

Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10553

Countries

Regional (Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro)

Project Name

Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

3/23/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Steffen Hansen

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH 4.3.2020):

In principle yes, however, please note the following:

1. As part of discussions with the GEF, the WB team has clarified that GEF funding will shift between project Components. A final decision pertaining to GEF IW strategic alignment can only be done once the WB resubmits the revised. package.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared, however, please address the below points A and B:

A. Concept Memorandum para 15: as part of this section please reference the alignment of the project with the GEF IW Objective 3 strategic actions (3.5, 3.6 and 3.7). The applied changes should also be reflected in the PID.

SH (4.14.2020): Cleared.

B. GEF data sheet table A: table A lists the following IW strategic priorities: IW 3.5, 3.6 and 3.7. Table 1 (component 4) in the Concept Memorandum only references IW 3.5 and 3.6. Please make sure there is alignment between the two tables. As relevant, the applied changes should also be reflected in the PID.

SH (4.14.2020): Cleared.

2. The project document submitted to the GEF for review is titled Project Paper. From discussions with the WB, GEF understands that the Project Paper is only submitted at GEF CEO Endorsement stage, while a Concept Memorandum is provided at GEF PIF stage.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

041020

Noted, thank you. In the CM and PID, at the end of each sub-component, there is a sentence indicating relevant GEF IW focus areas except sub-component 1.2 and 1.3.

The table demonstrating alignment of the project components with the IW objectives 3.5-3.7 is also included at the end of the project description in the CM and PID.

040620

1. thank you, the changes are made as discussed and the package is resubmitted

2. resubmission package includes COncept Memorandum, Project information document and other relevant GEF documents.

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH 4.3.2020):

1. As part of upstream discussions with the GEF, the WB team has clarified that GEF funding will shift between project Components. A final evaluation of the Table B components (as described in the GEF data sheet and in the project document) can only be done once the WB resubmits the revised package.

SH (4.8.2020): Thanks for the re-submission. Please address the following points:

A. **GEF portal data sheet component 4:** please note that with exception of Component 4, all Components in the GEF portal data sheet contain both Outcomes and Outputs. Please add outputs to the GEF portal data sheet Component 4 and make sure that such Outputs are duly reflected in the CM and PID.

SH (4.14.2020): Cleared.

B. **GEF data sheet Components, Outcomes and Outputs:** The GEF portal data sheet Component 1, 2 and 3 contain a series of Outputs. When looking at the Components description in the CM and PID, the GEF data sheet Outputs are not duly reflected. Please add additional detail to the CM and PID component descriptions, while also adding additional text so that the connection between Outputs and the GEF financed Component 4 becomes evident.

SH (4.14.2020): Cleared.

C. **GEF data sheet part I, Other Executing Partner(s) section:** GEF is under the impression that the Sava River Basin commission will execute all component 4 GEF related activities. Please correct the GEF portal data sheet info.

SH (4.14.2020): Cleared.

D. **GEF data sheet part I, Executing Partner Type section:** The category “Government” has been chosen. Please make corrections to reflect that Sava River Basin commission will execute GEF activities.

SH (4.14.2020): Cleared.

2. GEF data sheet Table B Indicative Project description summary: This section should start out by listing first the name of each component and then followed by the name(s) of each Outcome and Output specific to component. As you refine and resubmit the package, please make sure there is alignment between Components, Outcomes and Outputs as listed in the data sheet table B vs Component, Outcomes and Outputs listed in the project documents, including the PID.

SH (4.8.2020): Please see above comments.

SH (4.14.2020): Cleared.

2. 3. Please note that only in very rare circumstances can IW finance regional truism plans, provided that such plans are in alignment with IW priorities. De-mining activities cannot be funded via IW grants.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

4. Part I project information GEF data sheet section: Please enter the name of the recipient countries. Currently, the country section only states “regional”.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

5. Please as part of the re-submission annex the PAD.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

041320

A and B. Outputs for component 4 are added to the GEF datasheet. The team highlighted outputs and outcomes of each component in the Concept Memorandum (CM) and provided additional text so that the connection between Outputs and the GEF financed Component 4 becomes evident. Full description of the components 1-3 (including outcomes and outputs of these components) will be provided once the Phase I of the Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors Integrated Development Program is approved by the WB board in April. The PAD of the Program will be shared with the GEF Secretariat.

C and D. Thank you, addressed

2. Annex was added to the CM document, including on Components, Outcomes and Outputs. The PID's content is aligned with CM document.

040620

1. submitted datasheet reflects updates as discussed, GEF amount is shifted to component 4
2. Thank you, noted, components, outcomes and outputs are aligned as listed in the table B vs other project documents
3. Proposed tourism plan development focuses on the protection and management of wetlands while promoting economic growth through job creation, thus aligned to IW 3-7 strategic goal
4. noted, thanks
5. the equivalent of the project PAD for additional financing projects - Project Paper - will be shared with the GEF at the appraisal stage (endorsement submission). Current PAD focuses on the WB loan for the Phase I of the SDIP.

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH 4.3.2020):

GEF data sheet: Note that if GEF funding will shift between project Components then the GEF data sheet table A, B and C will need to be revised. Any revisions should be reflected in the relevant project documents.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

GEF portal data sheet: please note that there are discrepancies between co-finance listed per component in the GEF portal data sheet vis a vi the co-finance listed per component in the CM and PID. Please insure alignment between the three documents.

SH (4.14.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

041320

Not all activities in the WB phase I of the Sava and Drina Rivers Program will cofinance/support GEF grant. The CM document includes table explaining which subcomponent of the WB loan is considered as direct cofinancing to the GEF project.

040620

Noted, thank you. Co-financing for components is adjusted as discussed

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion SH (4.3.2020): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion SH (4.3.2020): Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion SH (4.3.2020: No PPG is being requested.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

1. Indicator 7: please indicate the number and name of shared water ecosystems under new or improved cooperative management.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

GEF Core Indicator 7.0: Please select the Sava and Drina River systems from the drop-down menu.

2. Please consider changing the choice of values specific to indicator 7.1; 7.2 and 7.3. As an example, the Sava River Basin Commission is a fully functional regional management institution and one of the project deliverable's is to update the current SRBMP phase 1. This baseline should be reflected in the values selected for indicator 7.1 and 7.2.

SH (4.8.2020) Cleared.

3. Indicator 7.4: this indicator should display the value 1.

SH (4.8.2020) Cleared.

4. Note that the Rio Markers is a mandatory tag for all GEF-financed projects. These markers indicate whether the project targets climate change adaptation and/or climate change mitigation using the OECD DAC Rio Markers: 0=does not target; 1=targets as a significant objective, 2=targets as the principal objective. Please refer to the OECD DAC Handbook for further details: https://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/Revised%20climate%20marker%20handbook_FINAL.pdf

This Additional Finance proposal has selected CCM #1 and CCA #2. Please explain how CCM is a significant project objective, e.g. the GHG emissions accounting analysis does not seem to point towards CCM being a significant project objective? If indeed CCM is not a significant PO then the CCM Rio Marker value should be changed to 0.

SH (4.8.2020) Cleared.

Agency Response

041320

Thank you, the correct selection is made.

040620

Thank you for your comments and suggestions, we are in agreement. The datasheet and relevant annexes are revised as suggested.

Project/Program taxonomy

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020): the list of tags seems rather short. Please consider if other tags might be relevant.

SH (4.8.2020) Cleared.

Agency Response

040620

Thank you, noted. the list is revised

Part II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020): This will be evaluated once comments specific to review part I box 1 and 2 have been addressed.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040620.

noted, thank you

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

In principle yes, however this can only be properly evaluated once comments specific to review part I box 1 have been addressed.

It should be noted that together with the WB, GEF has funded the project “West Balkans Drina River Basin Management” (GEF project ID 5556). BiH, Serbia and Montenegro are partaking in the 5556 project, which, amongst other deliverables, will produce a Strategic Action Plan signed at the ministerial level, and which is meant to strategically guide a series of future transboundary soft and hard investments across the countries. Upon request from GEF, the WB has sent the relevant evaluation documents pertaining to project 5556, including a description of the progress towards having the SAP signed at ministerial level.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040620

thank you for your comment. Information about GEF funded Drina project is mentioned in paras 7 and 40 of the Concept Memorandum document

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

This can only be properly evaluated once comments specific to review part I box 1 and 2 have been addressed.

SH (4.8.2020): Please address the below points.

A. Comment specific to the CM and PID: Please add additional text which makes it more clear how this GEF AF project forms part of the larger SDIP Program. E.g. text should be inserted which explains that the SDIP Program framework has already undergone appraisal (ESRS covering all four Program components) and that Component 1-3 are more advanced in their development than Component 4 - component 4 being financed solely by GEF IW and with the intent of fully developing this component as a crucial “regional glue” component of the program.

SH (4.14.2020): Cleared. The CM and PID are sufficiently clear as to the scope of the Program, its phases and the GEF increment (specific to phase 1 component 4).

B. Theory of Change: In the previous submission a Theory of Change was provided (in the form of figure 2), however, it has now been removed. Please note that a ToC is a GEF requirement and should be reintroduced into the CM and PID. Please also consider if Figure 1 from the previous submissions can be reintroduced.

SH (4.14.2020): Not cleared. Please note that the ToC is missing from the PID. Please either A) insert the ToC into the PID and upload the revised PID or B) upload in the Portal the ToC as a supporting document.

SH (4.15.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

041620

TOC is attached as a supporting document (marked for official disclosure, PID attachment)

041320

How Component 4 fits in the larger SDIP program: the team added text on how this GEF AF project forms part of the larger SDIP Program. The team indicated in the CM that component 4, being financed solely by GEF IW, is considered a crucial “regional glue” component of the program.

Theory of Change: the team included a Theory of Change in the CM and PID, and re-introduced the figure from the SDIP PAD on “Positioning of the SDIP Program in the Bank’s engagement in the Sava and Drina Rivers Corridors”.

040620

noted, thank you

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

In principle yes, however, this can only be properly evaluated once comments specific to review part I box 1 and 2 have been addressed.

SH (4.8.2020): Please see comments specific to review sheet part I box 1.

SH (4.14.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040620

Yes, thank you

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

In principle yes, however, this can only be properly evaluated once comments specific to review part I box 1 and 2 have been addressed.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040620

Yes, thank you

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

In principle yes, however, please address comments in review part I box 6.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040620

noted, thank you, all comments on core indicators are accepted and edited as suggested

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

In principle yes, however, this can only be properly evaluated once comments specific to review part I box 1 and 2 have been addressed.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040620

Thank you, CM document reflects all aspects mentioned in this part of the review.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020)

The project has ticked the box “Civil Society Organizations” box. Subsequently and per GEF policy, please provide a description of the consultations with civil society organizations and which happened in the formulation of the project. Citing the Policy: ‘Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development...’. If as part of the PAD going to board relevant documents were develop containing this information, then such documents should be annexed and referenced in the GEF data sheet.

SH (4.8.2020): Please note that if there has been no national level civil society or private sector engagement during the development of the larger Program or this AF project, then the Stakeholder section box specific to "Civil Society Organizations" in the GEF data sheet should be "un-clicked".

SH (4.14.2020): Cleared.

Please provide a table describing the stakeholder’s future roles in the AF project, and with information pertaining to how those stakeholders will be engaged (through which means). Citing the policy: "Agencies provide... as well as information on how Stakeholders will be engaged in the proposed project activity and means of engagement throughout the project/program cycle".

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

041320

thank you, noted and changes were made

040620

thank you for your comments. List of stakeholders is added in the datasheet. Stakeholders engagement plan will be submitted at the time of endorsement.

Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

PIF data sheet: As available, please include indicative information regarding women's socio-economic standing, associated barriers and measures to address these. Please also include text stating that by CEO endorsement, an elaborate gender strategy will have been produced, and which builds on a gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assessment and which considers the need to mainstream gender measures via the strategic documents produced by the project. The submitted Project Paper mentions that the following activities will be undertaken: 1) Analysis to identify Project-relevant gaps between males and females, especially in light of country gaps identified through SCD and CPF (Yes) 2) Specific action(s) to address the gender gaps identified in (a) and/or to improve women or men's empowerment and 3) Include Indicators in results framework to monitor outcomes from actions identified in (b). If as part of the PAD going to board relevant documents were develop containing this information, then such documents should be annexed and referenced in the GEF data sheet.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040620

Gender information and indicators are updated in the datasheet and CM, more detailed Gender analysis will be part of the endorsement package.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Risks

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

In principle yes, however, please check and make sure there is alignment between the PDO stated in the GEF data sheet and that of the relevant project documents, including in the /PID.

It is noted that per WB policy, the Additional Finance project PDO should align with the PDO of the WB lending project going to board, and which has a fully developed Environmental and Social Review Study in place and with an associated set of actions. The WB intends to use the same ESRS for this the additional finance proposal, which in effect will become component 4 of WB lending Program.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040620

thank you, noted, PDO is the same across all documents

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

In principle yes, however, this can only be properly evaluated once comments specific to review part I box 1 and 2 have been addressed.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040620

Thank you

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response**Knowledge Management**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

In principle yes, however, this can only be properly evaluated once comments specific to review part I box 1 and 2 have been addressed.

SH (4.8.2020): Cleared.

Agency Response

040620

Thank you

Part III – Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020):

1. LOEs are missing from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia. Please note that any potential recommendation of the project for technical clearance cannot happen until all LOEs have been submitted.

SH (4.8.2020): Please note that the LOE from Serbia is missing. All LOEs must be provided before the project can be technically cleared.

SH (4.15.2020) Serbia has been removed as a project beneficiary, however, please work towards having the LOE signed by Serbia during PPG and to have Serbia fully incorporated into the project by GEF CEO endorsement stage.

Agency Response

041520

thank you, noted

040620

only Serbia LOE is missing due to special circumstances (email is shared with GEFSEC). Team will continue to pursue the LOE with the government

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SH (4.3.2020): Please address comments and resubmit.

SH 4.8.2020): Please address comments and resubmit.

With the exception of the GEF portal data sheet, please note that the GEF review dated 4.8.20 has been made on the basis of the Additional Finance package circulated via email on Friday, April 3 by Zhimin Mao and as approved by *David Michaud, Practice Manager*. Following the Virtual review meeting, the project should be returned to the GEF via the portal, containing review sheet responses to GEFs comments, and with the final versions of all GEF documents uploaded. Also, the decision meeting summary should be shared with GEF following the virtual review meeting.

SH (4.14.2020): Please see comments specific to review sheet Part II box 3 and review sheet Part III box 1. Once addressed, please resubmit.

SH (4.15.2020): Recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval