



# Introducing Nature Based Solutions to Ensure Resilient Ecosystems, Green Recovery and Sustainable Livelihoods

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11335

**Countries**

Bosnia-Herzegovina

**Project Name**

Introducing Nature Based Solutions to Ensure Resilient Ecosystems, Green Recovery and Sustainable Livelihoods

**Agencies**

UNDP, FAO

**Date received by PM**

10/13/2023

**Review completed by PM**

12/12/2023

**Program Manager**

Ulrich Apel

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

### 1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023:

a) Yes

b1) Please clarify if FAO is also implementing, if so, it has to be entered alongside UNDP in the General Info table.

Note: If FAO is also implementing agency, it will also have other implications, such as revising the financial tables in the Annex (please refer to comments there).

b2) The listed executing partners are Federal Ministry of Environment and Tourism and the Ministry of Spatial Planning, Construction and Ecology of Republika Srpska, which are not included in the LoE. Please remove or provide revised LoE. (Note: other executing agencies they can be identified in the preparation phase and entered at CEO endorsement stage as appropriate)

b3) Should the OFP LoE indeed mean that UNDP and FAO are executing, we request an additional OFP support letter to make this request.

11/29/2023: Addressed.

However, please see comments on the financing tables, which are still not in line with the LoE (all financing tables only indicate UNDP as requesting/receiving funds).

12/05/2023: NOT addressed.

1) Executing Partner field now is empty ? however, the executing partner type says ?Government? ? please remove this as the executing partner will be decided during the preparation phase.

2) The financing table is still incorrect. It repeats the entry for UNDP. FAO is missing. Please bring it in line with the Letter of Endorsement.

12/12/2023: Addressed

(1) Portal doesn't allow changes by the agency (please see below). Please ask IT to change from the back-end.

(2) Table has been revised.

Cleared

### Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: November 28, 2023

Thank you for these comments

b1) FAO is now entered alongside UNDP as IAs (see revised LOE). The financial tables in Annex A breaks down the budget between UNDP and FAO and is now consistent with the LOE - - Refer General Information Table (page 1) and Annex A and LOE.

b2) The revised LoE and PIF both indicate that the project will be implemented jointly by UNDP and FAO. The Federal Ministry of Environment and Tourism and the Ministry of Spatial Planning, Construction and Ecology of Republika Srpska are now excluded from the LOE and PIF

b3) A new OFP letter is provided reflecting that UNDP and FAO will be jointly executing the project for the reasons indicated in the letter.

UNDP Response: December 11, 2023

Thank you for the comment.

1) We previously removed Executing Partner in the portal however, the portal does not allow us to delete or change the partner type which has been selected as government during initial submission. It should be empty as well.

2) The GEF Financing Table was updated in line with the LOE. The GEF Financing table and the PPG table in Annex A indicate FAO as receiving/requesting funds under LD STAR allocation: US\$ 700,000 under LD-1 (row 4 of the GEF Financing Table) and US\$ 591,491

under LD-2 (row 5 of the GEF Financing Table) plus agency fee of US\$ 122,691. The PPG table indicates FAO's portion of US\$ 40,071 plus US\$ 3,807 as agency fee.

## 2. Project Summary

**Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

## 3 Indicative Project Overview

**3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**

**b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Not fully

a) Yes

b1) Please include gender dimensions in Outputs 2.3 and 2.4.

b2) Please see comments on core indicators: there are some inconsistencies between the outcomes/outputs and core indicators.

11/29/2023: Not fully addressed.

b1) Please also include that in the Indicative Project Overview table - I don't see any changes as compared to the previous version.

12/12/2023: Addressed.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: November 28, 2023

b1) Gender dimensions are now included in Outputs 2.3 and 2.4 in 'Indicative Project Overview' and further elaborated in Section B - Refer Project Indicative Overview Table pages 3-5, Section B (pages 19-20)

b2) See response below under core indicators

UNDP Response: December 11,2023

This has now been revised in Project Indicative Overview table (Output 2.3 and 2.4 and indicators) and Section B, in terms of the title of the outputs have been revised to emphasize on gender dimensions. The narrative in outputs 2.3 and 2.4 includes specific reference to gender dimensions

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

However, please note comment above.

12/12/2023: Addressed.

Agency's Comments

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023:

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**4 Project Outline**

**A. Project Rationale**

**4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS**

**a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?**

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023:

a) Yes

b) Yes

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT**

**a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

**c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

**d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023:

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) Not fully. For local communities, the role assigned is merely to "be informed". Please clarify if local communities will be given the opportunity to actively engage through participatory processes.

11/29/2023: Not fully addressed.

While stakeholder engagement is further elaborated in Section A, please reflect this also in Table 1: "Stakeholder Engagement" in the last row of the table.

12/12/2023: Addressed.

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: November 28, 2023

Stakeholder engagement is further elaborated in Section A - Refer Section A (page 13)

UNDP Response: December 11, 2023

The last row of stakeholder engagement table has been revised to specify the direct role of communities

### 5 B. Project Description

#### 5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023:

a) Yes

b) Yes

Cleared

#### Agency's Comments

#### 5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

Cleared

#### Agency's Comments

##### **5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK**

**a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**

**b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**

**c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**

**d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Not fully adequate.

a) & b) Please provide details of the expected Implementation / Execution arrangements. The project has indicated that it expects to be executed by an Implementing Agency. Please explain which one (UNDP or FAO or both?) Please also explain and elaborate on implementation/execution details, including roles, institutional arrangements, etc.

Note: Clearance of a PIF does not indicate approval of the proposed implementation/execution arrangements as these will be further reviewed and are subject to approval at CEO endorsement stage.

c) Yes

d) Yes

11/29/2023: Addressed.

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: November 28, 2023

A new Section ? ?implementation Arrangements? has been added to the PIF that details the executing role of UNDP and FAO. These arrangements will be further discussed and agreed to with GEFSEC prior to submission at CEO endorsement stage. - Refer Section D (pages 36-37)



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

**b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Clarification required.

a) Yes

b1) Please enter HCVF areas under sub-indicator 4.4, as appropriate

b2) Please clarify which indicator targets component 3, especially output 3.3 will achieve. As a general comment, the project has very low targets under sub-indicator 4.3 despite component 3 activities seem to be focused on SLM. Please clarify & amend as appropriate.

b3) Please clarify why OECMs are not included in the core indicators, given that improving management of OECMs is mentioned throughout the document as a priority of the project.

11/29/2023: Addressed & clarified.

Cleared

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: November 28, 2023

b1) This is now specified - b1) Refer section on 'global Environmental benefits' pages 23-24 and Annex I

b2) The indicator target 3 (area of ecosystems restored) will be achieved via Outputs 3.2 and 3.3, with training support provided under Output 3.4. The target (4.3) is increased to 1,000 ha. - b2) Refer section on 'global Environmental benefits' pages 23-24 and Annex I

b3) At this juncture targets for HCVFs are provided under C.I 4.4. and not under OECMs, as a measure of precaution. While there is some general acceptance for 'OECMs' in the country, at PPG stage, the commitment of the government to recognize categories of OECMs (which will require national policy, criteria for selection of OECM types and capacity for management of OECMs) will be assessed and appropriate measures taken to

promote this concept and a decision will be made at that time to include a OECM core indicator category - N/A

**5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

**5.6 RISKS**

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**

**b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023:

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**5.7 Qualitative assessment**

**a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**

**b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**

**c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

If successfully implemented, the project would be impactful in introducing the OECM concept with potential for national scaling up.

Cleared

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: November 28, 2023

Agreed. The intent is to evaluate the potential, government commitment and opportunities for introduction of OECMs at PPG stage and develop a replication strategy for national scale up ? N/A

### **6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

Cleared

#### Agency's Comments

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

Cleared

#### Agency's Comments

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023:

Please provide information on what targets of the GBF the project will contribute to in the section on project fit with focal area strategies.

11/29/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: November 28, 2023

A new table is added to reflect global targets, including GBF - Refer Table 3 Pages 29-30

### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

#### **7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

Cleared

#### Agency's Comments

**7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

Cleared

#### Agency's Comments

### **8 Annexes**

#### **Annex A: Financing Tables**

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

**STAR allocation?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Clarification required.

The Sources of funds table is inconsistent with the OFP Letter of Endorsement, which states that part of the funding is provided to FAO. Please amend either the LoE or the table accordingly.

11/29/2023: Not fully addressed.

The Financing Tables still only list UNDP as the agency requesting/receiving funding. The LoE indicates that FAO is requesting/receiving the LD portion of the total amount. So, the amounts are correct, but FAO is missing.

12/05/2023: NOT addressed. FAO is missing from the tables. UNDP has a double entry. Please correct.

12/12/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: November 28, 2023

Annex A Tables break down funding between FAO and UNDP and is now consistent with LOE as follow:

FAO GEF Project Grant ? 1,291,491

FAO Fee GEF Grant. - 122,691

FAO PPG Grant share. - 40,071

FAO Fee (PPG) - 3,807

TOTAL FAO **1,458,060**

UNDP GEF Project Grant ? 3,543,039

UNDP Fee GEF Grant). - 336,589

UNDP PPG Grant share. - 109,929

UNDP Fee (PPG) - 10,443

TOTAL UNDP 4,000,000

UNDP Response: December 11, 2023

The GEF Financing Table was updated in line with the LOE. The GEF Financing table and the PPG table in Annex A indicate FAO as receiving/requesting funds under LD STAR allocation: US\$ 700,000 under LD-1 (row 4 of the GEF Financing Table) and US\$

591,491 under LD-2 (row 5 of the GEF Financing Table) plus agency fee of US\$ 122,691. The PPG table indicates FAO's portion of US\$ 40,071 plus US\$ 3,807 as agency fee.

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments Resources are available.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**8.3 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?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat's Comments 10/24/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

**Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

11/29/2023: New LoE provided and uploaded.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: No

1) As mentioned above, the portal entries are different from the LoE in terms of agency allocation.

2) The template use for this project removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?". As agencies have been consistently been informed, LoEs "with modifications cannot be accepted and will be returned?". While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (as an alternative to request a new LoE).

11/28/2023: Addressed. New LoE provided and uploaded.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: November 28, 2023

- 1) Updated in the portal
- 2) Footnote added to LOE

**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.



Cleared

Agency's Comments

**Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

Are pre-SESP has been provided and uploaded.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**Annex E: Rio Markers**

**8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: No.

Please note: the definition of the Rio Markers indicates that: "principal" (2) is higher than "significant" (1). It seems therefore that the LD and BD markers should be the principal objective of the project, whereas the CC-M and CCA markers are only "significant".

Please amend.

11/29/2023: NOT addressed.

Please double check - I don't see any changes compared to the previous submission.

12/12/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: November 28, 2023

Thank you for picking this up. Revised accordingly ? Refer Annex E

UNDP Response: December 11, 2023

LD and BD markers are marked as principal (2) in Annex E while CC-M and CCA as significant (1)

**Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments<sub>n/a</sub>

Agency's Comments

**9 GEFSEC Decision**

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/24/2023: No.

a) Please upload the UNDP Checklist in the documents? section.

b) Please address all comments made in this review.

11/29/2023: No. Please address outstanding comments.

12/05/2023: No. there are three remaining comments that have not been addressed. Please address carefully.

12/12/2023: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO clearance.

### Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: November 28, 2023

a) Checklist uploaded in the portal

b) All comments addressed

UNDP Response: December 11, 2023

Thank you. All comments addressed

### 9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

### Secretariat's Comments

12/12/2023:

Note: Clearance of a PIF does not indicate approval of the proposed implementation/execution arrangements as these will be further reviewed and are subject to approval at CEO endorsement stage.

### Agency's Comments

#### Review Dates

|                     | PIF Review | Agency Response |
|---------------------|------------|-----------------|
| <b>First Review</b> | 10/24/2023 |                 |

**PIF Review****Agency Response**

|                                         |                   |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b> | <b>11/29/2023</b> |
| <b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b> | <b>12/5/2023</b>  |
| <b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b> | <b>12/12/2023</b> |
| <b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b> |                   |