



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>9966</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Bosnia-Herzegovina</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Integrated Reporting and Transparency System</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>6209 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CBIT-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$20,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,200,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$1,350,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Milena Vasquez</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Yamil Bonduki</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	MGV, December 28, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, December 28, 2017: The project is consistent with Bosnia and Herzegovina's NDC and national reports under the UNFCCC. However, as the project aims to revise existing regulations and design a domestic MRV system, political buy-in is imperative for reaching the	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>project outcomes and ensuring their sustainability.</p> <p>Please clarify further how this project is aligned with existing national strategies and plans and is supported by the government at different levels (entities and Breko District, cantons, etc.). Also clarify the institutional arrangements for the Designated National Authority for CDM projects and the mechanism for NAMAs.</p> <p>MGV, March 30, 2018: Comment cleared. Political buy-in has been assured via the endorsement process for this project concept, which has to go through all relevant entity ministries (Ministry of Spatial Planning, Constructions and Ecology of Republika Srpska, the Federal Ministry of Environment and Tourism of FBiH and the Department for Spatial Planning, Property Rights Matters of the Breko District) as well as the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of BiH.</p> <p>The proposal's alignment with existing strategies and plans at different government levels, as well as the institutional arrangements for CDM and NAMA activities has been clarified. The Executive Board of the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Designated National Authority is composed of representatives from the same ministries.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>MGV, December 28, 2017:</p> <p>a) While the PIF does identify a series of gaps and barriers that the project aims to address, including those identified through the ICA process, existing institutional arrangements are not clearly defined and it paints a picture of nonexistent capacities and frameworks. Please clarify how (in terms of institutional arrangements and existing capacities) previous UNFCCC reports have been developed and the lessons learned from that process, particularly in light of Bosnia and Herzegovina's timely submissions.</p> <p>b) It is not clear how the project will ensure the sustainability of its outcomes. Under part F, the PIF states that "[institutions]...will be gradually expected to dedicate national resources...". Please clarify how this statement can be supported. In particular, the sustainability of the regional peer exchange program, the knowledge platform and climate software are of concern. Please also</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>considering adding to the risks table with a mitigation measure.</p> <p>MGV, March 30, 2018:</p> <p>a) Comment cleared. Additional details on the institutional arrangements and existing capacities to complete UNFCCC reports have been included.</p> <p>b) Comment cleared. We encourage the agency to continue focusing on the issue of sustainability as the project progresses to present a more certain sustainability plan for the regional peer exchange, knowledge platform and climate software.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV, December 28, 2017: Yes, the project builds upon identified gaps and barriers.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MGV, December 28, 2017:</p> <p>Component 1</p> <p>a) Output 1.1.1 - Please clarify the process, feasibility and if there is political buy-in to write and pass relevant legislation to support the national transparency framework. If relevant, you may also add as risk with a mitigation strategy.</p> <p>b) Output 1.1.2 - Please clarify the expected institutions and stakeholders that would be invited to the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>coordination committee and how the PPG may support this work.</p> <p>c) Output 1.1.2 - Please clarify which institution is expected to house the knowledge platform and how it will be maintained after the project ends. The amount of resources needed for the development of the platform, database and climate software may be more than has been budgeted to this component. Please also clarify if expected costs have been taken into account or if there are additional resources that may support this work.</p> <p>Component 2</p> <p>a) Project outcome 2.1 is written as a mix between output and outcome, please revise so it reads as an outcome.</p> <p>b) Output 2.1.1 - While coordination with the approved project supporting Bosnia and Herzegovina's Fourth National Communication and Third BUR is explained under Part D, please expand under this Output how the activities to be undertaken by the enabling activity project will be specifically coordinated with this output, as there was already an expectation that 2006 IPCC guidelines would be used for these reports. Is the goal of this output to provide additional capacity building</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>to support the development of those reports? Do the timelines of the two projects align well to do this?</p> <p>c) Output 2.1.2 - Please clarify how the regional peer exchange program will be linked to the inter-ministerial coordination committee and the knowledge platform. Please also clarify the existing institutional arrangement of it and how it is supported and is expected to continue to be supported past the project.</p> <p>d) Output 2.2.2 - Please clarify further the scope and reach of training and capacity building under this output.</p> <p>e) Output 2.2.3 - Please provide further information on the expected activities under this output. In particular how it is expected that the project will support quantifying and reporting on support provided and received, which is briefly mentioned.</p> <p>MGV, March 30, 2018:</p> <p>Component 1</p> <p>a) Comment cleared. The process will entail an analysis of existing legislative framework, incorporation of lessons learned and recommendations for adoption of standardized and harmonized rules and regulations to support a BiH-wide</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>transparency framework.</p> <p>b) Comment cleared. Stakeholders have been clarified.</p> <p>c) Comment cleared. Budget has been considered and knowledge platform will be hosted by the UNFCCC focal point.</p> <p>Component 2</p> <p>a) Outcome has been revised. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Comment not cleared. It is understood that the two projects are aligned; however it is still not clear how the CBIT resources will be incremental to what will be covered under the FNC/TBUR project. Is it that it will expand the reach of training to additional experts? Will it expand the scope of training (i.e. cover specific sectors)? Will it train trainers or entail the documentation of training? Please clarify. Further, it is not clear why this output exists on its own separate from Outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. Consider integrating them and proposing how topics and scope of training will be prioritized for both QA/QC and data collection and emissions calculations.</p> <p>c) Comment cleared.</p> <p>d) Comment cleared for now. This will be further clarified during PPG.</p> <p>e) Comment cleared.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>MGV, May 18, 2018:</p> <p>Component 2 b) Comment cleared. The distinction between the scope and targets of training under the FNC/TBUR project and the CBIT project has been further clarified. In addition, the outputs have been re-organized as suggested.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>MGV, December 28, 2017: Gender elements are incorporated into the project. However, additional information on how CSOs will be incorporated is needed. Please clarify the role of CSOs in the project and specify key CSO stakeholders.</p> <p>MGV, March 30, 2018: Comment cleared for now. CSOs will be identified during the consultation process of the PPG phase.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	MGV, December 28, 2017: N/A. This project utilizes resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	MGV, December 28, 2017: N/A. This project utilizes resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of</li> </ul>		



<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	MGV, December 28, 2017: N/A. This project utilizes resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MGV, December 28, 2017: No, please address comments above in boxes 2, 3, 5 and 6.</p> <p>MGV, March 30, 2018: There is a remaining comment in box 5.</p> <p>MGV, May 18, 2018: All comments have been addressed. PM recommends CEO PIF Approval.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	December 28, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 30, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 18, 2018	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.