



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 Watershed		
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:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,187,671
Co-financing:	\$15,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,487,671
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 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	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 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	
	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	
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	
	• 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	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/a	
	• focal area set aside?	January 7, 2013	

		No FA set-aside funding is being requested.	
		Cleared	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	January 7, 2013 Yes, the project is aligned with the LD focal area strategy. Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	January 7, 2013 Yes, the project will specifically contribute to LD1 (agro-ecosystems), LD2 (forest landscapes), and LD3 (integration of land uses) within the targeted watershed. Cleared	
	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?	January 7, 2013 Yes, the proposed project is consistent with the country's NAP, which will ensure support for implementation of the UNCCD. Cleared	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	January 7, 2013 Yes. Capacity development efforts will target project beneficiaries and local authorities, which will ensure ownership and hence sustainability of project outcomes. Cleared	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on	January 7, 2013 Yes, the context and baseline investments are sufficiently presented	

Project Design		<p>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>	
	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>January 7, 2013\par Yes. Reasoning for the GEF increment is sound, including potential GEBs to be generated.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<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 agricultural, rangeland, and forest landscape management to enhance sustainability at scale.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<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</p>	

		<p>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>	
	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>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>January 7, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</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>	
	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>	

	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	January 7, 2013 Yes, key stakeholders and institutions to be engaged and their roles have been identified. Cleared	
	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?	January 7, 2013 Yes, the PMC of \$151,794 is 5% of the total GEF grant requested, and matched with \$728,571 in co-financing. Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	January 7, 2013 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 the breakdown of co-financing amounts in Table B and correct to match the total \$15.3 million. January 10, 2013 The table is now correct. Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if	January 7, 2013 The total indicative co-financing is	

		leverage ratio of almost 1:5 for the GEF grant.	
		Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	January 7, 2013 Yes, UNDP will contribute \$300,000 in grant, which is line with its commitment to supporting environmental sustainability in the country. Cleared	
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?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	January 7, 2013 PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address concerns in #15 and #24. January 10, 2013 The PIF is now technically cleared and may be included in a future work program.	
	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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 07, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 10, 2013	
	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?	February 11, 2013 Yes, the PPG activities are appropriate and essential for designing a potentially transformative project. Cleared
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	February 11, 2013 Yes, the activities are appropriate budgeted, and adequately co-financed. Cleared
	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	February 11, 2013 Yes, the PPG is recommended.
Secretariat Recommendation	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.