



Community-based Wildfire Risk Management in Lebanon's Vulnerable Landscapes

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11117

Countries

Lebanon

Project Name

Community-based Wildfire Risk Management in Lebanon's Vulnerable Landscapes

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

6/24/2024

Review completed by PM

7/8/2024

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

2. Project Summary.

a) 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 outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- 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?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSPs up to \$2 million) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

07/08/2024: Additional comments on gender:

? As per GEF guidance, gender equality considerations should be mainstreamed throughout the project, including in the project description and in the project components and outputs.

? Please integrate in the project documentation that i) policies and frameworks are gender responsive (e.g. Fire Emergency Fund, Curriculum of Forest Academy, Forest Management Plan), ii) training is targeted to women, e.g. in MSMEs, biodiversity assessments, forest guards, etc. iii) KM and communications products feature good practices and lessons learned on gender mainstreaming/women's empowerment and iv) under M&E, gender dimensions are monitored and reported on.

07/15/2024: Comments have been adequately addressed, referring to agency response below as well as in the documentation.

Cleared

Agency Response

The team has developed a GAP for the project which has a lot of detail on how gender will be integrated into the project activities. The GAP will be part of the POM for the project.

The project document has fully integrated the gender dimensions:

? gender-responsive capacity enhancement and knowledge sharing using and improving existing networks, including first responder networks,

- ? gender responsive evaluation and adaptive learning.
- ? gender inclusion into forestry and forest fire management;
- ? involve all relevant stakeholders to regularly monitor project implementation outcomes, with a particular attention to gender

Para 89 and 90 of the project document provides details on gender mainstreaming for each component of the project:

89. *Gender.* During the project preparation, a gender assessment was carried out as part of social assessment (ESF ESS1) to identify project-relevant gender gaps and actions needed to address these gaps. The assessment built on existing data from Lebanon to inform the identification of gender gaps related to specific outcomes on issues such as employment in the firefighting sector and related topics (gender norms and roles, skills, etc.) as well as on worldwide gender case and research studies. The assessment further identifies any gender-differentiated needs and concerns related to project activities. Based on the assessment, the project document incorporated specific actions and indicators, and a Gender Action Plan was developed to further guide the implementation of these actions.

90. All activities under the project are gender responsive, including capacity development (incl. training for first responders and local civil defense centers; readiness and engaging in the voluntary carbon market and certification, forensic forest fire investigation, etc.); implementation of gender responsive operational forest management plans in fire hotspot zones; and community-based forest management for promoting sustainable livelihoods and green jobs which would focus on women and youth empowerment (including support for nature reserve committees and their teams to be trained and equipped to address fire risks in nature reserves). Based on the gender analysis, key activities to ensure gender mainstreaming were defined in the gender action plan including:

i. Under Component 1:

- ? Ensure the inclusion of men and women, at national and local levels, in consultations and decision-making processes from design to implementation and monitoring of the coordination mechanism on integrated wildfire risk management.
- ? Establish a collaborative network between forest guards and first responder teams, men and women, to exchange knowledge and experience. The civil defence members, men and women, must not be excluded from the process.
- ? Raising awareness of local communities has been repeated as a key activity across all hotspot areas, involving not only men and women but also universities and schoolchildren. Therefore, it is important to ensure that awareness campaigns use gender-inclusive language

and content. At the same time, it is key to engage women from the targeted hotspot areas in the design process to ensure social and cultural aspects are appropriately considered.

? Integrate within CBFM gender-inclusive training and budget to promote the role and sustainable livelihoods and green jobs for men, women, youth and persons with disabilities. Identify both direct and indirect forest users, men and women, and the extent to which community members, especially vulnerable groups like women, youth, and herders, rely on forest resources for their livelihoods, and plan green businesses accordingly.

? Identify a man and a woman among private landowners in each hotspot area to act as champions.

? Drawing inspiration from international best practices, consider building expertise of women in tasks traditionally assigned to men.

ii. Under Component 2:

? Establish and support women-led first responder teams;

? Diversify first responder-teams in municipalities and teams in the Civil Response Units;

? Supply responder teams with gender-appropriate gear, equipment and outfits, as needed;

? Conduct forest management and post-fire restoration activities with gender-diverse teams.

iii. Under Component 3:

? To monitor and update regularly the GAP, including indicators.

? Develop a comprehensive KM/L plan and implemented with gender-inclusive language, content, and actions. The plan will be updated annually in line with the Project progress.

? Disseminate regularly the Project findings that reflect best practices, success stories, and lessons learned for addressing the interests and needs of both women and men involved in sustainable forest management and livelihoods derived from forests. Such learning should emphasize the social, cultural, and economic specificities of the area/ municipality from which women or men originate, demonstrating how these factors can shape forest management strategies and actions.

The gender mainstreaming under each components has been added to project description and outputs.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental

degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) 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?

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic co-benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed budget table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

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

k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects OFP to request exception).

Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits ambitious yet realistic?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Clarification request:

The GEF core indicators have been reduced and are relatively modest for this level of investment. Please consider estimating a target **?Forest area brought under management plans?** and include this target under either 4.3 or 4.4 as appropriate.

07/08/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

The estimates at PIF stage were made based on the potential for forest landscape restoration and SFM in the three hotspots. During project preparation, it was decided to focus within the hotspots on (a) areas under very high and high fire risks and without SFM plans, and (b) highly-degraded post-fire areas in need of stabilization and reforestation. For these area activity costs were estimated:

Post-fire restoration ? very high and high risk areas: USD3416/ha ? we hope to get the numbers lower by avoiding fencing and instead have agreements with herders on grazing areas and times. That would increase the area we can have as target. But we need to see when implementation has started.

- SFM with focus on reducing fire risks: USD516 per ha

The targets were adjusted accordingly.

And confirmed that for indicator 4, we will add the ~2500ha under 4.3 as opposed to 4.1 which is what we had on PIF.

5.4 Risks

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- 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 assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

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

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/01/2024: Please clarify whether a separate gender action plan has been uploaded.

07/08/2024: Has been uploaded.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

Yes, GAP uploaded in the project Roadmap.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Please clarify whether a separate stakeholder engagement plan has been uploaded.

07/08/2024: Has been uploaded.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

Yes, SEP uploaded in the project Roadmap.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Please clarify whether a separate safeguards document has been uploaded and/or if the CDR serves as the safeguards document.

07/08/2024: Has been uploaded.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

Separate ESRS uploaded in the roadmap.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs were provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Please insert the entire project results framework (PDO is missing). Also, provide an explanation whether this is the new World Bank format for Project logframes?

07/08/2024: Addressed. The logframe is automatically created by the World Bank portal.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you, entire RF with PDO is updated in portal.

In terms of the log frame format ? this is automatically produced through the Operations Portal. We are following the [Bank's Small TF IPF Procedure](#).

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table?

(Note: the provision of maps is at the discretion of agencies considering sensitivities in the given context)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Please insert the budget table in the portal template.

07/08/2024: Addressed, no need to paste. Budget table is visible in the print version of the GEF portal template.

However, please address the following:

- please provide a brief justification for purchase of motorized vehicle from GEF project budget.

07/15/2024: The purchase of motorized vehicles specifically for fire fighting is considered justified. Program Manager approves the purchase from GEF grant.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

Project Budget attached in the roadmap as per the instructions in Portal (The portal requires an attachment and an explanation if needed).

Please advise if we should also copy/paste the budget in explanation box.

Response comment from 07/08/2024

Civil defense have only large fire trucks which cannot be used to get to fires in higher mountain areas. The use of smaller trucks and UTVs with smaller water tanks will allow early responders to quickly get to fires and reduce likelihood that fires spread over larger areas. The project will buy only small trucks and UTVs for municipalities in fire hotspot areas that don't have any.

Below are photos:

UTVs with 100 l water tank used by early responders



Trucks with 250 l water tank and equipment



Civil Defense Fire Trucks

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

ANNEX I: Responses to Project Reviews

8.11 a) Have responses to Council comments, if any, at PIF/PCN stage been provided?

b) Have responses to STAP screen, if any, been provided?

c) Have responses to other comments, if any, been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval /endorsement

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/01/2024: No. Please address clarification requests and provide missing information before the PM will request PPO review and complete the review.

07/08/2024: No. Please address two additional comments.

07/15/2024: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/1/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/8/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/15/2024	

**CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)