

Enhancing Lebanon's Institutional and Technical Capacities for Compliance with the Paris Agreement's Enhanced Transparency Framework (CBIT2)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12352
Countries
Lebanon
Project Name
Enhancing Lebanon's Institutional and Technical Capacities for Compliance with
the Paris Agreement's Enhanced Transparency Framework (CBIT2)
Agencies
UNDP
Date received by PM
5/23/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Milena Vasquez
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
MSP

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes, the project objective and associated components, outcomes and outputs are clear and sound.

Agency's Comments

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

MGV, 5/27/2026: Please ensure that the findings from the gender analysis informs the preparation of the Gender Action Plan and that key elements of the GAP are reflected in the project components. Please ensure that in the development of the project results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. Please indicate measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.). Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

MGV, 6/8/2026: Above comment has been addressed.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response 8 June 2026 -

Noted and addressed.

The Theory of Change barriers have been strengthened to reflect that gender analysis findings need to be translated into a GAP with clear measures, indicators, budgets, monitoring arrangements, and adaptive management mechanisms.

Key GAP measures have also been mainstreamed into the project components in line with the existing project logic: Component 1 now reflects integration of relevant GAP measures into taskforce ToRs, SOPs and operational texts, including women's participation targets, gender-responsive governance provisions, NCLW engagement, sex-disaggregated participation records, and reporting responsibilities; Component 2 now reflects incorporation of gender-responsive fields and sex-disaggregated data templates into MISCAL where relevant, as well as sex-disaggregated tracking of training participation and results; and Component 3 now includes monitoring and reporting on gender-specific results and implementation of the GAP through regular monitoring reports, PIRs, Project Board reviews and the terminal evaluation. The Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment section has also been revised to clarify that GAP implementation will be supported through relevant component budgets, including gender-sensitive capacity-building, engagement of NCLW, gender-responsive reporting templates, sex-disaggregated data collection, monitoring and adaptive management.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes components are adequately funded and PMC is 10% for MSP.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes, including information from the first CBIT project's terminal evaluation in Lebanon.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes the project is adequately justified.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes the theory of change is well described.

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes the incremental reasoning is properly described.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

MGV, 5/27/2026: Implementation framework, including coordination with ongoing initiatives, and knowledge and learning plans are adequate.

The agency is requesting exception for dual implementation and execution roles due to Lebanon's FCS status and ongoing financial, socio-economic, and institutional crisis. **This was approved by the Programming Manager in June 2025** (see uploaded correspondence and associated submissions, including the Letter of Support from the OFP and UNDP's justification.)

Agency's Comments

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes, these are reasonable for a CBIT project.

Agency's Comments

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

MGV, 5/27/2026: Attached Environmental and Social Safeguards Screening document and the Environmental and Social Safeguards in D. Policy requirements (page 32) concludes Low risk, but appears as Moderate in the Key Risks table (page 28). Please confirm rating and ensure they are consistent.

Ratings and explanations are missing for Institutional and Policy" and "Fiduciary" risks, which are relevant to this project. Please complete. Execution risk: The Technological risk (Moderate) partially addresses execution, but fiduciary and capacity risks under UNDP's DIM modality are not addressed. Since UNDP is both Agency and Executing Partner under DIM, the project should confirm that this arrangement has been reviewed for any capacity or conflict-of-interest considerations.

MGV, 6/8/2026: Above comment has been addressed.

Agency's Comments

8 June 2026 - UNDP Response

The PIF Key Risks table has been updated to ensure consistency with the SESP. Environmental and Social risk rating has been corrected to Low. Missing ratings and explanations for Institutional and Policy and Fiduciary risks have been added (both Moderate) with mitigation measures. Capacity, Technological, and Political/Governance risks have been clarified, including DIM execution considerations and gender-responsive mitigation measures. Overall risk remains Moderate. Mitigation measures, including gender-sensitive participation, legal anchoring, SOPs, MISCAL sustainability, and fiduciary controls under DIM, are reflected in the PIF narrative and component activities.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes, the project will contribute to policy coherence as it builds on existing transparency systems under the framework of the Climate Change Law. The project is building/scaling up from the CBIT 1 project.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes, the project is aligned with 2.1 Support capacity-building needs for transparency under the Paris Agreement through CBIT; and 2.2 Support relevant Convention obligations and enabling activities.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes, the project will help Lebanon respond to its transparency obligations under the Paris Agreement.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes, the project will be financed from the CBIT CCM Set Aside.

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: No PPG is requested.

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes, the project is a national project

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

MGV, 5/27/2026: The PIF is almost ready for technical clearance, except for the comment on the Risks section. Will send along for OP review to accelerate clearance process.

MGV, 6/8/2026: The project is technically cleared.

Agency's Comments
9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval

Secretariat's CommentsMGV, 5/27/2026: If by the time of CEO Endorsement request the Technical Expert Review process has been completed, please incorporate those findings into the project design.

Agency's Comments
Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	6/3/2026	6/8/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/8/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		