprespa@yahoo.com
	Mr. Ilo Male Secretary Prespa Commune Ligenas	T: +389 75577536
	Mr. Taqo Kitani Manager Prespa National Park Korçe	T: +355 682200090 E: csdprespa@yahoo.com

Greece	Ms. Athina Mourmouri Head of the Department of Nature Management Directorate of Environmental Planning Ministry of Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works Triakalon 36 115 26 Athens	T: +30 210 6917620 F: +30 210 6918487 E: a.mourmouri@dpers.minenv.gr
	Mr. Konstantinos Gakis PDF B Project – National Project Coordinator c/o Planet Regional K.Karamanli 167 & Mavromihali 37 54 249 Thessaloniki	T: +30 2310 326216 F: +30 2310 326290 E : kgakis@planetregional.gr
	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
	Ms. Irene Koutseri Society for the Protection of Prespa Ag.Germanos Prespa 530 77 Ag.Germanos	T: +30 23850 51211 F: +30 23850 51343 E: i.koutseri@spp.gr
	Ms. Eleftheria Patsea Society for the Protection of Prespa Ag.Germanos Prespa 530 77 Ag.Germanos	T: +30 23850 51211 F: +30 23850 51343 E: spp@line.gr
FYR of Macedonia	Mrs. Lindita Shakiri Atanasova 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 E: L.Shakiri@moepp.gov.mk
	Mr. Slavko Dameski Director, NP Pelister 29th November str.- 14 7000 Bitola	T: +389 97 31 464 F: +389 97 233 668 E:
	Mr. Naume Razmoski Director, NP Galichica Galichitsa str. b.b. 6000 Ohrid	T: +389 96 261 473 F: +389 96 261 473 E:
	Ms. Daniela Apostolovska Head of Department for Local Economic Development and Cross border Cooperation Municipality of Resen Marsal Tito str., No.20 7310 Resen	T: +389 47 451508 F: +389 47 451960 E: danniela@freemail.com.mk

	Mr. Branko Micevski President of Macedonian Ramsar Committee President of the Management Board SN Reserve EZERANI BSPSM Zoological Department Institute of Biology 1000 Skopje	T: +389 2 2432071 F: M: +389 70 254736 E: brankom@ukim.edu.mk
	Ms. Nijare Zulal NGO-Ecoprotection 7310 Resen	T: +389 47 452 251 E: jusne@hotmail.com
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, the FYR of Macedonia	T: +389 2 116335 (ext.118) F: +389 2 118261 E : anita.kodzoman@undp.org
	Mr. Jeffrey Griffin GEF expert - UNDP 721 N.W. 9 th Avenue, Suite 300 Portland, Oregon 97209, U.S.A.	T: + 503-224-2205, ext. 30 F: + 503-224-2216 E: jfgrif@msn.com
	Mr. Keith Shawe PDF B project - International Project Manager Municipality of Resen, Marshall Tito Square, No. 20 7310 Resen FYR of Macedonia	T: +389 47 455190 F: +389 47 455186 E: kgshawe@mac.com
	Mr. Ardit Konomi National Project Coordinator/ PDF B project Shetitorja " Vangjush Miho" Pallati Kulture Korcha, Albania	T: +355 68 20 54 724 F: E: arditkonomi@hotmail.com
	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	Ms. Natasha Sachmaroska Project Coordinator KfW-Skopje Maksim Gorki 1/6 1000 Skopje, FYR of Macedonia
Mr. Petar Gjorgjiev Project Coordinator KfW-Skopje Maksim Gorki 1/6 1000 Skopje, FYR of Macedonia		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: kfw.albania@interalb.net
	Ms. Susanne Pecher KfW-funded study team leader GFA Terra Systems Eulenkrustr. 82 22345 Hamburg, Germany	T: +49 40 60306 110 F: +49 40 60306 119 E: specher@gfa-terra.de
	Conrad Graf Hoyos GFA Terra Systems Eulenkrustr. 82 22345 Hamburg, Germany	T: +49 40 60306 175 F: +49 40 60306 179 E: Choyos@GFA-terra.de
UNESCO	Mr. Giorgio Andrian Environmental Programmes Consultant UNESCO Regional Bureau for Science in Europe (ROSTE) Palazzo Zorzi - 4930 Castello 30122 Venezia, Italy	T: +39 041 260 1524 F: +39 041 528 9995 E: g.andrian@unesco.org
WWF International	Mr. Demetres Karavellas CEO WWF Greece 26 Filellinon Str. GR-10558 Athens, Greece	T: +30 210 3314 893 F: +30 210 3247 578 E: d.karavellas@wwf.gr
EURONATUR	Mr. Gabriel Schwaderer Stiftung Europäisches Naturerbe (EURONATUR) Konstanzer Strasse 22 78315 Radolfzell, Germany	T : + 07732 92720 F : + 07732 92722 E: gabriel.schwaderer@euronatur.org