GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9388**		
Country/Region:	**Lebanon**		
Project Title:	**Land Degradation Neutrality of Mountain Landscapes in Lebanon**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5837 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Land Degradation**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**LD-2 Program 3; LD-4 Program 5;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$91,324**	Project Grant:	**$4,621,005**
Co-financing:	**$16,620,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$21,332,329**
PIF Approval:	**September 28, 2016**	Council Approval/Expected:	**October 27, 2016**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Ulrich Apel**	Agency Contact Person:	**Yves de Soye**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	02/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	02/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and	02/22/2016 UA: Yes.	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?
[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	02/22/2016 UA: Yes. By CEO endorsement, additional detail is expected on the following design elements: 1) Detailed plan, cost breakdown and justification for funding pilots in degraded quarries. The 'polluter pays principle' should be applied as appropriate. 2) Details on funding of review and update of Quarries Master Plan. 3) Elaboration on the concept of "consideration of offsets" within the output 3.5 financing mechanisms for LDN. 4) Assessment and discussion of the climate change risk and application of resilience thinking. 5) An update of the project design in view of the ongoing LDN target setting in the country and an analysis of any implications for project implementation. Above points are expected to be included by the project proponent in the work program of the PPG.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	02/22/2016 UA: Yes.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	02/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	02/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	02/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	02/22/2016 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends the project for CEO clearance. Please note expected clarification requests by CEO endorsement as mentioned above.	
Review Date	Review	February 22, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	05/04/2018 UA: Yes. All changes adequately justified. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	05/04/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	05/04/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	05/04/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	05/04/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	05/04/2018 UA: Yes. LD TT completed. Cleared	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	n/a	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the	05/04/2018 UA: Yes.	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	country or in the region?	Cleared	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	05/04/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	05/04/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	05/04/2018 UA: Yes. GEF comments to take into account at CEO endorsement stage have been adequately addressed during PPG. Cleared	
	• STAP	05/04/2018 UA: Yes. Adequately addressed during PPG. Cleared	
	• GEF Council	05/04/2018 UA: Yes. Germany and US comments were fully addressed. Cleared	
	• Convention Secretariat	none received	
	12. Is CEO endorsement	05/04/2018 UA:	

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation	recommended?	Yes. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.	
Review Date	Review	May 04, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		