

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

Review PIF 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

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

4/19/2023

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Not fully.

While the project objective is clear, it is unclear how the project will address other drivers of forest degradation beyond wildfires. These drivers are partly mentioned in para 14 of the PID, but need to be better elaborated on (and termed "drivers" if possible).

It appears that the project has in fact a broader approach that goes beyond wildfire prevention/mitigation, taking into account that it is designed as a MFA generating multiple LD, BD, and CC benefits. The summary statement also indicates that "The project will not only reduce wildfire risks but also enhance people's livelihoods and create job opportunities while delivering global environmental benefits such as carbon sequestration, ecosystem resilience, biodiversity conservation, and forest landscape restoration."

Further, the key results presented in para 46, 47 include activities/indicators on sustainable forest management, restoration, bio-corridors, livelihoods, etc.

This is not well reflected in the ToC presented in the Annex of the PID. The ToC should incorporate other activities and the pathways that address drivers of degradation beyond wildfires. Please amend.

05/11/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

The PCN was updated as follows:

New paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 added to discuss direct and indirect drivers of deforestation and forest degradation added. Please note that there is no comprehensive study on these drivers available, hence, there is also no ranking. We are currently finalizing a Lebanon Forest note which summarizes drivers listed in various documents. Based on discussions with various stakeholders, forest fires have become a main threat, hence, the project will focus on forest fires while also addressing other drivers associated with it.

The ToC was updated accordingly.

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Not fully.

See comments on ToC above.

05/11/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

TOC was updated as per comments above.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

04/19/2023: Not fully.

1) Please enter the relevant information in this portal section on Coordination and cooperation with ongoing projects in a concise way.

2) Further, on Knowledge Management:

The overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning (KM&L) has not been adequately described in the Project Description. The M&E section of the proposal includes some KM&L deliverables such as good practice notes, knowledge exchange events, south-south visits and training program. But no details are provided and it is not clear why these project activities are presented as part of M&E. Also, for a project of that size (\$3.5 million in GEF funds and \$126 million in co-financing), the proposed KM&L deliverables and budget seem rather insubstantial. There is also no mention of a communications strategy/plan for the project.

Please describe the overall KM&L approach by addressing key GEF KM&L expectations at PIF stage as follows:

- an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept,
- plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations,
- processes to capture, assess and document info, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation,
- tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration, including knowledge platforms and websites,

- knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders (at community, national and international levels as appropriate,)
- a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project/program impact and sustainability, and
- plans for strategic communications and outreach.

Accordingly, please consider separating proposed KM&L activities from M&E and either integrate them to other existing project components or present them in a separate knowledge exchange and community capacity development/learning component. It should also include a brief description of a Communications Strategy/Plan for outreach, awareness raising and dissemination of outputs/results.

05/11/2023: Addressed.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

1) on coordination with ongoing projects, New paragraphs 60 ? 62 provide additional information on the GATE project and the assurance that during project preparation, a strong coordination mechanism will be developed.

The team has added a list of relevant projects completed or still in implementation (paragraph 63) that have high potential to inform either the KM/L work of the proposed project or will also be closely consulted with.

2) on KM&L, The KM/L section has been separated from the M&E section. During project preparation, a comprehensive KM/L plan will be developed. Paragraphs 70-75 provide further detail to reflect the emerging activities to be included in the plan.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

04/19/2023: Not fully.

In the risk section of the PID, climate risks have not been described and addressed. Please amend. This is essential in the context of the project.

Further, please clarify if a separate ESS screen is available to upload in Annex D.

05/11/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

A climate risk screening had been performed for the project and uploaded in the roadmap.

A preliminary ESS screen has also been prepared and included in the project document in para 88. A full ESS screen is being conducted and will be available prior to commencing project preparation.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

This is well described in the PID.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank 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's Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank 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's Comments

04/19/2023: No.

Please add this information to para 18 of the PID.

05/11/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Paragraph 22 has been enhanced and discusses now consistency of the targets identified in Lebanon's NBSAP with the Aichi targets^[1] and goals of the "Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework". Please note that the GoL has not yet conducted a formal matching exercise between the NBSAP targets and the 23 targets discussed in the "Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework".

[1]

<https://www.cbd.int/countries/targets/?country=lb#:~:text=By%202030%2C%20the%20status%20of,on%2050%25%20of%20threatened%20species.&text=By%202030%2C%20the%20genetic%20diversity,%20and%20Ex%20situ>

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/19/2023: The project lists stakeholders consulted during the PIF development, however, it does not clearly elaborate plans to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan in Section B. Please elaborate.

05/11/2023: Addressed.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Paragraphs 79 and 80 now discuss that a stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) to be developed during project preparation and will focus on important stakeholder groups for the project. Meaningful stakeholder consultations will be conducted to strengthen inputs to the SEP.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Yes, however, please address inconsistency between the Financing table and Focal Area elements table with regards to CCM-1-3 or CCM-1-4, whichever focal area objective is relevant and applicable for this project.

05/11/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Financing table and Focal Area elements table updated to both reflect CCM-1-4.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

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 Comments

04/19/2023: No PPG requested.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Letter signed by OFP.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Comments n/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 Comments

04/19/2023: Not fully.

Please also upload the map in Annex C, so that all reviewers/stakeholders have access.

05/11/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Map uploaded in Annex C

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 Comments

04/19/2023: Please clarify if a separate ESS document is available. If so, please upload here.

05/11/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Preliminary ESS included in para 88 of the project document. Separate ESS screen is being prepared and will be available prior to commencing project preparation.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

04/19/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/19/2023: No. Please address comments made in this review.

05/11/2023: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO clearance.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Comments addressed and PID/PCN document updated accordingly

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

| | PIF Review | Agency Response |
|---|------------------|-----------------|
| First Review | 4/19/2023 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 5/11/2023 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |