



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	<b>5415</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Lebanon</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Assist Lebanon in the preparation of its First Biennial Update Report (BUR) for the fulfilment of the obligations under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5202 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$321,461</b>
Co-financing:		Total Project Cost:	<b>\$321,461</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Rawleston Moore</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Yamil Bonduki,</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes , Lebanon is eligible to receive resources.`
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	A letter from the operational focal point is on the file.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	UNDP has the comparative advantage for this type of proposal.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	Yes the project fits into the Agency's program and staff capacity in country
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	
	• the focal area allocation?	
	• focal area set-aside?	The resources are available from the focal area setaside.
	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Yes the project is aligned with the focal area results framework.

Project Consistency		
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	Yes GEF CCM-6 is identified
	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?	The project is consistent with the recipient countries strategies and plans.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, the proposal articulates how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of the project outcomes.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes, the project framework is sound and clear
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	Yes, there is a description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, public participation is considered in the project.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is consistent with other initiatives in the country.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project implementation and execution arrangements are adequate.
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	Yes the itemized budget is justified.
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The level of funding for project management is appropriate.

	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The funding is appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	Cofinancing is not required, as this project is financed at full cost.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	N/A
	20. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for financial management and procurement assessment.	
Agency Responses	21. 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>22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	The enabling activity is recommended for approval.
Review Date (s)	First review**	
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	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.**