



Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

10553

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT/NGI

CBIT **No**

NGI **No**

Project Title

Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program

Countries

Regional, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia

Agency(ies)

World Bank

Other Executing Partner(s)

International Sava River Basin Commission

Executing Partner Type

Others

GEF Focal Area

International Waters

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, International Waters, Freshwater, River Basin, Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan Preparation, Influencing models, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making,

Stakeholders, Beneficiaries, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Participation and leadership, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Knowledge Exchange, Conference, Knowledge Generation, Workshop

Rio Markers

Climate Change Mitigation

Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Submission Date

6/23/2021

Expected Implementation Start

11/1/2021

Expected Completion Date

11/1/2026

Duration

60In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

760,000.00

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
IW-3-5	Enhance water security in freshwater ecosystems through advance information exchange and early warning	GET	2,398,000.00	110,440,000.00
IW-3-6	Enhance water security in freshwater ecosystems through enhanced regional and national cooperation on shared freshwater surface and groundwater basins	GET	2,725,000.00	11,425,000.00
IW-3-7	Enhance water security in freshwater ecosystems through investments in water, food, energy and environment security	GET	2,877,000.00	21,635,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)			8,000,000.00	143,500,000.00

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

The objective of the Project is to enhance transboundary water cooperation and strengthen climate resilience in the Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors.

Project Component	Component Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 1: Integrated Management and Development of the Sava River Corridor	Investment	Increase in areas protected by flood risk mitigation Increase in people protected from 1:100 year flood event	Dykes and embankments constructed/rehabilitated Flood early warning systems enhanced Staff trained on flood forecasting	GET		102,230,000.00
Component 2: Integrated Management and Development of the Drina River Corridor	Investment	1. Increase in areas protected by flood risk mitigation. 2. Increase in people protected from 1:100 year flood event	a. flood protection and environmental management; b. integrated development of Drina watershed; c. Staff trained on flood forecasting.	GET		23,210,000.00

Project Component	Component Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 3: Project preparation and management	Technical Assistance	<p>1. Updated river basin management plan reflecting integrated measures presented for endorsement to national governments.</p> <p>2. Integrated decision support system for data sharing strengthened.</p>	<p>a. Priority regional investments prepared/implemented.</p> <p>b Integrated data MIS for data sharing established.</p>	GET		6,635,000.00

Project Component	Component Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 4: Regional dialogues and studies	Technical Assistance	<p>1. Timely and coordinated joint action and decision making in river basin management and flood risk management among riparian countries</p> <p>2. Enhanced climate adaptation capacity of the region</p> <p>3. Enhanced design of the SDIP (Program) as a result of information and studies conducted under GEF AF</p> <p>4. Improved knowledge and practice of key stakeholders regarding collaborative action to restore ecosystems ; control pollution and reduce vulnerability to flood risks.</p>	<p>1. Technical studies underlaying the updated Sava River Basin Management Plan, such as a hydrological Study for Sava River Basin, a study on sediment, water and biota in Sava River Basin, and a Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for the Sava River Basin;</p> <p>2. The updated Sava River Basin Management Plan itself, building on the afore-mentioned studies and national RBMPs;</p> <p>3. Further water cooperation and corridor development studies and plans, such as a Regional ecotourism strategy including nature-based solutions;</p> <p>4. Improvement in regional resilience management and forecasting, such as advanced flood and</p>	GET	7,619,048.00	

Project Compon ent	Compon ent Type	Expected Outcome s	Expected Outputs	Tru st Fun d	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co- Financing(\$)
Sub Total (\$)					7,619,048. 00	132,075,000. 00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
GET			380,952.00	11,425,000.00		
Sub Total(\$)			380,952.00	11,425,000.00		
Total Project Cost(\$)			8,000,000.00	143,500,000.00		

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
GEF Agency	World Bank	Loans	Investment mobilized	133,900,000.00
Donor Agency	Western Balkans Investment Framework	Grant	Investment mobilized	9,600,000.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)				143,500,000.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

The IBRD loan was approved by the Board of Executive Directors on August 6, 2020, for an amount of US\$134 million equivalent. The Financing Agreement will be signed in the coming months and is expected to become effective by early 2021. This project represents an innovative and integrated approach to transboundary water resources management. investment grant from Western Balkans Investment Framework will cover the financing gap to address land management issues on the left bank of the Sava River within BiH. This project is parallel co-financing of a larger program supporting flood risk management (including nature-based solutions) and integrated water resources management program for the Sava and Drina river basins. Regional studies and dialogues financed through GEF will facilitate and enable improved hydro-met data sharing and utilization as well as river basin management planning in the Sava river basin. In addition, GEF financed activities envisioned for each country will complement other activities financed through the world bank loan to collectively enhance each country's flood protection and environmental management capacity as well as transboundary collaboration. Specifically, investments in flood protection and environmental management and associated preparatory activities will complement GEF financed efforts on enhancing water security in freshwater ecosystems through advanced information exchange and early warning. Institutional strengthening and inter-sectoral coordination activities complement GEF financed activities on enhancing water security in freshwater ecosystems through enhanced national cooperation on shared freshwater surface and groundwater basins. Investments in integrated watershed management in the Lim and Grncar River will complement GEF financed activities on enhancing water security in freshwater ecosystems through investments in water and environment security.

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agenc y	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programmin g of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
World Bank	GET	Regional	International Waters	International Waters	8,000,000	760,000
Total Grant Resources(\$)					8,000,000.00	760,000.00

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required **false**

PPG Amount (\$)

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

Agenc y	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
Total Project Costs(\$)					0.00	0.00

Core Indicators

Indicator 7 Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Shared water Ecosystem	Sava	Sava		
Count	1	1	0	0

Indicator 7.1 Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation (scale of 1 to 4; see Guidance)

Shared Water Ecosystem	Rating (Expected at PIF)	Rating (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Rating (Achieved at MTR)	Rating (Achieved at TE)
Sava	3	3		
Select SWE				<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicator 7.2 Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional management institution(s) (RMI) to support its implementation (scale of 1 to 4; see Guidance)

Shared Water Ecosystem	Rating (Expected at PIF)	Rating (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Rating (Achieved at MTR)	Rating (Achieved at TE)
Sava	4	4		
Select SWE				<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicator 7.3 Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees (IMC; scale 1 to 4; See Guidance)

Shared Water Ecosystem	Rating (Expected at PIF)	Rating (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Rating (Achieved at MTR)	Rating (Achieved at TE)
Sava	2	2		
Select SWE				<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicator 7.4 Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products(scale 1 to 4; see Guidance)

Shared Water Ecosystem	Rating (Expected at PIF)	Rating (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Rating (Achieved at MTR)	Rating (Achieved at TE)
Sava	1	1		
Select SWE				<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	27,500	110,000		
Male	22,500	90,000		
Total	50000	200000	0	0

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

Indicator 11. The number of project beneficiaries is included in the Parent Project Result Framework (Annex A) as "People protected from 1 in 100-year flood event in the Sava and Drina River Basins under the project (of which female)" - it is reported for the SDIP as a whole

Part II. Project Justification

1b. Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.



2. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

The proposed GEF project will be part of the World Bank Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program, Phase I. Full level of consultations were conducted for all components of the Program, including component 4 funded by GEF. The program has developed three robust Stakeholder Engagement Plans for Serbia, BiH, and Montenegro to identify key Stakeholders and lay out how the project will engage with these groups and institutions. Additional consultations were conducted during the preparation stage of the GEF additional financing project (report of the 57th Session of the Sava

Commission on consultation of the ESCP of GEF-

SDIP: http://www.savacommission.org/dms/docs/dokumenti/sjednice_savske_komisije/57._sjednica/REPORT_from_the_57th_session_of_isrbc_adopoted-web.pdf). Participatory TDA/SAP process and subsequent Strategic Action Programme constitutes a stakeholder-driven process and constitutes part of the foundation upon which the SDIP program rests. Finalized and signed SAP is uploaded in the GEF portal.

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement

The project's (and the overall program's) longer-term vision has been developed and confirmed through consultations with key stakeholders. Project activities have been selected based on prior and ongoing consultations with the target communities. During project preparation, annual consultations with project beneficiaries will be conducted and include port users (such as shippers, inland waterway barge operators, truck operators, and other logistics service providers); the communities that host Sava river ports; land owners; and technical national and regional institutions, NGOs, and local government representatives (in addition to the site specific consultations with affected persons). The outcomes will be reflected in the design of flood protection interventions and regional river basin and tourism plans and reflected in quarterly progress reports. The process of engaging citizens, rural development networks and NGO representatives through participatory planning and capacity building for flood protection, Sustainable watershed management, and the Tourism Development plan, will be detailed after the Social Assessment Screening is completed during the first year of project implementation. On flood protection, the project will ensure a strong focus on establishing effective communications channels and establishing annual participatory decision-making systems with all relevant beneficiaries and their representative organizations; and an on-line citizens platform will be established. Detailed stakeholder engagement plan for each country is included in the package. Below is a sample stakeholder segmentation by their areas of influence of Serbia.

Stakeholders	Mandate and relevant roles in the project
Ministry of Finance	Loan Agreement oversight
World Bank	Loan Approval, Loan implementation support and monitoring of compliance to covenants

Regional Implementation Unit	<p>A new regional implementation unit will be housed within the International Sava River Basin Commission secretariat to implement regional activities under component 4. A grant agreement will be signed with the ISRBC to specify the respective commitments to implement regional activities in a coordinated manner. The grant agreement will be implemented following World Bank fiduciary and safeguard guidelines. During the preparation of the grant agreement, a capacity needs assessment will be conducted for the ISRBC secretariat. Additional skills needed for implementation and respective experts will be hired by the ISRBC.</p> <p>While the national PIUs under the parent project will be primarily responsible for M&E in their respective countries, the regional project implementation unit in ISRBC secretariat will be responsible for monitoring results under Component 4 and report the progress of the respective project activities and associated project indicators. The regional PIU and national PIUs will collect and present data and reports for semi-annual reviews by the Regional Task Force and respective national institutions responsible for project implementation, in conjunction with Bank missions.</p>
Regional Task Force	<p>A regional task force consisting of a senior official(s) of the ISRBC Secretariat and country senior officials from key sectors such as water, transport, energy, and tourism will facilitate dialogue and cooperation in the region. This task force will also provide strategic oversight and guidance for the implementation of regional activities, ensuring stronger transboundary dialogue, integration and knowledge sharing. During implementation, other sectors will be engaged as and when the need arises</p>
Local Governments (including line departments: land management, economic development, environment, Mesne zajednice)	<p>I. Serve as first point of contact, conduct field outreach, disseminate project related materials, facilitate public meetings and consultations, liaison between targeted groups and MAFWM /PMU.</p>
National media (Radio, TV, Newspaper)	<p>Enables wide and regular dissemination of information related to the Project, ensures its visibility and facilitates stakeholder engagement</p>
Social media (Twitter, Facebook etc.)	<p>Enables wide and regular dissemination of information related to the Project, ensures its visibility and facilitates stakeholder engagement</p>

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only; Yes

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor; Yes

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assesment.

The project will ensure that representative bodies engaged in flood protection activities have adequate representation of both women and youth, e.g. the project will work with and train community groups to make a concerted effort to voice issues specific to women. A screening and consultation process undertaken by country PIUs and their associated social specialists for each activity or investment, will help shed light on and raise the concerns as well as potential impacts on women and youth. Where vulnerable groups are identified, targeted group discussions will be undertaken to address their specific needs and ensure they benefit from project activities to mitigate future risks. Flood protection and early warning activities, carried out in areas where communities that may be directly impacted live, will include community-based training and support for the development of local organizations to better equip them to deal with early warning and flood management. In this regard, special attention will be given to women who are often impacted in different ways and could be more vulnerable to floods in the event of pregnancy, female-headed households and managing children.

Gender analysis were conducted for each of the participating country (please refer to the Stakeholder Engagement Plan for details). Under the regional tourism master plan for the Sava and Drina Corridor, the project will support increasing women's involvement in economic activities and engagement in decision-making. Most tourism businesses are small and medium-sized enterprises, and thus have the potential to bring benefits to women who have lost their jobs or means of living through floods. Since several tourism-related jobs are flexible and can be carried out from different locations, this could create opportunities for women to engage in waged jobs. The TORs of the plan will emphasize the importance of capturing the women-headed SMEs' specific needs and concerns, as well as exploring potential job opportunities for women, and ways to ensure that women-headed SMEs can benefit from flood recovery resources. Under the plan, a forum of women-headed SMEs will be established to

facilitate regular engagement with river basin management authorities and river port authorities, and in order to influence the tourism master plan design to create more resilient and post-flood employment opportunities for women-run SMEs. Furthermore, enterprise surveys have shown that women-headed businesses incur higher logistics costs than male-headed ones. The nature of this gap as it relates to the Sava River Basin will be further explored under Component 4 (financed through GEF grant), to better understand the needs and risk exposure of women-headed businesses and to promote interaction between these businesses and the river port authorities of the Sava corridor. SDIP-linked feasibility studies for Phase II activities will emphasize assessments of SMEs in the catchment area of the Sava river?as SMEs are more likely to be women-headed businesses?to better understand their logistics and operating needs and incorporate lessons thereof into the design of port and navigation capacity investments.

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

4. Private sector engagement

Elaborate on the private sector's engagement in the project, if any.

Phase I of the Program (IBRD/GEF) focuses on investments with large externalities, such as flood protection, which are typically unattractive for private financing. SDIP's first phase consists primarily of investments that are traditionally financed by the public sector given their significant externalities. Flood control infrastructure, demining of rivers, and environmental interventions are typical examples of areas where the rationale for use of public funds is strong. The project's IBRD lending will however leverage (limited) additional resources in the form of approximately US\$18 million in grants to cover regional activities. It will also indirectly leverage significant national resources, in particular in the non-borrowing countries of Croatia and Slovenia.

Once Phase I has provided the enabling conditions, it is expected that direct and indirect private investment will significantly increase under Phase II. Phase II's focus will gradually shift toward more financially attractive sectors, such as navigation and hydropower, and direct or indirect private financing in the respective activities, to be identified during Phase I, will be explored. Furthermore,

experience shows that once the conditions have been created for a stronger cooperation alongside the corridor, private initiative will ensure further economic impact. For example, the attractive multipurpose river restoration investments have a strong recreational and touristic appeal, leading to the emergence of small and medium enterprises (SMEs, Box 2). The specific development of a shared tourism master plan for the Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors during Phase I will identify further opportunities to leverage private initiatives. While implementation of the tourism master plan will not be supported by the project, it is expected that the plan will lay a foundation for the strong engagement with the private sector- and specifically with SME and individual entrepreneurs.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification *

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
High or Substantial			

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.

Environmental Risk Rating High. The Parent Project's environmental risk is rated as high. The Project encompasses the Sava River Basin (with some 97,713 km² area) and the Drina River Basin (with some 20,000 km² area) and involves all riparian countries in strategic and planning dialogue (Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, and Montenegro). The two river basins, pivotal to the economic and transport development of the region also present a highly unique area with rich biodiversity, cultural heritage and unfortunate degradation of the water resources through a number of man-made activities. As there is a varied stage of implementation capacity and enforcement mechanisms at the national and entity institutions this Program will require a number of steps and activities to bring all participating institutions to the same level. Despite improvements that occurred during past years while working within ISRBC, most of the implementing institutions are still faced

with the insufficient experience of multi-stakeholder discussion, analysis and prioritization for use of water resources within the Basin. The Program will need to ensure participatory approach of all relevant stakeholders and support in development of the policy dialogue aiming at multi-purpose water use with simultaneous protection and enhancement of the existing natural resources. Furthermore, the regional PIU within the ISRBC is yet to be established. The actual impacts of the known activities under the parent project are also varied. The activities to be supported include a variety of sectors, issues and stakeholders and have yet to be further defined. Through two Phases of the Program, there are at least forty identified locations, mostly at or immediately adjacent to the rivers Sava and Drina, although some of the investments may be located at the wider catchments. The first phase (2020-2026) will include activities on water training works, dredging, and port development, works on existing reservoirs or dams, all alongside natural protected areas and areas of cultural heritage, and as a precondition to the Project, certain demining operations will need to be carried out in the Sava basin. Preparatory activities for Phase 2 will also be carried out under Phase 1 of the Program. All regional planning activities will need to be followed by SESAs and sectoral ESIAs which will need to be developed on an approach that can reflect the regional nature of the activities, and will not be linked to one single national environmental legislation. The risk associated with the Parent project is High, and shall remain the same for the purposes of this AF. Although AF shall deal with only a portion of the parent project, and shall support solely development of technical and regional studies, such as the Sava River Basin Management Plan, regional strategies for the development of tourism, or the climate change adaptation strategy, that would correspond more to a moderate or low risk. All of the documentation, plans, programs and studies developed to feed into the future phases will consider all of the relevant environmental and social issues from a project design perspective, and not only impact perspective.

Social Risk Rating High. The social risk of this project is rated high due to the following identified issues: - Link with parent project: The GEF only supports a very small part of the parent project, ie. those activities linked to the regional institutional stakeholder decision making and coordination, as well as studies, which in itself are not high risk activities. However, due to the link with the parent project, the overall risk of the GEF activities are treated as high risk. -Stakeholder engagement: There is a high risk of delays in decision making, due to different interests and poor coordination and clear procedures between member countries. In addition, the nature of the investments (especially impacts on reservoirs) can evoke resistance from civil society groups due to resettlement and environment impacts. This aspect is especially relevant to the GEF activities. - Land acquisition: Activities such as port enhancement, dykes, dredging, river training and increasing river storage could have impacts on involuntary land acquisition. This is particularly risky in more populated urban areas. In addition, building dykes and protection of environmental areas could restrict access to economic resources for people along the river. -Labour impacts affecting community health and safety from worker influx and camps related to civil works such as port enhancement. For smaller embankments community labour will be used to the extent feasible. For GEF, the Labour issues are linked to direct and contracted labour for the regional institutions /regional PIU. - Community health and safety impacts; For flood protection measures to be most effective, they should be combined with good training and community response plans and information networks to flood forecasting centers. Without this element, the infrastructure solutions risk compromising their outcomes. At this point Borrower commitment to investing in the softer community preparedness side of flood management is not very strong. -Impacts

of labour influx and camps from port construction and other civil works have negative impacts on local communities and appropriate measures will have to be implemented. - Cultural Heritage: Civil works for ports, river dredging and training works etc. may impact physical cultural resources. Also any significant resettlement in case of planned reservoirs or for new ports may affect intangible cultural heritage and these impacts will need to be mitigated. - The social assessment studies have screened for all the above likely risks, with a focus on phase 1 activities.

Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Module	Submitted
AF Appraisal ESRS	CEO Endorsement ESS	

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Results Framework
COUNTRY: Western Balkans
GEF Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program

RESULT_NO_PDO

Project Development Objective(s)

The Objective of the Project (Phase I of the Program) is to improve flood protection and enhance transboundary water cooperation in the Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors.

Project Development Objective Indicators by Objectives/ Outcomes

RESULT_FRAME_TBL_PDO

Indicator Name	PBC	Baseline	End Target
Enhance transboundary water cooperation			
River basin management plan reflecting integrated measures updated and endorsed by countries (Yes/No)		No	Yes
Improved flood protection of the Sava and Drina River Corridors			
People protected from 1 in 100-year flood event in the Sava and Drina River Basins under the project (of which female) (Number)		0.00	200,000.00
Of which female (Number)		0.00	110,000.00
Area protected by flood risk mitigation measures under the project (Hectare(Ha))		0.00	150,000.00

PDO Table SPACE

Intermediate Results Indicators by Components

RESULT_FRAME_TBL_IO

Indicator Name	PBC	Baseline	End Target
Improved flood protection in the Sava and Drina River Corridors			
Length of embankments or dykes constructed or rehabilitated (Kilometers)		0.00	20.00
Flood monitoring and forecasting system upgraded in a participatory manner, publicly disclosed and adjusted based on citizen engagement (Yes/No)		No	Yes
Percentage of grievances responded and resolved within an agreed time frame (Percentage)		0.00	85.00
Strengthened institutions and instruments to enhance transboundary water cooperation			
Enhanced monitoring/ data sharing protocols and schedules developed (Yes/No)		No	Yes
Priority regional investments prepared (Number)		0.00	5.00
Stakeholders consulted (of which female) and engaged during planning and preparation of project interventions (Number)		0.00	1,000.00
of which female (Number)		0.00	510.00
Waterway improved through demining (Kilometers)		0.00	40.00
Regional tourism master plan for the Sava and Drina Corridor that includes the establishment of a forum for women-headed SMEs is developed and endorsed.. (Yes/No)		No	Yes

RESULT_FRAME_TBL_IO

Indicator Name	PBC	Baseline	End Target
Number of annual multi-national stakeholder workshops held (Number)		0.00	12.00
Enhancement of port facilities, services and logistics			
Freight throughput at the Sava river port of Sremska Mitrovica in Serbia (Tones/year)		234,465.00	300,000.00

IO Table SPACE

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

France

?investing in infrastructure improvements? to address the flood risk issue: Could we have confirmation that this refers to green infrastructure/nature-based solutions, given that we are focusing on nature-based solutions (i.e., land management adaptation, improved soil infiltration, flood plains management, or meander restoration) rather than on gray infrastructure such as dams?

Response: GEF financed component will focus on regional technical assistance such as flood early warning system. No dams will be constructed or prepared under the current project design. In addition, Phase 1 of SDIP will also support countries study the feasibility of flood retention areas as a nature-based solution for flood risk management.

United States

10553 Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program

? CSOs and media have been reporting on the controversial construction of Small Hydropower Plants (SHPPs) in the area, and their environmental impact. We would recommend early involvement of CSOs and indigenous people in light of these recent controversies.

? We would additionally recommend coordinating with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management of Republika Srpska.

Response: No dams or small hydropower plants will be constructed under Phase 1 of the SDIP program. The project maintains close coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management of Republika Srpska and is finalizing the establishment of a project implementation unit within the Ministry to support project implementation management.

Canada

We recommend that, given that this project is focused on the disaster impacts that are exacerbated by climate change and how integrated cooperation and management can support improved resiliency, the proposal should note how supporting biodiversity conservation and the ecosystems services that provides would be beneficial in these efforts and achieving these outcomes.

Response: We fully agree with the importance of supporting and incorporating biodiversity conservation and the ecosystems services concepts in the project design as much as possible. For example, we see opportunities to emphasize these concepts during the preparation of eco-tourism master plan and the development of an updated Sava River Basin Management Plan.

Germany

? Germany requires more information on the previously established Basin Management Plans and their role on Flood Protection to better identify the linkages to the proposed activities.

Response: The first Sava River Basin Management Plan identified best practices and recommended future steps related to the integration of flood protection in developments of the Sava River Basin as incorporating climate change impacts. This RBMP informed the need of developing flood risk management plan for the Sava River Basin as well as measures required for the implementation of EC flood directive. GEF financed activities under SDIP program will continue the development of additional key studies and flood risk management systems. Many of the investment projects included under the SDIP program is also the result of previous Basin Management Plans.

? Germany would appreciate further elaboration on the Component's contribution to the IW-Focal Area, particularly IW-3-7 on investments in water, food, energy and environmental security, which appears not to be covered by the proposal

Response: The project will conduct a range of studies and develop a number of plans that will influence how the river basin is managed, how floods are responded to, as well as how opportunities for enhanced income and tourism are shaped. The grant financed activity includes study on sediment, water and biota in Sava River Basin as well as the development a regional ecotourism master plan including nature based solutions. These activities aims to support nature based approaches to improve infiltration, avoid sedimentation and erosion thus protect aquatic ecosystems, especially wetlands within the river basin. Under the regional tourism master plan for the Sava and Drina Corridor, the project will support increasing women's involvement in economic activities and engagement in decision-making. Since tourism-related jobs are often flexible and can be carried out from different locations, this could create opportunities for women who have lost their jobs or means of living through floods to engage in waged jobs. The result of these studies and master plans will support multi-sectoral investments in Phase 2 of the SDIP program. At the same time, a Regional Task Force consisting of a senior official(s) of the ISRBC Secretariat and country senior officials from key sectors such as water, transport, energy, and tourism will be established and facilitate dialogue and cooperation in the region.

? Germany would like to see a better justification of the selection of the Rio-Marker for Climate Change Adaptation Score 2 and Mitigation Score 1. Climate change impacts with respect to more intense floods and prolonged droughts are mentioned in the PID description but are not explicitly included in the Outcome descriptions (PID) or Outputs (PIF). Activities mainly relate to flood management; however, it is not entirely clear how the project provides a principal contribution to climate change adaptation incorporating floods and droughts. Unfortunately, there is also no information on mitigation activities.

Response:

We revised the Climate Change Adaptation Score at 1 and Mitigation Score at 0. This component includes studies related to flood management and flood early warning system thus has adaptation potential. No mitigation potential is identified.

? Germany asks that additional mechanisms of public participation (e.g. for local communities) be included during the preparation and implementation phase of component 4 (among others, the updated Sava River Basin Management Plan), which have not been part of previous consultations in the World Bank Program. Germany would appreciate an explanation of how consultation and complaint mechanisms are planned within these management concepts.

Response: The GEF financed additional finance project follows the standard World Bank stakeholder engagement requirements. All environmental and social safeguard documents have been publicly disclosed. Safeguard documents related to investment components have also undergone public consultation process. In addition, development of key regional studies such as the River Basin Management Plan will follow additional public consultation process including meetings with institutions of the concerned countries, consultation workshops at key milestones (significant water management issues, Programme of Measures, Stakeholder Forum) , as well as web-based public consultation on draft RBMP.

? Germany asks for a more precise indication of the investments dedicated to grey infrastructure and to nature-based solutions (component 1-2).

Response: Please refer to the Board paper of the parent project for component 1 and 2 with detailed description of the planned investments.

? Germany would need to see more information on environmental and social safeguard assessments as the project is rated with an overall High Risk for both Environment and Society.

Response: Please refers to the Environmental and Social section of the Additional Finance Project Paper on the justification of the High risk rating and mitigation strategies.

STAP comments and responses

Nested character of investments, with regional interventions complementing prior and ongoing country-level investments, could yield important lessons for IWRM. There are also potentially important lessons relating to environmental security and cooperation after a legacy of conflict in the region, but these are not explicitly addressed. ?

Response: These can be found in parent project PAD section I. Strategic context (page 7-12)

?Description of stakeholder groupings does not adequately detail these groups and their anticipated roles. The indication in the PIF that there will be no private sector engagement is striking and comes without justification, though there is a suggestion elsewhere in the design that this is not the case (reference to SMEs). The PID indicates lessons from past GEF engagements have been integrated but does not specify these.?

Response: Description of stakeholder grouping can be found in national specific Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) and additional finance SEP.

While there is potential of engaging private sector, no explicit activities are envisioned under phase I of the project. Further description of this potential can be found in parent project PAD at page 38, para 78-79

Response: Lessons from past GEF engagement as well as previous Bank engagement are described under parent project PAD at page 11 para 9, 11. Also see section E. Lessons Learned and Reflected in the Project Design on page 28-30.

Insufficient information in PIF to assess. PID provides a better foundation, establishing sound basis for the project and institutional framework which the anticipated regional activities are meant to support.

Response: Please see parent project PAD section III implementation arrangement for detailed description (page 30 ? 32)

Project theory of change

Response: Please see parent project PAD page 15 ? 16 for Program Results Chain and theory of change.

Anticipated benefits

Response: Please see parent project PAD Section IV and Annex 3 for economic analysis which describes anticipated benefits that are quantifiable.

Incremental cost reasoning of GEF funding

Response: Please see parent project PAD (Section B project components page 21 ? 26) and project paper description of activities for link between GEF financed activities as well as other components.

Methodology of monitoring and evaluation

Response: Please see parent project PAD (page 33 para 63-64, and section VII results framework and monitoring) and additional finance project paper results framework section for description of methodology.

Risks

Response: The parent project PAD includes detailed elaboration on project risks (Page 45, section VI). In addition, relevant E&S documents specified risks and mitigation measures that will ensure community health and safety during project implementation.

Coordination:

Response: please refer to parent project PAD on envisioned regional collaboration advocacy and communication activities under implementation arrangement and monitoring and evaluation sections (Page 30, para 59 to 64).

Knowledge management:

Response: An annex has been developed which outlines the description and budget of knowledge management of this project.

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).
(Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

N/A

ANNEX D: Project Map(s) and Coordinates

Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.



ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template							
Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (US\$eq.)				Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Component 4. Regional Activities	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		
		Outcome 4.1 Improved transboundary water cooperation					
Contractual Services – Company	Consulting firms to complete relevant studies and assessment	7,400,000	7,400,000	-		7,400,000	ISRBC
International Consultants	International procurement specialist		-	-	50,000	50,000	ISRBC
Local Consultants	Environmental and social safeguard specialist		-	-	20,000	20,000	ISRBC
	M&E Specialist			30,000		30,000	
	Financial management specialist		-	-	30,000	30,000	ISRBC
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	e.g. Technical Coordinator		-	-	180,952	180,952	ISRBC
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Consultation workshop, annual regional coordination meetings	85,000	85,000	4,048		89,048	ISRBC
Travel	Travel from coordination team	50,000	50,000	-		50,000	ISRBC
Office Supplies	Regional PIU office supplies	-	-	-		-	ISRBC
Other Operating Costs	Operational costs (office, administrative expenses)		-	-	100,000	100,000	ISRBC
	Communication materials (posters, publications, banners, website)	50,000	50,000	-		50,000	ISRBC
Grand Total		7,585,000	7,585,000	34,048	380,952	8,000,000	
[1] In exceptional cases where GEF Agency receives funds for execution, Terms of Reference for specific activities are reviewed by GEF Secretariat							

ANNEX F: (For NGI only) Termsheet

Instructions. Please submit an finalized termsheet in this section. The NGI Program Call for Proposals provided a template in Annex A of the Call for Proposals that can be used by the Agency. Agencies can use their own termsheets but must add sections on Currency Risk, Co-financing Ratio and Financial Additionality as defined in the template provided in Annex A of the Call for proposals. Termsheets submitted at CEO endorsement stage should include final terms and conditions of the financing.

ANNEX G: (For NGI only) Reflows

Instructions. Please submit a reflows table as provided in Annex B of the NGI Program Call for Proposals and the Trustee excel sheet for reflows (as provided by the Secretariat or the Trustee) in the Document Section of the CEO endorsement. The Agencies is required to quantify any expected financial return/gains/interests earned on non-grant instruments that will be transferred to the GEF Trust Fund as noted in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy. Partner Agencies will be required to comply with the reflows procedures established in their respective Financial Procedures Agreement with the GEF Trustee. Agencies are welcomed to provide assumptions that explain expected financial reflow schedules.

ANNEX H: (For NGI only) Agency Capacity to generate reflows

Instructions. The GEF Agency submitting the CEO endorsement request is required to respond to any questions raised as part of the PIF review process that required clarifications on the Agency Capacity to manage reflows. This Annex seeks to demonstrate Agencies' capacity and eligibility to administer NGI resources as established in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy, GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, June 9, 2017 (Annex 5).