REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL
PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project
TYPE OF TRUST FUND:GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Enhanced Cross-Sectoral Land Management through Land Use Pressure Reduction and Planning			
Country(ies):	Serbia	GEF Project ID:[1]	5822
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	01276
Other Executing Partner(s):	UNEP Vienna Programme Office	Submission Date:	17 June 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation	Project Duration(Months)	36
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➢ For SFM/REDD+ ☐ ➢ For SGP ☐ ➢ For PPP ☐		Project Agency Fee ($):	62,856

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK[2]

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount ($)	Cofinancing ($)
(select) LD-3	3.1 Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management 3.2 Integrated landscape mangement practices adopted by local communities	Integrated land management plans developed and implemented INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested	GEF TF	661,644	5,636,000
		Total project costs		661,644	5,636,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Development of instruments and mechanisms for integrated land use management, remediation, and capacity development to reduce pressures on land as a natural resource from competing land uses in the wider landscape and to support reversal of land degradation

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount ($)	Confirmed Cofinancing ($)
1 Enabling institutional, policy and scientific environment for	TA	1.1 ILM tools available to land users for an increased	1.1.1. Pollution sources and land pressures from production sectors	GEF TF	260,000	2,010,000

[1] Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.
[2] Refer to the Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework when completing Table A.

long-term integrated land use management (ILM)		understanding of land degradation and remediation measures, based on identified environmental/ industrial hotspots and environmental and socio-economic risks	(spatial distribution, soil quality, pollutants) are identified and mapped 1.1.2. Environmental, social and economic risks of the production sectors related to land use patterns and soil quality are assessed and ILM tools developed on this basis			
		1.2 Mechanisms and responsibilities agreed upon for the implementation and financing of remediation of identified priority sites.	1.2.1. Remediation priorities are established in accordance with Regulation 22/2010 and stakeholder consultations 1.2.2. Cadaster[3] of environmental/industrial hotspots in Serbia with GPS database developed			
		1.3 Developed/ enhanced policy framework for ILM in Serbia with the application of international policy recommendations such as the UNCCD process	1.3.1 An *Integrated Land Planning and Management Framework (ILMF)* for Serbia developed in accordance with the requirements of SSNRM and its implementation mechanisms			
2 Landscape-level management of natural resources in Serbia	TA	2.1. Principles for management of natural resources are agreed upon and allow multipurpose use of resources	2.1.1. A methodology compiled for implementation of ILMF practice at the local level 2.1.2. A package of trade-off measures	GEF TF	179,852	2,200,000

[3] A technical term referring to a land register. It should also be distinguished from an "Inventory" (such as in *Inventory of Contaminated Sites*).

			developed and tested at community and local levels			
3. Capacity building, awareness raising and sharing learned lessons with main stakeholders and wider public based on sustainable monitoring system	TA	3.1. Strengthened capacities of major stakeholders for sustainable practices in sectors competing for land area and natural resources 3.2. Ensured broad and high level commitment to expanding and replicating measures for integrated SLM; ensured public support for remediation and SLM of environmental/ industrial hotspots	3.1.1 Support to the National Laboratory within SEPA for soil sampling and quality analysis is provided 3.1.2 Baseline information and methods established, and capacity strengthened for a monitoring and reporting system on soil quality and land degradation 3.1.3. Communication and outreach conducted in different regions of Serbia 3.1.4 Interactive hotspot map developed and made available to the public 3.2.1 A conference aimed at presenting best practices in integrated land management in Serbia and the region is organized 3.2.2. A platform for monitoring of impact on land degradation (physical, environmental, social and economic impacts) is created	GEF TF	161,643	1,176,000
				Subtotal		601,495	5,386,000
				Project management Cost (PMC)[4]	GEF TF	60,149	250,000

[4] PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

Total project costs		661,644	5,636,000

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME ($)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount ($)
National Government	Environmental Protection Agency	In-kind	3,250,000
National Government	Ministry of Mining and Energy	In-kind	1,000,000
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Environment	Cash	50,000
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Environment	In-kind	500,000
Others	Institute for Field and Vegetable Crops	In-kind	100,000
Others	Institute of Soil Science	In-kind	66,000
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea, Italy	In-kind	500,000
CSO	Forestry and Environmental Action (fea)	In-kind	10,000
Private Sector	Chamber of Commerce and Industry Serbia	In-Kind	20,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	Cash	50,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	In-kind	90,000
Total Co-financing			5,636,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY[1]

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in $)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)[2]	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Serbia	661,644	62,856	724,500
Total Grant Resources				661,644	62,856	724,500

[1] In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

[2] Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount ($)	Cofinancing ($)	Project Total ($)
International Consultants	10,000		10,000
National/Local Consultants	10,000	100,000	110,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency
and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF[5]

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i
NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update F
The
analysis provided in the PIF is still valid. During the PPG, relevant information was updated and ame
through intensive stakeholder consultations. For further detail, please refer to the Projet Document (I
Sections 2.4 and 3.6.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. No change from original PIF

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: No change from original PIF

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: The baseline provided in the PIF is still valid, although some further information was added during the course of the PPG. For further detail please consult the ProDoc, Section 2.

TABLE I: COMPARISON BETWEEN PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK AT PIF AND CEO ENDORSEMENT STAGE

Component **PIF**	Component **CEO doc**	Outcome **PIF**	Outcome **CEO doc**	Comments on changes
1. Enabling institutional, policy and scientific environmental for long-term integrated land use management	1. Enabling institutional, policy and scientific environmental for long-term integrated land use management	1.1 Adopted land use planning implemented by all land users 1.2 Identified priority sites for remediation with required remediation measures, policy coordination framework, and identified state support for implementation and financing for remediation.	1.1 ILM tools available to land users for an increased understanding of land degradation and remediation measures, based on identified environmental/ industrial hotspots and environmental and socio-economic risks	Slight reformulation of outcome 1.1 to emphasize the sequence of identifying and assessing hotspots before elaborating ILM tools Only semantical reformulation of outcome 1.2

[5] For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question.

		1.3 Enhanced policy framework for integrated land use management in Serbia.	1.2 Mechanisms and responsibilities agreed upon for the implementation and financing of remediation of identified priority sites 1.3 Developed/ enhanced policy framework for ILM in Serbia with the application of international policy recommendations such as the UNCCD process	Slight precision of outcome 1.3 through UNCCD reference
2. Landscape level management of natural resources in Serbia	2. Landscape-level management of natural resources in Serbia	2.1 Ecosystem management principles for management of natural resources are in place and allow multipurpose use of resources.	2.1 Principles for management of natural resources are agreed upon and allow multipurpose use of resources.	Minor reformulation
3. Capacity building, awareness raising and sharing learned lessons with main stakeholders and wider public based on sustainable monitoring system	3. Capacity building, awareness raising and sharing learned lessons with main stakeholders and wider public based on sustainable monitoring system	3.1 Strengthened capacities of major stakeholders for environmentally sound practices in sectors competing for land area and natural resources 3.2 Lessons learned captured in multimedia format 3.3 Broad and high-level commitment to expanding and replicating measures: ensured public support for remediation and SLM of environmental/ industrial hotspots	3.1. Strengthened capacities of major stakeholders for sustainable practices in sectors competing for land area and natural resources and their enhanced cooperation 3.2. Ensured broad and high level commitment to expanding and replicating measures for integrated SLM; ensured public support for remediation and SLM of environmental/ industrial hotspots	Outcome 3.1 slightly enhanced through reference to cooperation Outcomes 3.2 and 3.3 merged, as the former 3.2 read more like an output and capturing lessons learned is seen as contributing to public support and commitment for replication of SLM measures

Comparison of OUTPUTS

Outputs **PIF**	Outputs **CEO doc**	Comments on changes
1 Conducting Environmental and	1.1.1. Pollution sources and land	Slight re-organization of outputs 1 to

Social Impact Assessments of the production sector land use 2 Identified pollution sources and the degree on land use from production sectors and its spatial distribution, including sampling and testing 3 A set of remediation priorities (in accordance with Regulation 22/2010): site hazard assessment and classification of sites 4 Electronic GPS database – Cadaster of environmental/ industrial hotspots in Serbia 5 Integrated Land Use Management Plan	pressures from production sectors (spatial distribution, soil quality, pollutants) are identified and mapped 1.1.2. Environmental, social and economic risks of the production sectors related to land use patterns and soil quality are assessed and ILM tools developed on this basis 1.2.1 Remediation priorities are established in accordance with Regulation 22/2010 and stakeholder consultations 1.2.2. Cadaster of environmental/industrial hotspots in Serbia with GPS database developed 1.3.1 An *Integrated Land Planning and Management Framework (ILMF)* for Serbia developed in accordance with the requirements of SSNRM and its implementation mechanisms	4 to allow for a better sequencing of activities; all substantive elements are maintained in the outputs 1.1.1 – 1.2.2. Output 1.3.1 now allows for a better integration of new ILM tools into existing policy and planning processes
1 Setup of Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan and developed methodology for its implementation 2 A package of trade-off measures testing at community and local levels	2.1.1 A methodology compiled for implementation of ILMF practice at the local level 2.1.2 A package of trade-off measures developed and tested at community and local levels	Minor reformulations
1 Communication and outreach in different regions of Serbia 2 Videos, manuals, guidelines produced 3 Mapping hotspots and development of interactive hotspot map available to the public 4 Organization of conference aimed at presenting best practices in ILM in Serbia and the region 5 Creation of platform for monitoring of environmental, social and economic impacts 6 Establishment of project monitoring system	3.1.1 Support to the National Laboratory within SEPA for soil sampling and quality analysis is provided 3.1.2 Baseline information and methods established, and capacity strengthened for monitoring and reporting system on soil quality and land degradation 3.1.3. Communication and outreach conducted in different regions of Serbia 3.1.4 Interactive hotspot map developed and made available to the public 3.2.1 A conference aimed at presenting best practices in integrated land management in Serbia and the region is organized 3.2.2. A platform for monitoring of impact on land degradation (physical, environmental, social and economic impacts) is created	Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 were added as important capacity building measures to improve soil and site assessments and to allow for LD focused monitoring and reporting. Former output 2 is now merged into 3.1.3 on communication and outreach and respective activities refer to the production of information materials

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project: Please refer to the ProDoc, Section 3.7

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: During stakeholder consultations at PPG stage, one further medium risk was added to the PIF list, namely the risk that Government institutions might lack attention due to focussing on other priorities, such as EU negotiations. See ProDoc, Section 3.5 for more detail.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives N/A

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

In addition to the stakeholders as detailed in the PIF, additional stakeholders were identified during PPG. Identified project partners and their roles and responsibilities in project implementation is envisaged as follows:

Institution/ organization	Responsibility
MoAEP	▪ Overview of project implementation and overall support to project management ▪ Legal instruments
SEPA	▪ Support to the Ministry in the overview of project implementation, ▪ Responsible for the Inventory of Contaminated Sites and the hotspots cadaster ▪ Soil sampling and analysis ▪ Acting as a national reference institution for environmental reporting towards EIONET, and subsequently the JRC-IES on Soil Data and Information System.
PSUCE Vojvodina	▪ Environmental monitoring on the territory of the Autonomous Province, ▪ Support in identifying industrial hot-spots
MoME	▪ Support through data on mining operations, their scope and impact (cadaster on mining waste and risk assessment) ▪ Linking with mining operations and the private sector ▪ Support capacity building and training at national and local levels
CCI	▪ Participation of the Project representatives into relevant branch associations meetings being regularly held by the CCI ▪ Offering capacity of regional offices for information, collection and dissemination

	▪ Direct communication and interest representation of private sector and private companies of interest to the Project ▪ Promotion and dissemination of project activities and results within Sectoral Bulletins ▪ Support to capacity building of private sector (information channels, meeting space etc.)
IHTM	▪ Implementation of activities in Component 3 – organization of the conference, collection and dissemination of information and materials on the topic of land degradation
Institutes in Novi Sad and Belgrade	▪ Soil sample analysis, to support preparation of the cadaster
Aarhus centres and Standing Conference of Cities and Municipalities	▪ Facilitate communication and information flows to the LA

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF): For a detailed discussion of environmental and socio-economic benefits of the project, please refer to the ProDoc's Sections 3.1 and 3.7.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:
The project aims at reinforcing existing, but underutilized and uncoordinated institutional structures and policies related to land management in Serbia. Project funds will be invested in better linking sectoral policies, upgrading analytical and research capacities and in working at local level to improve management efforts and risk and remediation planning.

The project has a focus on integrated land management in industrial/environmental hotspots with the mid- to long-term aim of reconverting formerly industrially used lands into its original uses, mostly agricultural. Alleviating and remedying pollution that is not confined to these hotspots but has further pollution potential is a cost-effective approach in itself, as it reduces spill-out risks and associated consequential costs of environmental disasters. This is further enhanced by the capacity development measures and improvement of laboratory analyses for soil sampling that is built into the project implementation strategy.

Assisted execution through UNEP's regional office in Europe allows to keep project personnel costs very low, and GEF funds will instead pay for planning and implementing action on the ground, which contributes to both cost-effectiveness and sustainability of the project approach.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget from GEF	Budget co-finance	Time Frame
Inception Workshop	Project Manager (PM) and Project Management and Implementation Unit (PMIU)	10,000	38,000	Within 2 months of project start-up
Inception Report	PM and PMIU		2,000	1 month after project inception meeting
Measurement of project indicators (outcome, progress and performance indicators, GEF tracking tools) at national and local levels	PM and PMIU	10,000	10,000	Outcome indicators: start, mid and end of project Progress/perform. Indicators: annually (Cost incorporated in project components and management budget)
Semi-annual Progress/ Operational Reports to UNEP	PM and PMIU		3,000	Twice a year, within 1 month of the end of reporting period (Cost incorporated in project components and management budget)
Project Steering Committee meetings	PM and PMIU; UNEP TM	5,000	45,000	At least once a year
Reports of PSC meetings	PM and PMIU		5,000	Within 1 month after PSC meeting
PIR	UNEP TM		2,000	Annually, part of reporting routine (Cost incorporated in project components and management budget)
Monitoring visits to field sites	PM and PMIU; UNEP TM	18,000	15,000	As appropriate (Cost incorporated in project components and management budget)
Mid Term Review/Evaluation	UNEP TM and EO	15,000		At mid-point of project implementation
Terminal Evaluation	UNEP EO	20,000		Within three months prior to the terminal Steering Committee meeting
Audit	PM and PMIU	5,000		Annually
Project Final Report	PM and PMIU		2,000	Within 2 months of the project completion date (Cost incorporated in project components and management budget)
Co-financing report	PM and PMIU		2,000	Within 1 month of the PIR reporting period (Cost incorporated in project components and management budget)

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget from GEF	Budget co-finance	Time Frame
Publication of Lessons Learnt and other project documents	PM and PMIU	30,000	30,000	Annually, part of Semi-annual reports & Project Final Report
Total M&E Budget		**113,000**	**154,000**	

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this form. For SGP, use this OFP endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE *(MM/dd/yyyy)*
Jovana Jaric	GEF OFP	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	03/05/2014
Stana Bozovic	GEF OFP	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	05/19/2015

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date *(Month, day, year)*	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
J. Christophe Bouvier Director, Office for Operations and Corporate Services, UNEP GEF Coordination Office		June 17, 2015	Adamou Bouhari Task Manager Biodiversity/Land Degradation	+254719867657	Adamou.Bouhari@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Project objective	Objective level indicators	Baseline	Targets and monitoring milestones	Means of verification	Assumptions and risks	UNEP MTS reference
Development of instruments and mechanisms for integrated land use management, remediation, and capacity development to reduce pressures on land as a natural resource from competing land uses in the wider landscape and to support reversal of land degradation	1. Percentage of major environmental/industrial hotspots (caused by the operation of energy sector, industry, mining and agriculture) identified on the territory of Serbia	84.6% of the total territory of Serbia is affected by land degradation. Since 1957 to 1993 Serbia lost around 220.000 ha of fertile land due to industrial, mining, power, and road construction; No systematic methods and approaches for identification, addressing and remediation of environmental hotspots	Transparent process established to identify indicators for the hotspot list with major stakeholders At least 90% of priority environmental /industrial hotspots for remediation are identified and agreed upon by major stakeholders Legal and technical preconditions met to carry out remediation	Cadaster information, and GIS database; Government decisions on remediation; Legal and technical documentation for remediation prepared by public and private sectors	No significant additional loss of soil and land degradation caused by natural disasters (floods, fires, or earthquakes); Main production sectors and the representatives of private sector participate in the foreseen remediation and land use planning Risks: If substantial and unforeseen changes in the Government of Serbia occur (e.g., reorganization of public institutions, significant changes of political leadership), it could prolong project activities and delay project implementation.	
	2. Availability of Integrated land management (ILM), natural resource management (NRM) planning tools and monitoring framework	National Strategy for Sustainable NRM and Spatial Plan of Serbia are available	Recommendations produced for the incorporation of ILM planning tools into relevant Serbian policy frameworks; WS with decision makers (both ♀ and ♂) from different entities on the use of the planning tools	National legislation and guidelines on ILM; Project implementation and monitoring reports; Availability of easily accessible land information and tools for stakeholder participation		
	3. Number of authorities piloting community trade-offs, and development	Integrated land management is not practiced on	Environmental and social impacts and community trade-offs, taken into	Project reports; Training records; Strategic		

	alternatives from integrated land management	national and local levels	account by at least 2 local and/or regional authorities for development of strategies and projects; 1 monitoring framework Strengthened local capacities for ILM planning and monitoring	documents with ILM planning by ≥ 2 local communities		
Project Outcome	**Outcome indicators**	**Baseline**	**Targets and monitoring milestones**	**Means of verification**	**Assumptions and risks**	**MTS Expected Accomplishment**
COMPONENT 1: Enabling institutional, policy and scientific environment for long-term integrated land use management (ILM)						
1.1 ILM tools available to land users for an increased understanding of land degradation and remediation measures, based on identified environmental/ industrial hotspots and environmental and socio-economic risks	Number of environmental/industrial hotspots identified using participatory tools; Number of ILM tools developed, based on the assessment of major environmental and socio-economic risks and the hotspots	Available categorization methodology for land quality; Information on land utilization in Serbia based on Corine Land Cover Database 2006; Incomplete information on the contamination level, and current status of few potential hotspots (e.g., Kolubara and Kostolac mines); Scientific and research papers on the impacts of industry on the soil and land use.	MT: At least 3 tools developed and disseminated at national and local levels; At least 50% hotspots identified in Y2; ET: 90% hotspots identified in Y3, incl. socio-economic risks	Lists of identified hotspots; Environmental and social, and economic risk assessments	Main sectors required to carry out remediation cooperate with the project and the state institutions; Power, industry, mining and agriculture sectors are willing to share available information on land, soil quality and the extent of their operations	
1.2 Mechanisms and responsibilities agreed upon for the implementation and financing of remediation of identified priority sites.	Priority hotspot sites for remediation are identified in a participatory manner; Availability of a hotspot cadaster;	Requirements based on the Regulation for establishing remediation	MT: Hotspot cadaster created; Priorities for remediation are adopted by Y2; ET: Legal and financial	Contracts, Government decrees; GIS databases; Action plans and	The Government and public institutions of Serbia not experiencing	

	Existence of binding documents (such as contracts, government decisions and bylaws);	priorities (RS Official Gazette No. 22/2010), and the Regulation on remediation methodology for preparation of remediation plans (RS Official Gazette, No. 88/10)	framework for implementation is available by Y3;	supporting documentation for remediation; Reports on implementation; Project reports on implementation and monitoring	difficulties in its regular operation due to extraordinary events or natural disasters	
1.3 Developed/ enhanced policy framework for ILM in Serbia with the application of international policy recommendations such as the UNCCD process	Availability of policy mechanisms to ensure remediation of land under ILM approach; Land/Soil Action Plan developed, based on the National Strategy for Sustainable NRM (2012), and in participatory manner.	Strategy for Sustainable NRM Other sector strategies and action plans (water, mining, energy, forestry, agriculture, environment, climate change etc.) The Inter-ministry Soil Committee is responsible for the harmonization of planning documents	MT: Relevant stakeholder groups actively contribute to development of Land/Soil Action Plan ET: Integrated Land Planning and Management Framework (ILMF) *developed in Y3*	Project reports on implementation and monitoring Government publications; Media, and NGO reports; Statements of key stakeholders	See above.	
COMPONENT 2: Landscape-level management of natural resources in Serbia						
2.1 Principles for management of natural resources are agreed upon and allow multipurpose use of resources	*Guidelines for* implementation of ILM framework at the local level Trade-off measures tested at local level	Spatial Plan of Serbia; Relevant sectoral strategies	MT: Trade-off analysis and testing of trade-off measures at local level ET: Action Plan developed and submitted for adoption by Y3	Developed guidelines on integrated land planning and management by public institutions; Publications of local authorities Project reports on implementation and monitoring;	All stakeholders are willing to actively participate in the process.	

COMPONENT 3: Capacity building, awareness raising and sharing learned lessons with main stakeholders and wider public based on sustainable monitoring system						
3.1 Strengthened capacities of major stakeholders for sustainable practices in sectors competing for land and natural resources and their enhanced cooperation	Availability of analytical methods for monitoring the soil quality; Staff trained (both ♀ and ♂); Local and regional authorities include sustainable land use practices and ILM principles in development of new strategies and action plans; Local stakeholders (both ♀ and ♂) participating in ILM planning; Academia, authorities and production sectors communicate regularly Availability of videos, manuals, guidelines and interactive maps regarding land use in Serbia	The national laboratory is not certified for soil sampling and analysis; Limited capacities of local authorities for integrated land use management planning; Limited information flows between scientists, authorities and main sectors. EA records of photographs during field visits. Information from the National Register of Pollution Sources	MT: Project platform established for regular interface between academia, government and production sectors Responsible staff (both ♀ and ♂) trained to perform soil quality analyses at the National Laboratory; Interactive hotspots map developed by Y2 ET: At least 30 government officials (both ♀ and ♂) from local and regional levels trained in ILM and sustainable land use; By Y3, at least 2 municipalities have initiated preparation of local land action plans Hotspots map made available to all stakeholders and used by many at the latest by Y3	Records of trainings, and project reports; Records on the municipality land planning activities published in media or by government official sources (e.g., websites, official gazettes); Meeting minutes Records on the use of interactive map by different stakeholders; Records on dissemination of prepared materials to stakeholders and public	All stakeholders are willing to participate in the trainings; Information flows are not hampered.	
3.2 Ensured broad and high level commitment to expanding and replicating measures for integrated ILM; ensured public support for remediation and ILM of environmental/ industrial hotspots	Documented support of major stakeholders for integrated land management policies and actions; Scientific articles and research papers published in Serbia on land degradation, remediation of hotspots and integrated land use planning;	Awareness and level of support for the project is high to medium among project partners, government, and key identified stakeholders; The awareness on land degradation issues, level of impacts, and planning options is low among public	MT: Set up an open platform for monitoring of impacts; ET: Organization of public events and at least one international event	Records, and meeting minutes; Articles and news published in printed and online media in Serbia about land degradation issues and the Project; Information available online		

		and local and regional governments				

Project Outputs	Project Activities/Results	Year of Implementation
COMPONENT 1: Enabling institutional, policy and scientific environment for long-term integrated land use management Outcomes: *1.1. ILM tools available to all land users for an increased understanding of land degradation and remediation measures, based on identified environmental/ industrial hotspots and environmental and socio-economic risks* 1.2. *Mechanisms and responsibilities agreed upon for the implementation and financing of remediation of identified priority sites.* 1.3. *Developed/ enhanced policy framework for integrated land use management in Serbia such as the UNCCD process*		
1.1.1. Pollution sources and land pressures from production sectors (spatial distribution, soil quality, pollutants) are identified and mapped	▪ Data collection from available public records, local government records, research papers, and field data on soil conditions (e.g., chemical composition – concentration of metals in soils, dangerous and hazardous substances, organic and non-organic pollutants) ▪ Assessment of industrial, mining and power facilities with potential land degradation and pollution effects to identify environmental/industrial hotspots in Serbia (Please refer to Government Decision on Program for systematic monitoring of soil quality, land degradation risk indicators and remediation methodologies) ▪ Field testing and sampling to determine the level of land degradation and soil pollution for at least 30 locations	Y1 Y1/Y2
1.1.2. Environmental, social and economic risks of the production sectors related to land use patterns and soil quality are assessed and ILM tools developed on this basis	▪ Based on the list of hotspots, carry out an environmental and social impact analysis, including gender-differentiated land uses, for identified sites to indicate the level of environmental risks and remediation priorities ▪ Publish the results of assessments and disseminate it to the stakeholders (printed and electronic materials) ▪ Develop the methodology for assessment of environmental risks ▪ Based on the results, develop best practice tools and guidelines for ILM in Serbia	Y1/Y2 Y2
1.2.1. Remediation priorities are established in accordance with Regulation 22/2010 and stakeholder consultations	▪ Carry out stakeholder consultations on the identified hotspots in order to update the list of hotspots ▪ Submit the list for adoption by relevant authorities ▪ Carry out stakeholder consultations on the identified hotspots in order to define priorities for remediation ▪ Prepare site hazard assessment and classification of sites for the consideration and official adoption by the Government of Serbia	Y2
1.2.2. Cadaster of environmental/industrial hotspots in Serbia with GPS database developed	▪ Develop cadaster of identified hotspots in Serbia, with applicable attributes from collected data in accordance with the provisions of SSNRM	Y1/Y2
1.3.1 An *Integrated Land Planning and*	▪ Draft the National Land/Soil Action Plan in ILM in consultation with the responsible institutions in charge for water, power, agriculture, forestry, transportation, etc.	Y2

Management Framework (ILMF) for Serbia developed in accordance with the requirements of SSNRM and its implementation mechanisms	▪ Carry out stakeholder consultations, define funding sources, and submit the Action Plan for adoption by the Government	
COMPONENT 2: Landscape-level management of natural resources in Serbia Outcome: *2.1.* Principles for management of natural resources are agreed upon and allow multipurpose use of resources		
2.1.1. A methodology compiled for implementation of ILMF practice at the local level	▪ Compile and adapt a methodology and guidelines on best land use management practices ▪ Link guidelines with existing planning processes, such as spatial planning and planning documents in relevant sectors, and existing requirements of Serbian legislation	Y3
2.1.2. A package of trade-off measures developed and tested at community and local levels	▪ Selection of areas for testing of community trade-off measures ▪ Drafting and testing of measures ▪ Preparing the package of trade-off measures, following and informing the ILMF	Y3
COMPONENT 3: Capacity building, awareness raising and sharing learned lessons with main stakeholders and wider public based on sustainable monitoring system Outcomes: *3.1. Strengthened capacities of major stakeholders for sustainable practices in sectors competing for land area and natural resources* *3.2. Ensured broad and high level commitment to expanding and replicating measures for integrated SLM; ensured public support for remediation and SLM of environmental/ industrial hotspots*		
3.1.1 Support to the National Laboratory within SEPA for soil sampling and quality analysis is provided	▪ Drafting a manual on certification process and standards, introducing analytical methods for monitoring soil quality ▪ Training of staff during the certification process	Y1/Y2
3.1.2 Baseline information and methods established, and capacity strengthened for a monitoring and reporting system on soil quality and land degradation	▪ Calculate baseline concentration of heavy metals in soils - level of pollution should be determined against geochemical (natural) composition ▪ Building capacity for data collection, monitoring and reporting by the SEPA – focal point for data collection on soils – in accordance with national and international standards; including measures to integrate all relevant soil and land information being collected by various institutions in Serbia	Y1/Y2
3.1.3. Communication and outreach	▪ Meetings with local community representatives, and local and regional NGOs dealing with land degradation, climate change, pollution and environment to establish demands for capacity building and	Y2

conducted in different regions of Serbia	awareness raising ▪ Collection of photographs during field trips, video footage; Collecting paper information from Local Authorities and Operators ▪ Compilation of collected information and material for production of publications ▪ Carry out thematic workshops and seminars on land degradation, integrated planning and eco-system management focusing on the issues raised during stakeholder and consultative meetings ▪ Train local municipalities on how to integrate provisions of ILMF into local priorities, plans and projects	Y1 Y3
3.1.4 Interactive hotspot map developed and made available to the public	▪ Develop an interactive map with hotspots to be hosted on the SEPA website, and establish online tools for monitoring and data collection ▪ Integrate collection of information to online and other available tools for data collection and stakeholder communication	Y2 Y3
3.2.1 A conference aimed at presenting best practices in integrated land management in Serbia and the region is organized	▪ Celebration, and promotion activities aimed at supporting the “2015 Year of Soils” ▪ International Scientific Conference on best land management practices, adaptation and resilience to development and climate challenges, held in Serbia, ▪ Dissemination of the proceedings	Y1/Y2
3.2.2. A platform for monitoring of impact on land degradation (physical, environmental, social and economic impacts) is created	▪ Support the initial operations of the SEPA as a universal data collection and validation focal point/body at the level of Serbia ▪ Publication of collected data and monitoring results	Y2 Y2/Y3

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

The PIF was accepted without any further queries and amendment requests..

However, stakeholder consultations during the PPG phase suggested minor reorganization and reformulation of the original project outcomes and outputs approved by the major stakeholder groups.as presented in table B.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS[6]

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

Project title: Enhanced Cross-sectoral Land Management through Land Use Pressure Reduction and Planning In Serbia

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 27,397

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	***GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)***			***In-kind contribution by project partners ($)***
	Budgeted Amount	***Amount Spent To Date***	***Amount Committed***	
PPG coordination	6,000	6,000		
SSFA with NGO Fea (UNCCD CSO board representative) for baseline data collection, completion and facilitation of project CEO endorsement package	10,697	-	10,697	
Stakeholder Meetings at local and national level bringing together technical staff and key stakeholders to deliberate on baseline circumstances, project design, implementation strategy, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements	10,700	10,700	-	20,000
Total	**27,397**	**16,700**	**10,697**	**20,000**

[6] If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used**)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A