

Improved Financial Sustainability and Strengthened Resilience of Protected Areas Through Development of Sustainable Recreation and Partnership With Private Sector

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10344

Countries

Bosnia-Herzegovina

Project Name

Improved Financial Sustainability and Strengthened Resilience of Protected Areas Through Development of Sustainable Recreation and Partnership With Private Sector

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

11/22/2021

Review completed by PM

2/9/2022

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF **CEO Endorsement**

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes, Table A is aligned. However:

- Clarification question on "Other Executing Partner(s)": Currently, only UNDP is listed. Is this fully in line with the exception request or will the executing be done in partnership with a government entity?
- The OFP request letter could not be located.
- Please also note additional comments on execution arrangements in the coordination box further below.

01/26/2022: Addressed.

An "updated DIM confirmation" has been uploaded in the portal, which contains the information required as per GEF template.

GEF Program Manager approves the exception request and recommends MGR's clearance.

Agency Response

1. - [REDACTED] ?Other Executing Partners?: the project will be implemented by UNDP as requested by the Government.

1. - [REDACTED] The OFP requested that the project will be implemented by UNDP back at the PIF stage and re-instated the request at the PPG stage; both communications have been uploaded to PIMS+ and the portal

1. - Thank you for the additional comments that have been addressed in the coordination box below.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Not fully.

- Please spell out acronyms CISP, MOFTER

01/26/2022: Addressed.

Agency Response The acronyms spelled out as requested; CISP stands for International Committee for the Development of Peoples (Comitato Internazionale per lo Sviluppo dei Popoli), Rome, Italy, while MOFTER is the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Table D is adequate.

Clarification questions on the budget:

- the project admin/finance/M&E staff budget seems to be charged all to M&E? Or is the 2nd line that is charged to PMC the same position and it has been shared? This is not fully clear from the budget table and the notes, including the percentages of sharing.

01/26/2022: Per GEF guidelines, the costs associated with the execution of the project (i.e. project's staff) have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The position of Project Coordinator and Project Assistant should therefore be fully charged to PMC (as there are enough co-financing resources with an important portion represented in Investment Mobilized). However, currently the Project Assistant is partially charged to M&E (\$60,000), while the Project Manager has been charged to components 1 and 2 (\$116,000) ? please amend accordingly.

02/09/2022: Not adequately addressed. See outstanding issues below. Please contact the reviewer by email if there are any further questions.

(1) there is no explanation provided on point a) (?Based on the category (?Furniture/Equipment/Vehicle?) it is not clear what this expense (? Co-financing of tourism infrastructure ("Viewpoint with an educational trail") for Vjetrenica (USD 30,000)?) entails?) ? please clarify;

(2) With the explanations provided by the Agency we now better understood the distribution of the costs, but as a result, we detected inconsistencies not evident before as presented below:

- regarding point b) the explanation is understood, but the calculations made in the budget table are wrong: according to the explanation, ?the Project Assistant - Admin/Finance/M&E position is a combination of management, administrative and financial support as well as support to M&E. The latter is detailed in the last five lines of the respective ToR (ToR #3, Annex 11). Please note that 15% cost of this position is charged to Component 4: M&E in the amount of USD 20,000 (not USD 60,000).? Though the distribution explained in the column ?Detailed Description? in the budget table is

exactly the same, the row that allocates the costs to M&E correctly reflects US\$60,000 but the row that allocates the costs to PMC is wrong as it reflects US\$100,000 (US\$40,000 more) ? please revise and amend in all budget tables (in ProDoc, in Annex E in Portal, in documents? tab)

The agency has also explained that ?the Project Manager ? Principal Technical Coordinator position is a combination of execution (i.e. management and administration) and technical functions, where 80% is execution (charged to PMC) and 20 % is technical input (charged to technical Components 1 and 2). The latter is detailed in lines 1-5, 10-11 and several other elements of the respective ToR (ToR#1, Annex 11). Please note that 20% cost of this position charged to Components 1-2 is in the amount of USD 36,000 (not USD 116,000).? Hence, we understand that the total cost of the Project Manager - Principal Technical Coordinator is US\$116,000, out of which US\$36,000 are meant to be charged to components 1 and 2, while the remaining \$90,000 are meant to be charged to PMC. However, the budget table in Annex E in Portal only charges the costs to components 1 and 2, zero to PMC. The distribution in Budget table has to reflect the explanation provided in the column ?Detailed Description? ? please amend.

On this point, please note that regarding the budget provide in ProDoc, the total cost of the Project Manager ? Principal Technical Coordinator position is different than in the budget table in Annex E Portal (explained above): in ProDoc US\$58,000 + US\$58,000 + US\$55,000 = US\$171,000. Unless we are missing something, indeed the figures in ProDoc are different than in the budget table in Portal, which is not acceptable. Please amend and reflect the same figures in all budget tables (in ProDoc, in Annex E in Portal, in documents? tab).

02/22/2022: Addressed.

Agency Response

The Project Admin/Finance budget for personnel (Component 5, 71300) includes:

1. 30% of the cost of the Project Manager - Principal Technical Coordinator position budgeted from the GEF resources (Budget Note 24);
2. 50% of the cost for the Project Manager - Principal Technical Coordinator position budgeted from UNDP resources (Budget Note 27);
3. 40% of the cost of the Project Assistant Admin/Finance/M&E position budgeted from the GEF resources (Budget Note 24);
4. 45% of the cost of the Project Assistant Admin/Finance/M&E position budgeted from UNDP resources (Budget Note 27).

The M&E budget for personnel (Component 4, 71300) includes the remaining 15% of the cost of the Project Assistant Admin/Finance/M&E position (Budget Note 21).

On the comment from 01/26/2022:

As per the ToRs presented as Annex 11 to the Project Document, the Project Manager ? Principal Technical Coordinator position is a combination of execution (i.e. management and administration) and technical functions, where 80% is execution (charged to PMC) and 20 % is technical input (charged to technical Components 1 and 2). The latter is detailed in lines 1-5, 10-11 and several other elements of the respective ToR (ToR#1, Annex 11). Please note that 20% cost of this position charged to Components 1-2 is in the amount of USD 36,000 (not USD 116,000).

Similarly, the Project Assistant - Admin/Finance/M&E position is a combination of management, administrative and financial support as well as support to M&E. The latter is detailed in the last five lines of the respective ToR (ToR #3, Annex 11). Please note that 15% cost of this position is charged to Component 4: M&E in the amount of USD 20,000 (not USD 60,000).

Response on comment from 02/09/2022:

(1) Clarification of the category Furniture/Equipment/Vehicle: Co-financing of tourism infrastructure ("Viewpoint with an educational trail") for Vjetrenica (USD 30,000)

?Co-financing of a viewpoint and educational trail development in Vjetrenica PL together with Ravno Municipality, including educational boards and benches for tourists along the 4 km long route walk as well as a safe tourist infrastructure at the Vjetrenica Cave Viewpoint.?

This clarification has been added as a budget note for the respective budget item (in ProDoc ? Budget Note 13). Reference to the viewpoint and educational trail development is made in the Co-financing letter of Ravno Municipality uploaded to the GEF Portal at earlier stage.

(2) clarification of budget inconsistencies on staff costs:

We would like to apologize for an honest error in the budget description of Contractual Services ? Individual (PMC portion ? red highlighted on the below snip) that we realized only based on your latest comment and which has caused a lot of confusion on your side. As a general practice we are preparing the budgets in UNDP ProDoc format and when finalized we are converting them to GEF Format. During this conversion, an error has occurred in the formula when incorrect description was copied twice and deleted the correct one.

For clarification we copy here the part on *Contractual Services ? Individual* with reference to the respective budget lines from ProDoc and correct description for your reference in yellow on the right:

Contractual Services - Individual	Project Manager-Principal Technical Coordinator NPSA 9 10% of the cost (USD 18,000); Project Technical Officer NPSA 9 25% of the cost (USD 40,000)	50,000			58,000			58,000	UNDP	BL 3
Contractual Services - Individual	Project Manager-Principal Technical Coordinator NPSA 9 10% of the cost (USD 18,000); Project Technical Officer NPSA 9 25% of the cost (USD 40,000)		50,000		58,000			58,000	UNDP	BL 10
Contractual Services - Individual	Project Communication and CRM consultant NPSA 6 (USD 105,000); Project Technical Officer NPSA 9 25% cost (USD 40,000)			145,000	145,000			145,000	UNDP	BL 15
Contractual Services - Individual	Project Assistant Admin/Finance/M&E NPSA 6 15% of the cost (USD 20,000); Project Technical Officer NPSA 9 25% of the cost (USD 40,000)				-	60,000		60,000	UNDP	BL 21
Contractual Services - Individual	Project Assistant Admin/Finance/M&E NPSA 6 15% of the cost (USD 20,000); Project Technical Officer NPSA 9 25% of the cost (USD 40,000)				-	100,000		100,000	UNDP	Incorrect description - to be corrected as per BL 24: Project Manager - Principal Technical Coordinator NPSA 9 30% of the cost (USD 55,000); Project Assistant Admin/Finance/M&E NPSA 6 40% of the cost (USD 45,000).

For better overview please see a summary of all staff costs with respective budget notes:

Project Manager - PTC	%	Amount	BL	Project Assistant	%	Amount	BL	Project Technical Officer	%	Amount	BL	Coms & KM consultant	%	Amount	BL
Comp 1	10%	18,000	3	Comp 1				Comp 1	25%	40,000	3	Comp 1			
Comp 2	10%	18,000	10	Comp 2				Comp 2	25%	40,000	10	Comp 2			
Comp 3				Comp 3				Comp 3	25%	40,000	15	Comp 3	100%	105,000	15
Comp 4				Comp 4	15%	20,000	21	Comp 4	25%	40,000	21	Comp 4			
PMC GEF	30%	55,000	24	PMC GEF	40%	45,000	24	PMC GEF				PMC GEF			
PMC TRAC	50%	90,000	27	PMC TRAC	45%	50,000	27	PMC TRAC				PMC TRAC			
Total	100%	181,000		Total	100%	115,000		Total	100%	160,000		Total	100%	105,000	
Budget lines from ProDoc															
3 Project Manager-Principal Technical Coordinator NPSA 9 10% of the cost (USD 18,000); Project Technical Officer NPSA 8 25% of the cost (USD 40,000)															
10 Project Manager-Principal Technical Coordinator NPSA 9 10% of the cost (USD 18,000); Project Technical Officer NPSA 8 25% of the cost (USD 40,000)															
15 Project Communication and KM consultant NPSA 6 (USD 105,000); Project Technical Officer NPSA 8 25% cost (USD 40,000)															
21 Project Assistant Admin/Finance/M&E NPSA 6 15% of the cost (USD 20,000); Project Technical Officer NPSA 8 25% of the cost (USD 40,000)															
24 Project Manager - Principal Technical Coordinator NPSA 9 30% of the cost (USD 55,000); Project Assistant Admin/Finance/M&E NPSA 6 40% of the cost (USD 45,000);															
TRAC - 27 Project Manager - Principal Technical Coordinator NPSA 9 50% of the cost (USD 90,000); Project Assistant Admin/Finance/M&E NPSA 6 45% of the cost (USD 50,000);															

ProDoc budget has been double checked - all sums and budget line descriptions related to staff costs are correct (budget line descriptions can be checked on p. 60-61).

Annex E in GEF Portal and all documents (CEO ER, ProDoc, GEF Budget) have been updated now with the above mentioned (1) clarification of Co-financing of tourism infrastructure for Vjetrenica and (2) correction of *Contractual Services ? Individual (PMC)* and re-uploaded to the Portal.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes. Annex C is adequate.

- please check PPG Table F: the totals are missing. Can this be fixed on your end or has to be done by IT from the backend?

01/26/2022: The issue has been fixed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Based on the email clarification with GEF reviewer this comment can be disregarded as missing data were caused by technical glitch on GEF side which has been in the meantime corrected.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: No.

There seems to be a calculation error in indicator 1, which went significantly down to 1,086 ha ? However the portal text in section I.6 states: "Indicator has been increased to 94,175 ha". Please double check the entries in the core indicator table, including for all individual PAs.

01/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

We have corrected and double-checked all figures; Table E indicates 113,451 ha for Core Indicator 1. Further on, section I.6 confirms that the spatial coverage for the Core Indicator 1.2 ?Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness ? has increased from 54,941 ha pledged in PIF to 113,451 ha confirmed at the PPG. The total of 113,451 ha, as well as the areas for all individual PAs have been checked and confirmed.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/02/2019 UA: Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

- However, please provide a short summary of how stakeholders have been engaged at PPG stage in the portal section.

- Please upload Annex 12 with the title "stakeholder engagement plan" for easy reference.

01/26/2022: We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and the attached Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP). ESIA is planned during implementation. The SESP mentions that further details are provided in the ESMF attached to the Project Document (Annex 24); the ESMF, however, is not attached to the ProDoc. The ProDoc said ESMF attached separately, but it is not uploaded in the GEF Portal neither. Please check and upload the ESMF in the Portal, if possible.

02/09/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The following summary of the PPG stakeholder consultations has been added to the CEO ER:

The PPG phase commenced with a mapping of stakeholders resulted in the Stakeholder Analysis presented in Annex 12 to the Project Document. The stakeholder analysis provides the foundation for engagement with duty-bearers, project development partners and other governmental authorities in charge of nature protection, protected area management, conservation finance, tourism etc.; project beneficiaries, including pilot protected areas and their Management; local communities, NGOs, private sector actors within and in the vicinity of the project impact area, academia. The stakeholder mapping includes all important stakeholders at various levels: regional, national, entities and local level.

The comprehensive stakeholder consultation process started during project scoping prior to the project concept approval and continued through the PPG phase until the finalisation of the Project document. The PPG phase included a number of consultation activities, information sharing and communication events, with efforts made to appraise the proposed project strategy with the project development partners and other governmental stakeholders and ensure project co-financing, identify/re-confirm main beneficiaries and various non-governmental stakeholders at the project pilot sites.

The stakeholder consultations on the proposed project strategy started in early November 2020 with zoom and face-to-face meetings with the principal governmental, NGO and academia stakeholders in the two entities of BiH, Federation of BiH and Republika Srpska. The stakeholders re-confirmed the overall relevance of the project and the management capacity strengthening needs for the PAs in the country. During the following five months, the UNDP CO and the PPG team collected, analysed, processed and responded to the individual stakeholder proposals on project content and individual activities (detailed in Appendix A to Prodoc Annex 12 ?Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan). The pilot PA managers were contacted for the specific baseline data and information, e.g. CC impact on the BD values and PA finance data, and consulted for the specific activities and capacity needs to be addressed through the proposed project strategy. A series of meetings and consultations were dedicated to the specific elements in the proposed project strategy where a comprehensive feasibility analysis was required, such as ecosystem restoration activities; climate threat response integration into pilot PA management planning; the PA baseline and needs for valorization and increased visibility; PA access (and related capacity constraints) to governmental funding; the PA concession pilot. As a result of these consultations, a comprehensive draft of the project strategy together with other key elements of the project, such as implementation arrangements, stakeholder engagement, risk assessment, financing plan was presented at the Validation Workshop (zoom) on April 24, 2021. The stakeholders' comments and suggestions from the validation workshop were publically discussed and addressed through the semi-final version of the Project strategy and Project Document further subject to UNDP and GEF review and appraisal (please refer to Appendix A to Prodoc Annex 12 ?Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan for details). As a follow-up to the validation workshop and in conclusion to the PPG phase, the UNDP CO led on the final consultation round with a specific focus on the issues of stakeholder engagement, SES safeguards, risks, finance and management arrangement, co-financing commitments, and confirmation of project additionality and incremental value in the national context.

- Annex 12 has been uploaded.

On the comment of 1/26/2022: ESMF has been uploaded in the GEF Portal

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

- However, please provide a short summary of gender issues in the portal section.

- Please upload Annex 3 with the title "gender analysis" for easy reference.

01/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The following summary of the gender issues relevant for the project has been added to the CEO ER:

The gender issues which are of the importance of the project implementation can be summarized as follows:

- Women are underrepresented among high-level decision-makers in national and local institutions in charge of PA management and BD conservation in general. It compromises the possibility to take into account the diversity of opinions, ideas and experiences in the decision-making process.

- Women are underrepresented as beneficiaries when it comes to access to innovations, best available knowledge and practice, capacity building and training.

- Women remain substantially underrepresented as leaders in tourism sector development; the private businesses run by women are rare and lack access to best business development practice and opportunities to enhance skills and promote businesses.

Through implementation, the project will focus on the following gender aspects:

- Balanced representation and meaningful participation of women and men in key project activities, including those related to capacity building and management planning for protected areas, BD threat and risk assessments, PA management and business planning, introduction of climate-smart PA management solutions and responses to CC threats and effects, sustainable tourism development with PA engagement, PA promotion and marketing;

- Engagement and mobilization of individuals, local women groups, women NGOs, etc. to participate in its implementation of the Project and to benefit from business opportunities that are created under the particular Project components;

- Encouragement of and better access for women entrepreneurs and women's businesses.

The project will ensure that the decision-making, local capacity development and economic incentives are sensitive to these gender issues and will actively promote women and girls participation in relevant project activities in the field, especially in the remote rural communities where women are traditionally underrepresented where it comes to the economic and empowerment opportunities. The project will seek to enhance social inclusion in all stages of the implementation, thus contributing to the creation of equal opportunities when it comes to access and use to natural values, public infrastructure and services in protected areas, employability and access to knowledge.

- Annex 13 has been uploaded.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

- However, please provide the usual GEF risk table with at least the climate change risk and the COVID-19 risk addressed.

01/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The GEF risk table from Prodoc section 3.4 Risks to project success and social/environmental safeguards? has been copied to CEO ER as requested; Risk 3 discusses the climate change implications; Risk 6 summarizes the project aspects that are likely to be significantly affected by COVID-19 crisis.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Not fully.

- The reviewer was not able to locate (a) the OFP letter requesting the exception and (b) previous communication with GEFSEC on this issue.
- Please make sure that the arrangements described in the documentation are fully in line with what has been discussed/agreed. Specifically, is it correct that UNDP will execute 100% of the project as indicated in Part I under "other executing partners".
- The section should also include a brief summary of the arrangement and references to the official letters (in line with project document).
- suggest to edit "duly noted by GEF" to "discussed with GEFSEC upstream" and reference/upload the email exchange in this context.

01/26/2022: Addressed.

GEF Program Manager approves the exception request and recommends MGR's clearance.

Agency Response

1. 1. The OFP letter and the previous communication with the GEF SEC on the project implementation arrangements have been uploaded to the portal
1. 2. It is hereby confirmed that the implementation arrangements described in the Prodoc and CEO ER are fully in line with the discussions and upstream consultations with the Government and the GEF
1. 3. A summary of the arrangements and references has been provided as requested
1. 4. The statement "duly noted by GEF" has been edited as advised, thank you!

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

However, please briefly summarize the KM approach in this section.

01/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

A summary of the KM approach was added as advised and reads as follows:

The project activities include extraction and dissemination of lessons learned and good practices to enable adaptive management and upscaling or replication at local and global scales. The PA management practices and tools will be captured, analysed and discussed at experience sharing events, as well as shared and recommended through the existing communication links between the PAs and the governmental authorities in charge of their management in the country. The project will contribute to scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks as appropriate (e.g. by providing content, and/or enabling the participation of stakeholders/beneficiaries).

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through existing information-sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to the project. The project will identify, analyse and share lessons learned that might be beneficial to the design and implementation of similar projects. There will be continuous information exchange between this project and other projects of similar focus in the same country, region and globally.

Outcome 3 of the project encompasses a variety of activities that support Knowledge Management, as follows:

The project will ensure the documentation of lessons learnt from implementation of activities aimed at: (i) PA climate threat assessment and climate impact monitoring, (ii) PA management planning including a more effective engagement with local communities in order to raise awareness on the climate-induced threats and devise appropriate adaptation measures that would benefit natural ecosystems and local livelihoods; (iii) participative ecosystem restoration, (iv) tourism concessions, etc., (v) and the collation of the guidelines and tools developed. The knowledge database will be made accessible to

different stakeholder groups in order to support better future decision-making processes in protected areas and more consistent adoption of best practice. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing regional information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyse, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. The project will also contribute to, and make best use of, the digital transformation of both the tourism and conservation work in BiH and will engage in the digital promotion and dissemination of project's results and lessons learned.

Knowledge products commissioned by the project, such as threat assessments, innovative management tools for protected areas, results of ecosystem restoration demos, etc. will be made available on Information System for Nature Conservation in both entities of BiH, managed by FBiH Environmental Fund and Republic Institute for Protection of cultural, historical and natural heritage of RS.

The Outcome 3 budget is assessed at USD 217,000 and includes the cost of Project Communication and KM consultant position, as well as various events and activities related to knowledge management and capacity building. The Outcome 3 budget provides for the KM activities and products mentioned above and includes the actual cost of PA capacity building and KM effort at advanced management planning; promotion of PA values and awareness; fundraising and preparation of proposals for external funding, etc. The Activity Plan includes support to the PA Manager Day as a platform for knowledge management, experience exchange, learning and individual capacity building.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Not fully

- A response to the Council comment from Canada is missing (see below):

Comment by Anar Mamdani, Director, Environment Division (MSS), Global Issues and Development Branch (MFM), Global Affairs Canada? , Council, Canada made on 6/26/2020

Canada Comments:

We have noted that there is no mention of ?Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures? (OECMs) in the short description ? we would like to clarify whether this project covers or links to OECMs.

01/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

We thank the reviewer for bringing the comment from Canada to our attention and apologize for overlooking it initially; the response to the comment from Canada has been added as follows:

The project does not specifically cover ?Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures? (OECMs) as it is focused on protected areas (PAs). The understanding and implementation of OECMs as a concept is still low in the region; in Bosnia and

Herzegovina, the practical recognition of approaches and areas as they relate to OECMs is yet to have occurred. For the EU Member States, several EU directives related to land and water management could be considered as a driver to work on the identification and management of OECMs. BiH will most likely join the EU efforts aimed at OECM recognition once and if significant progress is achieved towards improving the state of BD knowledge and the BD monitoring capacities outside the PAs in the country. As for now, the only area in the focus of the future project, the wider landscape of Popovo Polje outside Vjetrenica Protected Landscape, could be potentially considered as a future OECM. This would occur provided that there are significant BD values proven by data from research, by long-term sustainable management arrangements to maintain biodiversity, and by adequate monitoring capacities. Understanding that none of these is currently in place, it would have been presumptuous to indicate any contribution or linkage to OECMs as a primary objective for this project. The proposed project was designed as a GEF-financed increment added to the national effort in meeting the CBD and other international obligations related to PAs and is intended to deliver global environmental benefits associated with the improved management of PA estate.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: GEFSEC comments at PIF stage have been adequately addressed in the PPG stage.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: A response to the Council comment from Canada is missing (see below):

Comment by Anar Mamdani, Director, Environment Division (MSS), Global Issues and Development Branch (MFM), Global Affairs Canada? , Council, Canada made on 6/26/2020

Canada Comments:

We have noted that there is no mention of ?Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures? (OECMs) in the short description ? we would like to clarify whether this project covers or links to OECMs.

01/26/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response The response to the comment from Canada has been added; we apologize for omitting it initially

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/15/2021: Has been addressed.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Has been provided in Annex C.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Has been provided.

Cleared

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

Importantly, the OPF request for the IA/EA execution arrangement exception could not be located, which is a requirement to approve the implementation/execution arrangements. Please provide.

01/26/2022: No. Please address additional comments on stakeholders and budget.

02/09/2022: No. Please address inconsistencies in the budget throughout the entire submission package.

02/22/2022: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/15/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/26/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/9/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/22/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The project "Improved Financial Sustainability and Strengthened Resilience of Protected Areas through Development of Sustainable Recreation and Partnership with Private Sector" in Bosnia and Herzegovina has the objective to improve protected area management leading to a better biodiversity status through strengthened resilience of key biodiversity assets. The project will offer a sustainable alternative to the current functional model for the protected area system in Bosnia and Herzegovina, aiming to reduce newly emerging climate change threats to key biodiversity values and providing for sustainable management options and increased funding for protected areas. The project will conduct a climate threat assessment covering the entire protected area system in the country to identify the key climate impacts on biodiversity and developed adequate response scenarios. The project will also develop and test mechanisms for increased revenues from sustainable tourism and provide tools and instruments aimed at diversifying and improving the sustainable tourism options in targeted protected areas. Public-private partnerships will be developed to boost income streams from legal natural resource use activities. The project will improve management in 133,451 ha of PAs, bring 120 ha of highly important wetland area under restoration, and benefit 315,000 people.

The challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic will be addressed through adequate safeguards that the project team and UNDP CO will put in place at the Project Inception, following government regulations and health standards and other appropriate safeguards (including those of UNDSS). Further, adaptive project management measures have been put in place to address project implementation risks.