



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>5125</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Lebanon</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Sustainable Agricultural Livelihoods in Marginal Areas (SALMA)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>World Bank</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>131431 (World Bank)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-2; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$7,147,635</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$26,100,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$33,247,635</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 01, 2012</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Bonizella Biagini</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Song Li</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	YES. Lebanon is a non-Annex I Party to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated September 5, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. The World Bank has considerable experience in sustainable land and water management for climate change adaptation.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	YES. The proposed project contributes towards the World Bank's Country Partnership Strategy, and would build on a \$20 million IBRD investment project.	

Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	YES. The proposed grant (\$7.86 million, including Agency fee) is available under the SCCF Adaptation Program.	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2 and, specifically, outcomes 1.3 and 2.3. Given that activities proposed for SCCF funding would be strongly geared towards reforestation and afforestation, however, the project appears to correspond well to outcome 1.2 and output 1.2.1 "Vulnerable physical natural and social assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts".</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the Focal Area Strategy Framework captures the most relevant CCA outcomes and outputs, towards which the proposed project would contribute.</p>	

		Strategy Framework has been revised as recommended.	
	9. 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?	YES. The proposed project is aligned with Lebanon's national priorities for climate change adaptation, as articulated in the National Capacity Self-Assessment and Second National Communication.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>NOT CLEAR. While the project seeks to build the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture, it is not clear how the project would ensure that the local beneficiaries have the knowledge and skills to adopt and to manage the water harvesting and irrigation technologies introduced, and that forest resources are utilized in a sustainable manner beyond project completion.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how (i) the project will build the capacity of smallholder farmers to adopt and to manage the water harvesting and irrigation technologies introduced; and (ii) ensure that forest resources are used in a sustainable manner beyond project completion.</p> <p>09/19/2012 -- YES. Component 3 has been revised as recommended to include capacity building to ensure that local beneficiaries have the knowledge and skills to adopt and to manage the water harvesting and irrigation technologies introduced, and that forest resources are utilized in a sustainable manner beyond project completion.</p>	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on the IBRD-financed SAIMA project and the IFAD Hillv	

Project Design	<p>sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Development (HASAD) project. It is not entirely clear how the two projects are vulnerable to the effects of climate change, or unable to fully address such effects on their beneficiaries.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please elaborate how the two baseline projects are vulnerable to the effects of climate change, or unable to fully address such effects.</p> <p>09/19/2012 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies that the two baseline projects may become vulnerable to more frequent and more intense flooding, and that the projects are unable to reach all vulnerable communities and ecosystems in the targeted regions.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. In the absence of a description of the vulnerabilities and gaps found in the baseline projects, the additional cost reasoning cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.</p> <p>The PIF suggests that the SCCF grant would be necessary to respond to national priorities to expand forest areas. The hill lakes established through SCCF financing would enable planted seedlings to be irrigated. Finally, the SCCF grant would build the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture to measure</p>	

While reforestation and afforestation may enhance the resilience of ecosystems and communities in the face of climate change, it is not clear whether the activities proposed for SCCF financing have adaptation as their primary objective. In particular, the PIF does not demonstrate that the project would target the human and natural systems most at risk from climate change. As for monitoring and measuring carbon sequestration, this does not appear to be directly relevant for adaptation.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please (i) adjust the additional cost reasoning accordingly, if necessary. Moreover, kindly (ii) demonstrate that the activities proposed for SCCF funding take adaptation as their primary objective, or propose alternative adaptation measures; and (iii) consider seeking more appropriate sources of financing for the carbon monitoring activities proposed.

09/19/2012 -- YES. The additional cost reasoning, along with the activities proposed for SCCF financing, have been revised and clarified as recommended.

By CEO Endorsement, please demonstrate that the reforestation activities and the establishment of additional hill lakes, proposed for SCCF financing, target the communities and ecosystems that are most vulnerable to

		scientific and technical assessments.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the project framework accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>09/19/2012 -- YES. The project framework has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please describe the adaptation benefits associated with the activities proposed for SCCF financing.</p> <p>09/19/2012 -- YES. The adaptation benefits have been adequately described in the re-submission.</p>	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	YES. Public participation is adequately described for this stage of project development.	

	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would target areas in North Lebanon, which may face insecurity and political risks.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide further information about the security situation in the targeted regions.</p> <p>09/19/2012 -- YES. As recommended, the PIF provides additional information about the political and security situation in North Lebanon. The selection of project sites will be guided by more detailed risk assessments.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF cites only the two baseline initiatives. It is not clear, however, how the project will be coordinated with the IFAD-Adaptation Fund project, Climate Smart Agriculture: Enhancing Adaptive Capacity of the Rural Communities in Lebanon (AgriCAL). The PIF should also include any other relevant initiatives in the areas of forest management, agriculture and rural development, with which coordination will be sought.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) provide a complete list of other relevant initiatives, with which coordination will be sought; and (ii) demonstrate that the proposed project will not duplicate efforts carried out under AgriCAL.</p> <p>09/19/2012 -- YES. Section B.6 of the PIF has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>YES.</p>	

	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. The funding level for project management is appropriate at \$340,363 or less than five per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.  RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component, if necessary.  09/19/2012 -- YES. The grant amounts per component have been adjusted as recommended.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	At \$26.1 million, the indicative co-financing is appropriate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. In line with its role, the World Bank is bringing \$20 million in the form of a loan to the Government of Lebanon.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

	adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 19 and 24.  09/19/2012 -- YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	

	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.