

# Creating an Enabling Environment to Support LDN Target Implementation Through Strengthening Capacities and Establishing an LDN Monitoring and Reporting System in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10830

**Countries**

Bosnia-Herzegovina

**Project Name**

Creating an Enabling Environment to Support LDN Target Implementation Through Strengthening Capacities and Establishing an LDN Monitoring and Reporting System in Bosnia and Herzegovina

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

7/16/2021

**Review completed by PM**

9/21/2021

**Program Manager**

Ulrich Apel

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**Project Type**

MSP

## PIF

**Part I ? Project Information****Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

08/18/2021: Yes.

However, please re-consider the Rio Marker for CC-M, which is set to 2, which means CC-M is the primary objective. Based on the focus of the project and the modest CC-M targets, it would seem more appropriate to set the marker to "1".

09/21/2021: INCONSISTENCY FOUND:

The project title in the OFP Letter of Endorsement is different from the project title in Portal ? please modify in Portal accordingly.

10/19/2021: Has been corrected.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

Point taken. CC-M marker has been set to 1.

10/14/2021:

Point taken, the project title is now adjusted on the PIF in the attached word document and GEF Portal in line with the letter of endorsement.

#### Indicative project/program description summary

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

However, please explore the possibility to increase the ratio of co-financing for the PMC. The ratio is currently lower and not proportional to the overall co-financing ratio.

09/21/2021: Co-financing ratio has been increased. However, the increase still doesn't achieve proportionality. If the GEF contribution is kept at 10.0%, for a co-financing of \$6,135,691 the expected contribution to PMC should be \$631,569 instead of \$427,309 (which is currently only 6.96%). Please adjust.

10/19/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

Point taken. PMC ratio (cofinancing) has been increased.

10/14/2021

Point taken. The ratio of the PMC to co-financing subtotal is now 10%.

#### Co-financing

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

However, please list the area targets under indicator 4.3 instead of 4.1. The PIF text under 6) GEBs clearly indicates that the targets refer to area und SLM.

09/21/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Point taken. Indicator has been moved to 4.3.

**Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

However, at CEO endorsement stage, please link the area targets und 4.3 to the LDN targets and describe in as much the project will contribute to the implementation of LDN targets.

09/21/2021: Comment acknowledged.

Cleared

Agency Response

Noted. We will consider this during project preparation.

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project?/s/program?s intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

However, please double check the role for the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management of FBiH, which may have been mixed up with the Ministry in Srpska.



09/21/2021: ADDITIONAL COMMENT:

It is well noted that the PIF includes information on stakeholder groups to be consulted in project development. The PIF however does not include any information of the consultative process, including which stakeholder groups have been consulted in the preparation of the PIF. Please provide additional information on who and how different stakeholder groups have been consulted and engaged in the project preparation stage.

10/19/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

Point taken. The role of the Ministry in FBiH is now correct.

10/14/2021:

Point taken. The PIF now includes detailed information on the consulted stakeholders during Project identification (PIF) including names, consultation methodology and dates.

#### Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Not fully.

After the paragraph describing the gender context, please include a paragraph on how the project plans to address these issues and contribute to its improvement. Are there any specific opportunities in this context?

Please also make sure that the template boxes in this section are ticked and the respective YES/NO answers included.

09/21/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

Thank you for the comment. Please refer to the edited version of section 3 of the PIF including an additional description of how the project will address gender gaps. The boxes have also been checked in the PIF document and GEF portal.

#### Private Sector Engagement

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Not fully.

Please make sure that the template boxes in this section are ticked and the respective YES/NO answers included.

The description of the cooperation with private sector entities is acceptable at PIF stage, however, please include more details on the partners that will be involved at CEO approval/endorsement stage and include them into the stakeholder discussions at PPG stage.

09/21/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Point taken. We will elaborate during project design. The template boxes have now been ticked.

#### Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

However, please include an brief assessment if there are any opportunities of the COVID-19 pandemic in the context of green recovery under the risk table.

09/21/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

Added.

#### Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Not fully.

Please include in the first paragraph that the proposed arrangement has been discussed with the OFP and GEFSEC, and make reference to the OFP endorsement letter, which specifically mentions this arrangement.

09/21/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

The information has been added.

#### Consistency with National Priorities

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Not fully.

Please include a specific mention of the UNCCD alignment and how the project will feed into the national UNCCD agenda, not only in terms of LDN but also in general UNCCD strategy/plan implementation in BiH as well as feedback mechanism from this project to the national UNCCD processes, including UNCCD reporting as appropriate.

09/21/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

Added.

### Knowledge Management

**Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Not fully.

Please elaborate on the proposed KM approach and add some more specifics, in particular on how the KM approach can provide feedback mechanism to the national UNCCD process.

09/21/2021: Paragraph added in the KM section.

Cleared

## Agency Response

### Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

09/21/2021: ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATION REQUEST:

- The project's ESS risk is classified as low and attached is the UNEP Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). The PIF's ESS Risk (section 9), however, indicate the project risk classification as moderate. Please clarify the ESS risk assessment level and double check for consistency.

10/19/2021: Corrected.

Cleared

Agency Response

10/14/2021:

Thanks for pointing out the error. We corrected the ESS risk as Low on the portal.

### Part III ? Country Endorsements

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

RESPONSE TO THE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BELOW:

Thank you for the comments. We will consider them during Project Preparation Phase.

### GEFSEC DECISION

### RECOMMENDATION

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/18/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

09/21/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

10/19/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO PIF approval.

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Link project targets to national LDN targets and the extent of contribution towards LDN targets.

- More detailed information of private sector involvement

#### **Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>8/18/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/21/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/19/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

#### **PIF Recommendation to CEO**

#### **Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

The project "Creating an enabling environment to support the implementation of LDN target in Bosnia and Herzegovina" is fully in line with the GEF-7 LDFA strategy, specifically objective LD-2-5 to support the enabling framework for LDN. The objective

of the project is to foster a coherent policy environment and track progress towards achieving the national LDN targets. The project will create an enabling policy environment to support LDN target implementation through strengthening national and local capacity and establishing an LDN monitoring and reporting system in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In addition, the project will support the practical application, testing and local adaption of a wide range of innovative SLM and SFM practices for the sustainable management of forests, rangelands and croplands. The Project will pilot innovative measures in order to enhance land quality and protection, as well as restoring land functions in degraded ecosystems. The Project will deliver a roadmap that will set the milestones and indicators for the next 10 years that will support the monitoring and reporting against the national LDN target as well as toward the achievement of SDG 15.3. The project will directly bring 10,000 ha under SLM, sequester 280,000 t of CO<sub>2</sub> eq, and benefit 2200 women and men.

This project will build on the efforts from the BiH institutions to build back better considering that the Agricultural Service has been designed as a key executing agency for post COVID-19 economic recovery activities with the implementation of agro-ecosystem management and natural resource protection activities to be developed during 2021. This project will take the lessons learned from that experience and build on them to promote sustainable practices for the agriculture sectors.