



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	6990		
Country/Region:	Bosnia-Herzegovina		
Project Title:	Achieving Biodiversity Conservation through Creation, Effective Management and Spatial Designation of Protected Areas and Capacity Building		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$45,662	Project Grant:	\$1,397,260
Co-financing:	\$13,548,200	Total Project Cost:	\$15,036,784
PIF Approval:	July 08, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Ersin Esen

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes. B&H has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance.	07/07/2016 UA: Yes. Please refer to comments at PIF stage.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the OFP has endorsed the project for an amount total \$1.58 million.	07/07/2016 UA: Yes. Please refer to comments at PIF stage.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 	No. The GEF-6 BD STAR allocation is \$1.5 million for B&H. The project total amount needs to be revised within the allocation of \$1.5m (currently 1.58m).	07/07/2016 UA: Yes. Please refer to comments at PIF stage.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		14 Jan 2015 The endorsement letter clarifies that the additional funding of \$80000 will come from LD focal area, considering that B&H is a flexible STAR country.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	Refer above.	07/07/2016 UA: Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	n/a	n/a
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>Component 1 is clearly linked to BD1. However, component 2 is linked towards mainstreaming program.</p> <p>Considering the limited resource and capacity, the PM recommends the project to focus only on PA management, i.e. component 1, and delete the component 2 and limit to spacial planning activities for PA designation, but not on mainstreaming).</p> <p>Please revise.</p> <p>14 Jan 2015 The PIF has been adequately revised based on the above comment. However, paragraph 12 and some other section still discuss about the project's work on mainstreaming BD in sectors. Please delete and revise accordingly.</p>	07/07/2016 UA: Yes.
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports</p>	Yes, the linkage with the NBSAP as well as the Aichi Target is well recognized.	07/07/2016 UA: Yes. Please refer to comments at PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?		
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>No. The threats to biodiversity (i.e. drivers of biodiversity loss) is not clearly articulated. There is only one sentence on threats related to energy sector, and other explanations are all related to institutional issues. Please provide information on the direct and indirect threats to biodiversity, including issues related to natural resource use etc.</p> <p>14 jan 2015 While some additional threats such as overexploitation and conversion of habitats are identified. However, it is not clarified what are the drivers of these threats, e.g. what are the production sectors that are causing these threats, and why is it not adequately addressed (policy, institutional, etc). Why creating and expanding protected areas would solve the issue? The theory of change for the project is rather weak. Please provide further explanation and clear logic between the problems and the solutions.</p> <p>1 April 2015 General information has been provided.</p>	07/07/2016 UA: Yes.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>No. While the target of tripling the PA coverage is clear, there is lack of information on the "how." Besides developing legal and institutional framework: - how would it ensure ecosystem representativeness?</p>	07/07/2016 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- how would it ensure PA management effectiveness? - what are the gaps in capacity? - How would it ensure sustainable financing? The project lack basic information.</p> <p>In addition, further elaborate the PA monitoring system that is envisioned under the project. How would it build on the database that is under development? What kind of effective and cost-efficient monitoring system is considered?</p> <p>Please provide further information.</p> <p>14 Jan 2015 Some additional information has been provided. However, the following elements still require further information and explanation: - Wide range of habitats are identified for PA expansion. The proposal needs to further clarify what are the current gaps in ecosystem representativeness in the PA system and focus on those. - Where are the most globally significant areas that requires PA expansion and further coverage. Need for expanding the areas can not be the sole reason. - How would the government ensure sustainable financing for PA system? This has been an ongoing challenge and further thoughts and plans (or activities to identify and assess financial sustainability) would be required in the project design. -Updating the national red list can not be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>a standalone monitoring output but rather it would be important to identify how the red list could be used and necessary capacity will be developed to monitor the PA management effectiveness, including the species status. Please clarify.</p> <p>Please revise and provide adequate information.</p> <p>1 April 2015 Further information has been provided but not sufficient. The project still lacks focus and over ambitious for the limited funding. Please clarify and revise based on the below comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project still suggests to cover variety of ecosystem gaps with the large area of PA expansion, including karst, cave, forest, freshwater, mountain ecosystems. Please be mindful of the limited capacity and resources available at the government as well as GEF finance, and further focus (i.e. narrow the target ecosystems and areas) and define specific area for intervention. - In addition, please refer to the recent clarification email from the GEFSEC on the PA expansion to meet the criteria set by the Key Biodiversity Areas. Please provide necessary information on the areas, i.e. whether the sites are KBA or they meet the criteria. - On the sustainable finance, while some information has been provided in the 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>sustainability section, there are no clearly defined activities in the project framework, i.e. description of outcomes. Please integrate these activities in the project framework. Further, the information on the two environmental funds are very limited and confusing. Please provide further information and how the project intends to build on these funds.</p> <p>- Outcome 1.4 is confusing. How does this relate to rest of the project design, particularly outcome 1.2? This outcome requires substantial review and possibly delete to ensure further focus of the project.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>While the rich biodiversity of B&H is recognized, it is unclear what exactly the project will be able to achieve besides the coverage. Please specify and provide tangible information.</p> <p>If the focus is on forest ecosystem, it maybe worth considering to develop a multi-focal area project with SFM incentive, considering the challenges and financial resources required to effectively work on strengthening the PA system in B&H.</p> <p>14 Jan 2015 Please refer to comment under item 7 and further clarify GEBs based on specific habitats/ecosystems, based on B&H's critical areas for biodiversity.</p> <p>1 April 2015</p>	<p>07/07/2016 UA: Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Please refer additional clarification comments under item 7 and further clarify tangible GEBs.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		07/07/2016 UA: Yes.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	General information has been provided but lack information particularly on the local and international CSOs. Who are the potential partners? What are they doing in this field in B&H? Please provide further information. 14 Jan 2015 Further information provided.	07/07/2016 UA: Yes.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Key risks are identified at this stage. Please provide further details at the time of CEO approval.	07/07/2016 UA: Yes. Further details have been provided at this stage.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	While other GEF projects are noted, the PIF lacks information on related work, specific to PA system. What are the baseline and other activities conducted at the Entity or District levels? How would this project coordinate with these activities? 14 jan 2015 Further information has been provided.	07/07/2016 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>Innovation - Yes, recognized. Sustainability - No, please clarify both institutional and financial sustainability of the project and PA system as a whole. Please clarify. Scaling up - There is potential but considering that the financial sustainability is particularly unclear, it is hard to tell at this point. Please clarify.</p> <p>14 jan 2015 As noted above, please further clarify the issue of financial sustainability.</p>	<p>07/07/2016 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>07/07/2016 UA: Yes. The project is very close to what was agreed at PIF stage.</p>
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>07/07/2016 UA: Yes.</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>While the ratio is 1 to 5.5, cofinancing is all identified as in-kind. In order to ensure sustainability and adequate baseline activities are ongoing, please consider mobilising some cash cofinance.</p> <p>14 Jan 2015 Adequately revised at this stage. Encourage further cash cofinance by the time of CEO approval.</p>	<p>07/07/2016 UA: Yes. Cash - cofinance increased to \$7.3 million.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	UNEP is bringing in only in-kind contribution of \$400000.	07/07/2016 UA: Yes.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The PMC is slightly higher than 10%. Please kindly review and revise as appropriate. 14 Jan 2015 Adequately revised.	07/07/2016 UA: Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes, the PPG amount is within the range and considered adequate.	07/07/2016 UA: Yes.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	n/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		07/07/2016 UA: Yes. BD-1 TT completed.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		07/07/2016 UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		n/a for a MSP.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		none received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? 		n/a for a MSP.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		none received
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No. Please review the comments provided above and submit a revised PIF for further consideration.</p> <p>14 Jan 2015 No, please review further clarification required to the comments provided earlier.</p> <p>1 April 2015 No, please review the comments carefully and revise the PIF accordingly. The PM is available for further clarification and upstream consultation on phone as needed.</p> <p>2 July 2015 Yes, the revised PIF adequately responds to the earlier comments. The PM recommends the PIF for CEO approval.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		07/07/2016 UA: Yes. PM recommends final CEO approval.
	First review*	November 21, 2014	July 07, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 14, 2015	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 01, 2015	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.

