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

GEF ID:	**5604**		
Country/Region:	**Bosnia-Herzegovina**		
Project Title:	**Technology Transfer for Climate Resilient Flood Management in Vrbas River Basin**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5241 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCA-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$5,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$12,540,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$17,690,000**
PIF Approval:	**February 05, 2014**	Council Approval/Expected:	**March 03, 2014**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Rawleston Moore**	Agency Contact Person:	**Anna Kaplina**

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; Bosnia and Herzegovina is a non-Annex 1 signatory to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	Yes, an endorsement letter from the OFP dated January 8th, 2014 is attached.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	Yes.	

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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).*	Yes, the project is aligned with the SCCF results framework.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Yes. The country's Initial National Communications identified international support for technology transfer as an important need to modernize the hydromet network and create an integrated monitoring system, particularly for river basins. Also, as an EU candidate country, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) is keen to comply with the EU Floods Directive and the EU Water Framework Directive, both of which consider climate change a priority issue. The Government of BiH has recognized the need to address flood risk in the Vrbas River Basin, and the project has support from the state government as well as relevant line ministries.	
	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?	Yes. Floods and drought, expected to increase in frequency with climate change in BiH, pose significant risk to hydropower dams along the Vrbas as well as to its population of 510,000. The majority of this population is rural	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		'smallholders' who produce farm or livestock products, mostly for their own consumption. Over the past 10 years, all 13 municipalities of the Vrbas River Basin (VRB) have experienced major flooding, with an estimated $31 million in damages. The SCCF project will aim to build resilience to extreme events in VRB by integrating adaptation aspects into the following 3 baseline projects that currently do not consider climate change impacts in their design/activities: (i) Emergency Flood Relief and Prevention; (ii) Vrbas River Basin Environment and Tourism Development Programme; and (iii) Disaster Risk Reduction Initiative in BiH. It will also assist BiH undertake necessary activities to reduce flood risk in accordance with the EU Flood Protection Directive.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	More information is requested regarding Output 1.3. The remaining components and outputs are clear and sound, and include: mainstreaming of climate change information in priority sector policies; improved hydrological and hydrodynamical models for VRB to produce flood risk maps; improved GIS capabilities for hazard prediction/analysis and assessment of associated losses; improved hydromet monitoring; trainings on climate change and flood risk for practitioners and decision-makers; EWS; and community-based flood risk plans, adaptation strategies and technologies, and trainings.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Recommended action: Please explain more precisely what is meant by "state-of-art adaptation technology solutions for climate-resilient flood management codified and replicated at national level". 23 Jan 2013, DS: Yes, for PIF stage. Output 1.3 has sufficiently been explained and includes: collect and disseminate lessons learned from other outputs by codifying successful flood risk management practices after project implementation and producing guidance documents and tools on a national level to promote upscaling of proven flood risk management measures. 23 Jan 2013, DS: Recommended action by CEO endorsement stage: Please provide a more detailed explanation as to how the guidance documents will be used to promote upscaling in the rest of the country. While the added value of codified flood risk management practices and tools and the resulting guidance documents is unambiguous, it would be advantageous to lay out a clear approach regarding how the utilization of these guidance documents by targeted policy makers and the public can be promoted and sustained after project implementation.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes; the adaptation benefits are identified. The proposed SCCF project will put in place a range of measures to build basin-wide resilience to extreme climatic events particularly floods, which are expected to become more frequent with climate change -- in the Vrbas river area. The description of additional reasoning for adaptation measures is sound, as at present the baseline plans and projects in the Vrbas River Area do not include consideration of climate change, and monitoring systems as well as EWS are inadequate.	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes for PIF stage. Table A2 states that smallholder farmers, the rural poor, and displaced persons will be engaged in identification and delivery of adaptation activities. NGOs will be involved in awareness-raising, capacity development and delivery of adaptation solutions. Recommended action by CEO Endorsement stage: Please provide more detailed information on public participation.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient	Yes for PIF stage. Recommended action by CEO endorsement stage:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Please address potential risks (and their mitigation) posed to sustainability of the proposed SCCF measures, both to institution-level actions and to community level approaches.	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. UNDP has been working in the Vrbas area for 18 years in cooperation with national, canton-level, municipal and community-level entities. The SCCF project will benefit from the lessons obtained through the Sava Commision's pilot project on climate change adaptation and apply them to the Vrbas -- a tributary of the Sava River. The project will also collaborate on a regional level with a 5-Year Disaster Risk reduction Plan for the Western Balkans, development of a regional Multi-Hazard EWS, and, to avoid duplication of efforts, will use some of the existing coordination mechanisms for the UNDP Clean Varbas Project and UNDP Disaster Risk Reduction Project.	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • 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	Innovation: Yes; it is BiH's first project to attempt to manage flood risks at basin scale while considering land-use, legislative, institutional and climate change considerations while using community-based, participatory approaches. Sustainability: The project will use a 'training of trainers' approach to capacity development, which is a positive step towards sustainability. However, as mentioned for Item 11, it might be advantageous to include a more detailed discussion on measures being taken to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	intervention.	ensure sustainability of the project activities. Potential for scale-up: Yes, potential for scale-up exists. Currently, the proposed SCCF project targets a limited number of sector plans, monitoring stations, practitioners and communities in the VRB.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	More information is requested. Component 2 includes hard-technology related outputs such as upgrades to the hydromet monitoring system, which may be costly. Also, Agency response to comment on Item 7 is pending, which seeks clarification on Output 1.3. Recommended action: Please clarify whether the proposed SCCF grant ($1.3 M) and co-financing ($2 M) amounts will be sufficient for Component 2. 23 Jan 2013, DS: Yes, according to the preliminary assessment conducted by UNDP in collaboration with hydro-meteorological	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		institutes of Republika Srpska and of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the proposed SCCF grant ($1.3 M) should be sufficient to cover Component 2. This assessment is based on three main requirements, including: 14 new gauging and meteo-stations (each approx. $31 K plus costs of installation and calibration); developing an hydraulic model (approx. $200 K); and hydrodynamic modeling (approx. $200 K).	
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes, co-financing is adequate ($12.54 million) and the amount that UNDP brings to the project is in line with its role.	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	Yes, it is 5% of the total SCCF grant requested.	
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes, PPG has been requested and is within the norm.	
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	Not yet. Please address comments for Items 7 and 16. 23 Jan 2013, DS: Yes, PIF clearance for WPI is recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please see comments for Items 10 and 11. We would also welcome gender-disaggregated indicators for beneficiaries, if possible. 23 Jan 2013, DS: Please refer to comments on Items 7, 10 and 11. Gender-disaggregated indicators for beneficiaries should also be included, if possible.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 17, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 23, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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.**