

# Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10553

**Countries**

Regional (Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia)

**Project Name**

Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program

**Agencies**

World Bank

**Date received by PM**

6/23/2021

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Steffen Hansen

**Focal Area**

International Waters

**Project Type**

## 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

SH (6.25.21):

Specific to Germany comment on the project's contribution towards IW-3-7. The response provided remains rather weak. In the response, please make it clear how/if the RBMPs will guide multisectoral development (energy, agriculture, tourism etc.). If this is not the case then please edit the data sheet section A so that the entirety of the GEF grant is distributed across IW-3-5 and IW-3-6 objectives.

#### Agency Response

##### 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

SH (6.25.21):

Overall yes. The project structure/design remains in alignment with the council approved PIF. However, please explain if the PDO has been adjusted during project development? Within this context, please explain the difference between the PrDO and PDO as stated in the Project Paper and PID vs the PDO as stated in the GEF Endorsement data sheet. Please ensure PDO alignment across the respective documents (incl the GEF data sheets) and explain any changes made since council approval.

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 NA

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

SH (6.25.21):

Please expand the table C "Investment Mobilized" description. Right now, this section remains unclear as to exactly how this GEF additional finance project leverages the co-finance from and integrates into the IBRD loan, while providing important regional glue specific to the planned national level lending activities.

Agency Response

**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 SH (6.25.21): Cleared.

Agency Response

**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 SH (6.25.21): No PPG was requested.

## Agency Response

### 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  
SH (6.25.21):

It appears the Rio markers have been adjusted to Climate Change Adaptation Score 1 and Mitigation Score 0. This rating seems appropriate and in line with Germany's comments. However, in the GEF datasheet council comments response matrix section the response to Germany's comment does not make note of the adjustment of the Rio Markers. Rather the response seeks to explain why the Rio Markers remain unchanged from PIF council approval stage. Please revise the response.

## Agency Response

### 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  
SH (6.25.21): The PID and Project Paper primarily focuses on issues specific to floods/droughts within the context of the Drina and Sava basins and explains how the GEF grant constitutes the regional component (component 4) of the larger and complex SDIP program.

In the PID, please include language which makes clear why intersectoral plans are needed (energy, agriculture, shipping, tourism etc.) within the framework of the updated/strengthened Save RBMPs.

In the PID, please be clear that RBMPs are crucial instruments towards balancing intersectoral developments at national/regional level, while identifying options for green infrastructure solutions and preserving/expanding natural assets that deliver on biodiversity, climate and flood/drought protection etc.

#### 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

SH (6.25.21):

- In the PID, please provide a para detailing the 1st Sava River Basin Management Plan of 2014.
- In the PID, please provide additional detail specific to the previous GEF and AF financed baseline projects and the subsequent signed SAP, and their incremental nature towards advancing the baseline upon which the SDIP program stands.

#### 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

SH (6.25.21): Overall yes, however, please address the below points:

- PID component 4 should be organized according to the outcomes/outputs structure as listed in the council approved GEF data sheet and the draft appraisal GEF data sheet. Please introduce Outcomes to the PID component 4 structure.
- PID component 4 description should be expanded with details specific to Outputs dealing with advanced flood and drought monitoring, forecasting and management systems and envisioned regional collaboration advocacy and communication activities.
- Specific to the datasheet results framework section, please explain how the "River Basin, and a Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for the Sava River Basin" output will be tracked?

#### 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

NA

#### Agency Response

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (6.25.21):

- Per previous comments please expand the table C co-financing description and the baseline description (e.g. explain the previous GEF investments and the transformative aspects specific to the recently approved SAP).
- As evidence of co-finance please submit the board approved PAD specific to the parent program via the GEF portal. Also, please consider if the PAD can be circulated to donors as part of the package sent for 4 weeks council review?

#### 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

SH (6.25.21): The GEB description remains sparse, but adequate. 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

SH (6.25.21): For the region the approach is both innovative and complex. Integration of the GEF grant into the SDIP phase 1, and the preparation of works toward phase 2, clearly demonstrates the potential for drawing in a diverse set of partners and influencing sectoral development across the wider basin. 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

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

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

NA

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

SH (6.25.21): Please address the below points:

- Please include a separate annex with information that makes clear which stakeholders have been consulted since council approval stage of this GEF additional finance project and what their roles will be? The annex should make specific references to the national level line departments/ministries/ISRBC structures to be involved in the country level execution of GEF grant resources. The information from the annex should also be copy pasted into the GEF data sheet stakeholder section, which also needs to be expanded to include the remaining countries (currently only Serbia is included). Finally, as you update the datasheet stakeholder section please reference the key project documents where additional information may be found.
- In the PID and as to demonstrate alignment with GEF policy requirements, please include aspects specific to gender, knowledge management arrangements and stakeholder engagement, including the foreseen roles of partners.

Agency Response

**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

SH (6.25.21): Please address the below points:

- The stakeholder plans contain elements pertaining to a gender action plan but remains very general and with little mention of specific water related gender barriers and consequent planned actions by the GEF project. Please expand the data sheet gender sections and other documents, as relevant, to include such information. Please also included references in the data sheet to relevant documents.
- In the PID and as to demonstrate alignment with GEF policy requirements, please include aspects specific to gender, knowledge management arrangements and stakeholder engagement, including the foreseen roles of partners.

Agency Response

**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

SH (6.25.21):

The GEF datasheet private sector section has been left empty. Please populate this section and make note of the STAP comments specific to private sector engagement.

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

SH (6.25.21):

- GEF welcomes the separate annex specific to COVID-19 consideration. Please explain how these considerations have been factored into the Environmental and Social safeguard assessment specific to the project?
- Key risks are detailed in the Project Paper, but not the PID. Please expand the PID to include risk aspects. Please also in the PID reference other documents that clarified risks and mitigation actions.

## Agency Response

### 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

SH (6.25.21): Overall yes, however, please address the below points:

- the PID component 4 description should be expanded with details specific to envisioned regional collaboration advocacy and communication activities.
- Note that the decision meeting package should clearly state that the 1 % of the GEF financing dedicated to IWLEARN will be used to support (hosting of project website, aligned with IWLEARN guidance, PCU and stakeholder participation in regional and global IW:LEARN activities and development and delivery of IW Experience Notes and Results Notes and other IW:LEARN related products and services.)

## Agency Response

### 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

SH (6.25.21): 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  
SH (6.25.21):

To demonstrate alignment with GEF policy requirements, in the PID please include aspects specific to knowledge management arrangements and stakeholder engagement. A separate KM plan should be provided with costed outputs.

Agency Response  
**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
SH (6.25.21): Please address the below points:

- An Additional Financing Appraisal Environmental and Social Review Summary has been provided along with a Environment and Social Commitment Plan. Specific to the ESRS Social Environmental Safeguard assessment ESS7, the GEF asks for reassurance that proper screenings will be conducted specific to interventions at regional/national level and to insure that all rights per GEF/WB policy are secured for IPs, including Roma communities.
- The datasheet Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks section states that the risk associated with the Parent project is high, and shall remain the same for the purposes of this AF. It also states that individual activities under the GEF Additional Finance project correspond more to a moderate or low risk. Please be clear that the GEF grant will not finance infrastructure work on the ground, but rather the GEF finance will increase the capacities of countries to collectively manage basin resources while factoring in the Sava and Drina basins important contributions toward biodiversity and climate.
- PID para 21 states: The high incidence of protected areas and sites along both rivers, and a number of endemic species both on land and in water along with a very rich cultural heritage warrants multiple areas and applicability of all relevant standards,

including ESS1 that warrants preparation of SESAs, Regional and Sectoral ESIAs, site specific ESIAs and ESMPs, **also in line with the three countries?** Please update this section and other sections, as relevant.

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  
SH (6.25.21): M and E plan has been provided. 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  
SH (6.25.21): please see previous comments specific to the inclusion of text in the GEF data sheet specific to private sector development. Further, per previous comments the PID should be a bit more clear on the intersectoral linkages advanced by the SAP/RBMPs.

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
SH (6.25.21):

- Please explain where the original project budget can be found?

- Specific to the datasheet project budget. \$7.4 M is allocated towards consulting firms to complete studies and assessments. In what concrete ways is the project building the capacity of the ISRBC secretariat and subsequent national level institutions? How will the regional PMU be staffed? Also, please explain if consultants hired will be local or international consultants and who at the level of ISRBC and national level departments and ministries will write the ToR and oversee the work? From a GEF perspective, a strong degree of sustainability of activities and subsequent involvement of regional/national technical teams should be insured.

Agency Response

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (6.25.21): Please consider including in the PID the series of PDO sub-indicators.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
SH (6.25.21):

- In the GEF data sheet, please be more explicit in your response to Germany's comment and detail the additional mechanisms of public participation that have been conducted during preparation of this GEF additional finance project? Also, in your response to Germany's comment please be more explicit in detailing how consultation and complaint mechanisms are planned?

- In the GEF data sheet, when responding to Germany's question specific to environmental and social safeguard assessments and the overall High Risk for both Environment and Society, please note that the German council member does not necessarily have access to the Project Paper document. Consequently, please expand the response.

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (6.25.21):

No response to STAP comments has been provided. Please respond to STAPs comments, including by providing a description of stakeholder groupings and their anticipated roles as part of this GEF Additional Finance project design; a better indication of private sector engagement, including by referencing engagement with SMEs; and finally by explaining lessons from past GEF engagements and how these have been integrated into the project design.

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request No PPG was applied.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request SH (6.25.21): 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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

SH (6.25.21): Please address comments and resubmit.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**First Review**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**