



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

GEF ID:	5229		
Country/Region:	Lebanon		
Project Title:	Sustainable Land Management in the Qaroun Catchment		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1; LD-2; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,187,671
Co-financing:	\$18,050,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,337,671
PIF Approval:	February 20, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Johan Robinson

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	January 7, 2013 Yes, Lebanon is eligible under the UNCCD. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	January 7, 2013 Yes Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	January 7, 2013 Yes, UNDP has an established national framework, and implemented related	Confirmed.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		GEF projects in the country that will serve as basis for the proposed project. Cleared	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/a	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	January 7, 2013 Yes. The project is in line with UNDP's country program, which is developed and implemented jointly with the government of Lebanon. Cleared	Confirmed.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	January 7, 2013 Yes, Lebanon has a total allocation \$6.25 million, of which \$4.25 million for LD and BD is still available. Cleared	Cleared at PIF level.
	• the focal area allocation?	January 7, 2013 The country is exercising its flexibility under the STAR rules, and proposes to utilize \$1.2 million of BD and \$2.4 million of LD resources for this stand-alone LD project. Cleared	Cleared.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/a	NA

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/a	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/a	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>No FA set-aside funding is being requested.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the project is aligned with the LD focal area strategy.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	Addressed.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the project will specifically contribute to LD1 (agro-ecosystems), LD2 (forest landscapes), and LD3 (integration of land uses) within the targeted watershed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	The relevant GEF5 objectives are identified: LD1, LD2, and LD3.
	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?	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the proposed project is consistent with the country's NAP, which will ensure support for implementation of the UNCCD.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	Addressed.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes. Capacity development efforts will target project beneficiaries and local</p>	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>authorities, which will ensure ownership and hence sustainability of project outcomes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the context and baseline investments are sufficiently presented based on sound data and assumptions. Because of the importance of the Qaroum Watershed, the overall national framework for the proposed project also reflects a timely opportunity for leveraging GEF resources to invest in GEBs.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>The problems are identified. Addressed.</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>Yes, by reinforcing capacities, mechanisms, and tools, the project aims to be cost-effective. Addressed.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>January 7, 2013\par</p> <p>Yes. Reasoning for the GEF increment is sound, including potential GEBs to be generated.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>- Please provide more information on the activities financed by the baseline. We understand that most of the cofinancing comes from the Ministry of Environment including various loan and technical assistance programmes. However, within the considered amount of \$14.850 million, \$5.15 million is for agriculture, \$5.5 million for the policy level support, and \$4.2 million for the solid waste sector. What is the reasoning to include this third part on the solid</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>waste sector?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How are GEF resources used on the top of this sub-program on solid waste sector? - The table 4 in the project document explains the project activities in front of each cause of land degradation. Actually, a column is missing with the baseline activities financed by the government. The GEF resources should finance activities on the top of these baseline activities, but not all activities. Without this part of the reasoning, there are serious doubts about sustainability aspects. Can you include this column in the table 4? - Please, take note that the GEF does not finance business-as-usual activities as impact environmental assesement. We understand that the Strategic Environmental Assessment is a normal activity in the landuse planning process. Please assign this activity to the cofinancing from the governeemnt, but not to the GEF resources. <p>November 11, 2014 Cleared.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the project framework is anchored on two components that are essential for SLM implementation at watershed scale - 1) enabling environment (including decision-support); and 2) application and uptake of interventions. The framework also supports integration of</p>	<p>Partially.</p> <p>Following comments made in the STAP review, we would like to get your attention on the formulation of outcomes and outputs. Outputs should reflect a concrete results, reflecting the expected result of defined activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The output 1.1. (enhanced connectivity) sounds more as an

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>agricultural, rangeland, and forest landscape management to enhance sustainability at scale.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>outcome. Reading the details in the project document, this output seems to be very broad -too broad- and we are not sure about the additionality and then eligibility of this set of actions. Please, revise the formulation and the scope of this output.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please note that the LD focal area focus is on productive landscapes and not protected areas. You cannot include "drafting or adoption PA management plans" or "investigation of the potential for extension of the PA to enhance corridors" (whatever it means in terms of activities). These activities should be taken by cofinancing or you have to demonstrate the benefits for productive landscapes in the catchement area. - However, rehabilitation of 500 ha of degraded lands and improved management of productive forests are welcome. - The output 3.1 sounds also very wide and lacks focus ("identification of reforms required" does not reflect the nature of activities financed by the GEF; it is not quantified either). Please, revise. - The output 3.2. is interesting and welcome. However, the experience within the GEF portfolio shows that if there is no more details at CEO endorsement on the potential innovative financing mechanisms, there is little chance to see such mechanism designed

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>and set in place. Either provide more background information to convince us that this output is feasible, or reduce the ambition to a feasible, concrete, and reachable output.</p> <p>November 11, 2014 Thanks for the revisions. The formulation of outputs is much better. The formulation may still be discussed for some of them, but the text in the project document helps to better figure out what the intentions are behind the outputs and activities. Cleared.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>A separate table outlining the GEF increment is included (page 11-12). However, the selected list of environmental benefits is unrealistic and lacks clarity with respect to appropriateness for the LD focal area. Please review and specify which indicative benefits are clearly justified and quantifiable, in accordance with the focal area priorities for arresting and reversing desertification / deforestation.</p> <p>January 10, 2013</p> <p>The re-submission now includes a more realistic and appropriate set of indicative benefits.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>There is a problem of reasoning and about the scope of the project. Because the baseline activities from cofinancing are not enough detailed, it is difficult to figure out the additionality of GEF financed activities. It seems that because of a lack of baseline analysis, the GEF financed activities are too broad and even beyond the LD focal area strategy on productive landscapes.</p> <p>November 11, 2014 Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the socio-economic benefits are adequately described, and the approach to engaging beneficiaries will ensure long-term sustainability of project outcomes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>Yes. Socio-economic benefits, including gender aspects, are included in the project design and reflected in the monitoring programme.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>There is a stakeholder analysis and a plan. However, the list of "secondary stakeholders" is somehow surprising: NGOs, professional organizations, academic institutions,... Don't you think the CSO should be better considered in project implementation, especially farmer organizations and NGOs. They seem key partners for scaling up and sustainability of the approach. Please, clarify.</p> <p>November 11, 2014</p> <p>Addressed.</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>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, relevant risks have been taken into account.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>Addressed.</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, other relevant initiatives have been highlighted.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>Collaboration with three other GEF/UNDP projects in Lebanon is mentioned in the request for CEO endorsement, as well as coordination with UN, WB, EU projects. in the project document, without mentioning them... We would have expected more</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>information on other related initiatives and further details on potential coordination. Please provide further information on these projects as well as coordination mechanisms involving the client (the country).</p> <p>November 11, 2014 Addressed.</p>
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, key stakeholders and institutions to be engaged and their roles have been identified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>See cell 17 on the role of CSO and cell 19 on coordination.</p> <p>November 11, 2014 Addressed.</p>
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>Yes. The adjustments are explained.</p>
	<p>22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>		<p>NA.</p>
Project Financing	<p>23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the PMC of \$151,794 is 5% of the total GEF grant requested, and matched with \$728,571 in co-financing.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>Under 5%. Cleared.</p>
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the breakdown of GEF grant and co-financing is adequate and appropriate to achieve project outcomes and ensure delivery of GEBs. Please double-check</p>	<p>As mentioned earlier, the activities financed by cofinancing should be detailed. For the time being, we cannot estimate if the funding per objective is appropriate, adequate, and additional to cofinancing. Please, clarify.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the breakdown of co-financing amounts in Table B and correct to match the total \$15.3 million.</p> <p>January 10, 2013</p> <p>The table is now correct.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>November 11, 2014</p> <p>The explanations are well taken. Thanks. However, in the memo for CEO endorsement, it seems that cofinancing amounts have been reverted for the outcome 1 and 3 (\$1,049,500 and \$4,636,000).</p>
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>The total indicative co-financing is \$15.3 million, which will ensure a leverage ratio of almost 1:5 for the GEF grant.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>cofinancing is confirmed.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes, UNDP will contribute \$300,000 in grant, which is line with its commitment to supporting environmental sustainability in the country.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>Confirmed at PIF level.</p>
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>The LD tracking tools are included in the annexes in word. Please provide an excel file. Thanks.</p> <p>November 11, 2014 Addressed.</p>
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		<p>Addressed.</p>
Agency Responses	<p>29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>Yes. However, we made some comments partially inspired from the STAP review (Please see cell 14 on the formulation of outputs).</p> <p>November 11, 2014 Addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address concerns in #15 and #24.</p> <p>January 10, 2013</p> <p>The PIF is now technically cleared and may be included in a future work program.</p>	
	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?		Yes
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>Not yet. Please address the comments above. On reception of a revised package addressing these comments, the project will be recommended for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>November 11, 2014 Please revise the cofinancing in the request for CEO endorsement. All other</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>comments have been addressed. Upon receipt of a revised project package, the project will be recommended for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>December 12, 2014 The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 07, 2013	October 09, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 10, 2013	November 11, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		December 12, 2014
	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?	<p>February 11, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the PPG activities are appropriate and essential for designing a potentially transformative project.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>February 11, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the activities are appropriate budgeted, and adequately co-financed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>February 11, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the PPG is recommended.</p>

	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 11, 2013
	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.