



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

GEF ID:	<b>5302</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Bosnia-Herzegovina</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Capacity Development for the Integration of Global Environmental Commitments into National Policies and Development Decision Making</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CD-2; CD-4; CD-5;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,438,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$2,115,870</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$3,553,870</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>September 12, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Ludgarde Coppens</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1.Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes, Bosnia-Herzegovina has ratified the UNFCCC on September 7, 2000, the CBD 26 of August, 2002 and the UNCCCD on 26 of August, 2002.  Cleared 03/11/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014
	2.Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes, with letter dated January 31, 2013.  Cleared 03/11/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	N/A

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

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes. CCCD allocation.  Cleared 03/11/2013	Yes. From resources from CCCD allocation. Cleared 06/26/2014
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?  <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>Yes. The project is consistent with CCCD Objectives 2 (To generate, access and use information and knowledge) and objective 4 (To strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines). However, some of the expected outputs (such as 1.2.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3) are more attuned to Objective 5 (to enhance capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends).</p> <p>Please review Table B accordingly. Additional information is requested 03/11/2013</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 05/02/2013</p>	Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	Yes. Cleared. 03/11/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and</p>	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	based on sound data and assumptions?		
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>To some extent. However, the air quality components do not seem eligible to be funded by the GEF. If this refers to physical infrastructure it should be financed from other sources, not GEF resources. Please revise and clarify accordingly.</p> <p>Additional information and clarifications are requested. 03/11/2013</p> <p>There's no precedent of purchase of equipment under the CCCD strategy. In addition, this is not comparable to a Chemicals FA project. We would like to see more details about this item: how much is being budgeted for the equipment? Please provide additional information. 05/02/2013</p> <p>As mentioned before, this type of equipment purchase is not eligible under the capacity development strategy and its corresponding objectives. Please remove this item from the grant budget or use co-financing to cover its expense.</p> <p>Modification is requested. 06/05/2013</p> <p>The revised PIF provides a better clarification regarding the importance of the measuring stations in the project and how the government will take care of its maintenance. Concrete results will be derived from this investment.</p>	Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared 06/27/2013	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		<p>To some extent, the socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions were included in the PIF. However, the CEO approval document does not elaborate on those, and does not explain for instance how the project will include gender disaggregated data.</p> <p>Please review.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 06/26/2014</p> <p>07/10/2014 UA: Additional information has been provided.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2013	<p>To some extent, the PIF included mention of CSOs as users of the EMIS. However, please for the CEO approval document include the specific role and mechanisms in which the public and civil society organizations in particular will participate in the project.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 06/26/2014</p> <p>07/10/2014 UA: Additional information</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			has been provided.  Cleared
	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)	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>There is no mention of the project's innovative aspects. Please clarify. Additional information is requested, 03/11/2013.</p> <p>The revised PIF includes a paragraph on the project's innovativeness. It's based on the establishment of a centralized environmental monitoring and information system for capturing environmental data to contribute to better integrated national environmental management, an innovation in the fragmented insitutional landscape of the country.</p> <p>Cleared 05/02/2013</p>	<p>Since the completion of the PPG, please ellaborate on the following aspects of the project:</p> <p>The project's innovative aspects. The project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. The Project's potential for scaling up based on its intervention.</p> <p>Additional information is requested.</p> <p>06/26/2014</p> <p>07/10/2014 UA: Additional information has been provided.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>Yes. The baseline has been reviewed and an objective and output modified accordingly.</p> <p>Cleared 06/26/2014</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014
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?	<p>Somewhat. However, please see # 7 above and clarify/adjust accordingly.</p> <p>Co-financing is slightly less than 1:1. Please review and increase co-financing. In addition, cash co-financing should be increased. Sop far it's only 9% of the total cost.</p> <p>Additional information is requested 03/11/2013.</p> <p>The co-financing has been reviewed. However, there are inconsistencies between tables A and B. The totals here under both columns do not coincide. Please review. In addition, please complete Table D with the amount of co-financing to match tables A and B under the multi-focal area option. Additional revision is requested. 05/02/2013</p> <p>Again, please review amounts for Tables A and B. The totals here under both columns do not coincide. Please review. PMIS is throwing an error message due to this inconsistency.</p> <p>Again, please complete Table D with the amount requested to match GEF's contribution in tables A and B under the</p>	<p>In-kind co-financing has been significantly increased.</p> <p>Cleared 06/26/2014</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		multi-focal area option.  Additional revision is requested. 06/05/2013  Completed. Cleared 06/27/2013	
	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?	It seems low. UNEP has indicated that additional co-financing will be explored during PPG phase. Please clarify why at this stage the co-financing from the agency is not more significant. 03/11/2013  Co-financing reviewed. However, please refer to point 16 above about the inconsistencies in the co-financing amounts.  Revision requested. 05/02/2013  Please review tables A and B as per point above. 06/05/2013  Reviewed. Cleared 06/27/2013	Letters of co-financing have been provided.  Cleared 06/26/2014
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014
	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?	Not yet. Once the PIF has been approved, PPG may be recommended. 03/11/2013.  PPG is included and the amount conforms to the level. Once the PIF is approved, the PPG amount can be approved. 06/05/2013  Cleared 06/27/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes. Cleared 06/26/2014
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		To some extent. However, as indicated above in the relevant section, please include gender disaggregated indicators, where appropriate.  Additional information is requested.  06/26/2014  07/10/2014 UA: Additional information has been provided.  Cleared
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		n/a
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• The Council?		n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet. Please respond to the comments/recommendations above. In addition, please provide the agency fee calculation in Table D. This table has to be completed.  03/11/2013  Not yet. Please respond to the revisions	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>requested above. In addition, please complete Table D.</p> <p>05/02/2013</p> <p>Not yet. Please respond to the revisions requested above. In addition, please complete Table D. 06/05/2013</p> <p>Yes, the PIF has been technically cleared and it's being recommended. 06/27/2013</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Additional co-financing will be explored during the preparation phase.</p> <p>Additional expertise and support through organizations such as EEA, the UNSD and WCMC will be brought in during the preparation phase.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>Not yet. There are a few questions that require revision. Please see #10,13 and 22 above.</p> <p>07/10/2014 UA: Additional information has been provided.</p> <p>The MSP is recommended for CEO approval.</p>
	First review*	March 11, 2013	June 26, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 02, 2013	July 10, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 05, 2013	

\* **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.**