



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	<b>4818</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Lebanon</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Revision/updating of the NBSAP, preparation of 5th National Report to CBD and undertaking clearing house mechanism activities</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$180,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$220,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$400,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jaime Cavalier</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Edoardo Zandri</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	3-02-12 Yes. Lebanon is an eligible country for GEF support. Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	3-2-12 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$242,000 dated 2-3-12. Cleared
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	3-2-12 Yes. UNEP has a comparative advantage. Cleared
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	3-2-12 UNEP plans to provide technical support to this project from Headquarters in Nairobi (Task Manager and Fund Manager), and the Regional Office for Western Asia. Cleared
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAP allocation?</li> </ul>	N/A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>3-2-12 Yes. Nonetheless, the total request is too high for Lebanon. See below</p> <p>4-12-12 Addressed in the revised EA. The budget request is now \$198,000 (inclusive the Agency fees).</p>
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	<p>3-2-12 Yes. See p. 9 of EA. Cleared</p>
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	<p>3-2-12 Yes. See p. 9 of EA. Cleared</p>
	8. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	<p>3-2-12 Yes. Cleared</p>
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>3-2-12 Are the outcomes of the EA sustainable behind the life and budget of the EA? How is the EA going to contribute to the institutional and financial sustainability of the outcomes?</p> <p>4-12-12 Addressed in the revised EA. Cleared.</p>
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>3-2-12 Yes. This EA has the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stocktaking and assessment</li> <li>2. National Targets, principles and priorities of the strategy</li> <li>3. Strategy and action plan development</li> <li>4. Development of implementation plans</li> <li>5. Institutional, monitoring, reporting and exchange.</li> </ol>

		Cleared
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	3-2-12 Addressed under Component 2. Cleared
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	3-2-12 Addressed under Component 2. Cleared
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	3-2-12 Cleared.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	3-2-12 The project will be executed by the Ministry of the Environment. Cleared
Project Financing	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	3-2-12 Yes. It is 10% of the GEF funding. Cleared
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	3-2-12 The funding request \$200,000 is far too much an update of the NBSAP Phases I and II, for a country with significant information already available as clearly demonstrated on pages 6 & 7 of the original submission, and relatively small size compared with other GEF eligible countries. Please reconsider the budget for Personnel (consultants = \$51,000), Workshops (\$61,500), Equipment (\$12,000) and Reports (\$6,000).  4-12-12 Addressed in the revised EA. The funding request is now \$180,000 (+IA fees). The budget for consultant has decreased from \$51,000 to \$41,000. The budget for workshops has decreased from \$61,500 to \$38,000. The budget for equipment has decreased from \$12,000 to \$7,500. The budget for report has decreased from \$6,000 to \$4,000. Cleared.
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	3-2-12 The co-financing (in-kind) is appropriate, assuming it becomes effective during project implementation. Cleared

	bringing to the project in line with its role?*	No co-financing from UNEP. Cleared
Agency Responses	19. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	<b>20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	3-2-12 No. Please address issues under items 5, 9 and 16. Thanks.  4-12-12 Adequate justifications and clarifications have been provided and the EA is being recommended for clearance.
Review Date (s)	First review**	March 02, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	

**\*\* 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.**