



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: FULL SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Land degradation neutrality of mountain landscapes in Lebanon			
Country(ies):	Lebanon	GEF Project ID: ¹	9388
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5837
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment	Submission Date:	23 April 2018
GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/> Corporate Program: SGP <input type="checkbox"/>		
Name of Parent Program	N/A	Agency Fee (\$)	US\$438,996

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES²

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
LD Objective 2, Program 3	Landscape management and restoration	GEF-TF	1,823,003	5,817,000
LD Objective 4, Program 5	Mainstreaming SLM in development	GEF-TF	2,798,002	10,803,000
Total project costs			4,621,005	16,620,000

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: To achieve land degradation neutrality of mountain landscapes in Lebanon through integrated landscape management						
Project Components/Programs	Financing Type ³	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
1. Rehabilitation and restoration ⁴ of degraded land to protect and re-instate ecosystem services in mountain landscapes including forest and agricultural land	TA/Inv	1. Degraded mountain land in selected mountain districts of northern Lebanon identified, rehabilitated and restored <i>(For indicators and targets, please refer to PRODOC Section 5 – Project Results Framework)</i>	1.1 Landscape-scale survey of mountain lands and high country areas in Akkar and Jbeil Districts 1.2 Degraded forests restored at selected project sites and sustainable forest management applied 1.3 Sustainable rangeland management practices for selected sites in high country grasslands 1.4 Degraded quarries rehabilitated 1.5 Sustainable agricultural practices in degraded farmland in selected sites 1.6 Enabling environment established for responsible tourism and minimum impact outdoor recreation	GEF-TF	2,787,000	14,500,000
2. A sustainable management system on a landscape basis for mountain lands developed, tested and evaluated to prevent	TA	2. Mountain lands managed sustainably to prevent degradation <i>(For indicators and targets, please refer to PRODOC Section 5 – Project Results Framework)</i>	2.1 Improved Land Use Planning through strengthened frameworks and capacity at central and local levels 2.2 LDN capacity enhanced and LDN mainstreamed into land use planning and key policies targeting mountain	GEF-TF	883,700	1,500,000

¹ Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#) and [CBIT programming directions](#).

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

⁴ In this initiative, “rehabilitation” is seen as the effort required to maintain, and enhance if possible, ecosystem services; whereas “restoration” is the return as close as possible to the original functional ecosystem with its biodiversity and sustainable state. To the extent possible, both will be attempted by the project.

land degradation		Framework)	lands			
			2.3 GIS platform established for land use planning and related monitoring			
3. Development of a communication and knowledge management strategy and the financial mechanisms to allow the scaling up from the pilot activities and reach out beyond the project into the broader mountain environment in Lebanon	TA	3. Project monitoring and evaluation, communication, knowledge management and financial mechanisms for the dissemination and replication of the results of the project with the aim of achieving land degradation neutrality (For indicators and targets, please refer to PRODOC Section 5 – Project Results Framework)	3.1 The project is monitored and evaluated on a continuing basis according to the adopted M&E Plan 3.2 Communication and Knowledge Management Strategy implemented 3.3 Effective sustainable financing mechanisms identified and developed	GEF-TF	730,805	500,000
Subtotal					4,401,505	16,500,000
Project Management Cost (PMC)					219,500	120,000
Total project costs					4,621,005	16,620,000

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Co-financing letter are enclosed in the submission in ProDoc Annex 12 as evidence for the below listed amounts.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	Ministry of Environment	Grant	7,000,000
Recipient Government	Ministry of Environment	In kind	500,000
Recipient Government	Council for Development and Reconstruction	Grant	7,000,000
NGO	Lebanon Reforestation Initiative	Grant	2,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	120,000
Total Co-financing			16,620,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Lebanon	Land Degradation		4,621,005	438,996	5,060,001
Total Grant Resources					4,621,005	438,996	5,060,001

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	26,621 ha of forest, rangelands, and high country agricultural land, sustainably managed ⁵

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT?

No

⁵ The land area targeted by the project in Akkar and Jbeil is 19,365 ha and 28,019 ha, respectively, for a total of 47,385 ha. Of these, 29,621 ha (17,210 ha in Akkar, 12,411 ha in Jbeil) are considered productive lands, with the difference of 17,764 ha consisting of artificial lands, water bodies and natural (mountain) lands without vegetation. In the PIF this distinction was not made and the entire land area targeted was listed for global environmental benefits – however this here seems a more accurate/ rigorous approach.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶

A.1. Project Description.

1. The overall project design as presented in the PIF was confirmed, even though the approach has been refined further. Several studies and reports were prepared to inform specific issues, including inter alia a social and environmental screening (ProDoc Annex 10), gender analysis and mainstreaming plan (Annex 15), stakeholder strategy, land cover/use assessment (Annex 18), site assessment (Annex 17), a Communication and Knowledge Management Strategy (Annex 19) and a preliminary assessment of SLM/SFM financing mechanisms (Annex 20).#

2. The project duration was reduced to 5 years (from the 6 years envisaged in the PIF) based on the detailed formulation of the workplan and detailed activities assessment in time and value.

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed;

3. There have been no changes since the PIF was designed and approved – PPG confirmed the original project analysis. Land degradation problems facing Lebanon are discussed fully in ProDoc Section 1.2 *Land degradation problems facing Lebanon* and the barriers and root causes of these are elaborated in Section 2.1. Problems, root causes and barriers were re-examined including through a theory of change (ProDoc Annex 5a) and causal chain analysis (Annex 5b), which identify the causes of land degradation and lead to the various impacts arising from land degradation.

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects,

4. The responses to the above problems and causes by the Lebanese Government and society, are discussed in ProDoc Section 1.3 *Baseline scenario* (and to a lesser extent Section 2.3 *LDN project response*) and comprises the baseline or departure point for the project. There have been no significant changes in the baseline scenario.

3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area⁷ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project,

5. The proposed GEF alternative, building on the baseline, is developed in the Theory of Change and Causal Chain Analysis in ProDoc Annexes 5a and 5b, and then elaborated in ProDoc Section 3.1 *Expected results*.

6. While the problem analysis and baseline remained largely unchanged, the project design/ framework was slightly modified during the PPG. This is primarily a wording and logical structure issue, but there are also changes linked to comments received from GEF SEC, STAP and Council, most notably regarding stronger linkages with the national LDN effort in Lebanon. Please refer to the above Table B, and especially the following sections in the PRODOC for the a presentation and discussion of the updated version.

7. The changes to the project framework are as follows:

- The applicable **GEF Focal Area Strategies** were maintained
- The **Objective** was maintained
- The **Outcomes** 1-3 in the PIF were largely maintained in the PRODOC and CEO Endorsement Request, yet slight wording adjustments were made. The following table compares Outcomes with changes highlighted and explained:

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

⁷ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project’s consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

Outcomes in PIF	Outcomes in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request	Explanation
1. Degraded mountain land in the Governorates of North Lebanon and Mount Lebanon identified, rehabilitated and restored	1. Degraded mountain land in selected mountain districts of northern Lebanon identified, rehabilitated and restored	There is no North Lebanon Governorate, it is Akkar Governorate. Focus is at District level not Governorate level.
2. Mountain lands managed sustainably to prevent degradation	2. Mountain lands managed sustainably to prevent degradation	No changes
3. Communication, knowledge management and financial mechanisms for the dissemination and replication of the results of the project with the aim of achieving land degradation neutrality.	3. Project monitoring and evaluation, communication, knowledge management and financial mechanisms for the dissemination and replication of the results of the project with the aim of achieving land degradation neutrality	M&E added to this Outcome and hence also reflected in the title

- The **Outputs** were changed in a several places, primarily to simplify and reduce the extensive wording of the PIF stage, to merge Outputs that belonged together, to add some new elements and rigour emerging from the PPG, and to respond to comments from GEF. The following table compares Outputs with changes highlighted and explained:

Outputs in PIF	Outputs in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request	
1.1 Landscape-scale survey of North Lebanon and Mount Lebanon governorates mountain lands and high country areas, identifying state of the environment – ecosystems, ecological values and vulnerabilities, agricultural productivity and degraded land that merits rehabilitation/restoration	1.1 Landscape-scale survey of mountain lands and high country areas in Akkar and Jbeil Districts	Output wording simplified and details moved to Output narrative
1.2 Assess economic impact of land degradation on socio-economic development and ecosystem service provision, and define technical and financing plans for rehabilitation and remedial works including measures to avoid or minimize further impacts downstream.	N/A	Work on LD economy & finance is captured by the adapted Output 3.3
1.3 Identified degraded forests replanted and restored at 2-3 pilot project sites and sustainable forest management applied – biodiversity habitat enhanced, community forestry (co-management + Hima) established, non-timber forest products identified and promoted, stress reduction on identified ecosystem services (e.g. enhancing vegetative cover to improve slope stability).	1.2 Degraded forests restored at selected project sites and sustainable forest management applied	Output wording simplified and details moved to Output narrative
N/A	1.3 Sustainable rangeland management practices for selected sites in high country grasslands	While the inclusion of rangeland management was implicit at PIF stage, as one of the LD issues of importance to be addressed in the targeted mountain localities, it was now added more explicitly through this Output
1.4 Identified degraded quarries (3-4 pilots) rehabilitated – made safe (e.g. terracing), planting (e.g. green wall, hydroseeding), landscaping, impact minimization, use for social and ecological benefit, enhancement for eco-tourism and outdoor recreation potential.	1.4 Degraded quarries rehabilitated	Output wording simplified and details moved to Output narrative
1.5 Collaboration with farmers and others in the mountgain region agricultural sector (e.g. vineyards and other fruit and nut producers, as well as honey, mushrooms, medicinals, herbs and spices), to rehabilitate degraded farmland in 2-3 pilot projects sites to restore soil fertility and move towards environmentally sound production through e.g. contour	1.5 Sustainable agricultural practices in degraded farmland in selected sites	Output wording simplified and details moved to Output narrative, where also cleaned and improved to enhance clarity

bunds, mulching, planting of riparian vegetation strips, introduction of nitrogen-fixing intercrops, conservation agriculture, integrated crop management, drip-irrigation, recycling compost and other natural fertilizer, cover crops, soil enrichment, natural pest and predator controls, bio-intensive integrated pest management and other techniques.		
1.6 Collaboration with the tourism and outdoor recreation sector (as 2-3 pilot sites) to address impacts of tourism on productive land, protected areas, and ecosystem services; develop a tourism charter for nature; aim for zero discharges.	1.6 Enabling environment established for responsible tourism and minimum impact outdoor recreation	Output wording simplified and details moved to Output narrative
2.1: Review of national policies, legislation and procedures relevant to land use planning and management in the mountain environment to identify opportunities to avoid land and forest degradation; identify barriers to implementation and address shortfall as appropriate (including review of current planning, permitting and licensing procedures, and removing any regulatory barriers; assess and adopt monetary incentives and disincentives, bond/guarantee management, mining levies and royalties, fines and penalties, etc)	2.1 Improved Land Use Planning through strengthened frameworks and capacity at central and local levels	<p>The new Output 2.1 has become the main Land Use Planning Output bringing together several related PIF Outputs (2.2, 2.3, 2.4) on institutional aspects of LUP.</p> <p>Capacity strengthening was moved here as a key element from PIF Output 2.6, to make a clearer connection to LUP and link it also to the institutional aspects.</p> <p>Output wording was simplified and details moved to the Output narrative, including from the other PIF-stage outputs.</p>
2.2: Strengthening of the SEA and EIA Processes to prevent land degradation and identify options for mountain landscape rehabilitation and regeneration; identify opportunities for biodiversity and social gains, minimization of impacts on other land uses such as agricultural production, impact on ecosystem services and loss to society.	N/A - merged into 2.1 above	See comment above
2.3: Review current provisions for Land Use Planning and achievements at Strategic Regional level (District level) and local Development level (Municipality level), identify needs and gaps hindering an effective LUP process that integrates guidelines for sustainable land and forest management.	N/A - merged into 2.1 above	See comment above
2.4: Promote land degradation neutrality through a stronger system for compliance monitoring and enforcement as part of multi-stakeholder land use planning and management systems (including monitoring of conditions arising from the SEA/EIA Process, Land Use Plans, and the permitting system; collaborate with other central government agencies such as the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Agriculture and local government) to ensure that the targeted benefits are sustained.	N/A - merged into 2.1 above	See comment above
2.5: In pursuit of the above harmonization aim, review and update the Quarries Master Plan and develop the Master Plan for the Protection of Mountain Plateaus, Natural Areas, Beaches, Green Areas, and Agricultural Areas to ensure the integration of these into Land Use Plans, and focus better on environmental protection, impact abatement, offsets, rehabilitation, compliance, and sustainable land use within a landscape approach.	2.2 LDN capacity enhanced and LDN mainstreamed into land use planning and key policies targeting mountain lands	<p>To strengthen the link with LDN efforts, as requested by GEF, this Output was reframed such that rather than the two policies informing LUP, which is covered by Output 2.1, the objective is to mainstream LD/LDN issues into these two key mountain land policies.</p> <p>The output also offers LDN specific capacity development to complement the capacity development on LUP under Output 2.1</p>
2.6: Capacity and know-how enhanced in Ministry of Environment and other relevant central government agencies as well as at local government level. (Training courses at institutional and individual level for efficient	N/A - merged into 2.1 above	PIF Output 2.6 on capacity development was integrated into Output 2.1 on strengthened land use planning, see the comment above. Details were maintained in

processing of permit applications as well as for compliance monitoring. This includes at relevant tertiary planning institutions as well as in training programmes of regulatory authorities).		the Output narrative.
3.3: The Ministry of Environment Mountain Lands Database developed and made available (within the scope of the Master Plan for the Protection of Mountains, Natural Areas, Beaches, Green Areas and Agricultural Areas) through a WWW portal accessible by local authorities and others, to keep all those involved in the permitting, running and management of mountain land use, up to date with the latest statistics and developments.	2.3 GIS platform established for land use planning and related monitoring	This Output was shifted from Outcome 3 to Outcome 2 as it was more considered part of land use planning than knowledge management. It was also reframed to have a wider focus than just on mountain lands to reduce silos and make it more useful for LUP and LDN efforts. There is no operational government LUP GIS platform in Lebanon presently and this was considered a worthwhile addition/change.
N/A	3.1 The project is monitored and evaluated on a continuing basis according to the adopted M&E Plan	This Output was added to give M&E more weight, especially given the requests by GEF to link the project to national and global LDN efforts
3.1: Communication and knowledge management strategy developed and implemented, based on the project results (after evaluation and validation)	3.2 Communication and Knowledge Management Strategy implemented	Pooled PIF Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 into one. Output wording simplified.
3.2: Production of knowledge management products based on best practice arising from Outcomes 1 and 2 above to ensure SLM through a cross-sectoral multi-stakeholder landscape approach to managing competing uses of mountain lands.		
3.3: See above	See 2.3 above	
3.4: Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in development investments leading to investment in SLM/SFM by private sector developers so as to avoid land degradation.	N/A - merged into 3.3 below	This now falls under the new Output 3.3 on financing mechanisms
3.5: Develop and put in place sustainable financing mechanisms (e.g. Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA), comparative scenarios, costs & benefits, consideration of offsets, calculation of cost of environmental degradation and social costs) to provide the means for scaling-up and replication of best practices for rehabilitation of degraded land, the prevention of further degradation and achievement of land degradation neutrality.	3.3 Effective sustainable financing mechanisms identified and developed	Output wording simplified and details moved to Output narrative; some PIF-stage confusion about what are economic assessments versus financing mechanisms was clarified and a greater emphasis was placed on the latter.

- The **distribution of the GEF budget** between Outcomes was amended, as follows

Outcomes	Budget in PIF (US\$)	Budget in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request (US\$)	Comment
1	2,694,002	2,787,000	Minor increase
2	1,241,250	883,700	Reduction to free more resources for Component 3, most notably the work on KM and SLM/SFM financing; some of the work indicated here a PIF stage will now be paid and undertaken by government
3	466,253	730,805	Increase, most notably for work on KM and SLM/SFM financing
PMC	219,500	219,500	No changes

4) [incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and [co-financing](#);

8. The incremental reasoning is shown in ProDoc Section 3.3 *Incremental reasoning*. The changes are fundamentally outlined in detail in the above description of the changes to Outputs and the GEF budget – in addition to changes to the project co-financing, which can be seen in the co-financing tables on the PRODOC front page and in the

Financial Summary of Section 9 *Total Budget and Work Plan*, as well as in the above Table C. Co-financing letters have been obtained for the co-financing and are included in ProDoc Annex 12.

9. The following table compares the co-financing with changes highlighted and explained:

Type and name of co-financier	PIF STAGE: Type and amount and of co-financing	CEO Endorsement STAGE: Type and amount and of co-financing	Comment
Government: Ministry of Environment	Grant 8,025,000	Grant 7,000,000	Minor reduction largely due to the change of project duration from 6 to 5 years
	In-kind 500,000	In kind 500,000	
Government: Council for Development and Reconstruction	0	Grant 7,000,000	New co-financier not considered at PIF stage
Government: Ministry of Agriculture	In-kind TBD	0	Despite the role of MOA in the project, the co-financing role was assumed by CDR instead
	Grant 2,000,000	0	
NGO: Lebanon Reforestation Initiative	0	Grant 2,000,000	New co-financier not considered at PIF stage
GEF Agency: UNDP	In-kind 335,000	Grant 120,000	Reduction due to increasingly limited resources and the change of project duration from 6 to 5 years
Private sector: Various land owners	Grant 8,400,000	0	Formal co-financing commitments from land owners could not be confirmed during PPG, despite their interest in the project
	In-kind TBD	0	
TOTAL	17,260,000	16,620,000	

5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF);

10. The global environmental and further benefits of the project are described in ProDoc Sections 3.2 *Project benefits and beneficiaries*, 3.3 *Incremental reasoning* and 5 *Project Results Framework*, as well as in the LD-PMAT (ProDoc Annex 4); like also in the above Table E *Project's target contributions to global environmental benefits*.

11. The land area targeted by the project in Akkar and Jbeil is 19,365 ha and 28,019 ha, respectively, for a total of 47,385 ha. Of these, 29,621 ha (17,210 ha in Akkar, 12,411 ha in Jbeil) are considered productive lands, with the difference of 17,764 ha consisting of artificial lands, water bodies and natural (mountain) lands without vegetation.

12. In the Akkar site, forests and shrubland comprise the predominant land type with 11,342 ha, whereas agricultural cropland amounts to 5,375 ha and grasslands are 493 ha. In the Jbeil site there are 8,377 ha of forests and shrubland, 3,106 ha of agricultural cropland, and 928 ha of grasslands. The key global environmental benefit of this project is the achievement of sustainable land management in these productive lands on the ground (the forests in particular are of key ecological value and heavily impacted by unsustainable human practices), beside preparing the way for a reduction of land degradation through enhanced planning and the promotion of the LDN framework.

13. In the PIF the distinction was not made between productive and non productive lands, and the entire land area targeted was listed for a global environmental benefit over 52,000 ha. However, the approach adopted here, which leads a significant nominal reduction of the area benefitting from the project, seems more accurate/ rigorous and was therefore adopted.

6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

14. Please refer to ProDoc Section 4.4 *Innovation, sustainability and scaling up*.

15. There have been changes since the PIF was designed and approved, given that following the comments from GEF SEC, STAP and Council the project design is now more linked to the LDN framework. LDN will hence play a role in on-the-ground work (Outcome 1), in land use planning (Output 2.1), and there will be LDN-specific capacity development and policy mainstreaming (Output 2.2). Also Output 2.3 on GIS is a new innovation for government agencies in Lebanon not considered at PIF stage.

A.2. *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

No

A.3. Stakeholders. Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes ☒ /no ☐)? and indigenous peoples (yes ☐ /no ☒)?⁸

16. Stakeholders including government entities and civil society organizations (but not indigenous peoples) have been involved in the preparation of the project (see ProDoc Annexes 16 and 17) and will continue to be involved in the implementation of project activities.

17. Please refer to ProDoc Table 2 *Stakeholders, their respective mandates and their relationship with the project* (after §118) for a detailed compilation of stakeholders and their roles, and to ProDoc Annex 9 for a Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes ☒ /no ☐)?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes ☒ /no ☐)?; and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women 40%, men 60%)?⁹

18. Please refer to ProDoc Section 3.4 *Gender equality and the empowerment of women* and Annex 15 *Gender Analysis and Mainstreaming Plan*.

A.5 *Risk*. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation:

19. Two types of risk were analysed in project preparation – 1) risks that threaten the implementation of project activities and achievement; and 2) risks of social and environmental impacts that may arise from project implementation.

20. For a description of risks and proposed mitigation measures please refer to ProDoc Sections 4.2 *Risks to project success and mitigation measures*, 4.3 *Social and environmental risks and safeguards*, and Annex 7 *UNDP Risk Log*.

A.6. *Institutional Arrangement and Coordination*. Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Institutional arrangements

21. The Ministry of Environment of Lebanon will be the Implementing Partner of the project, which will be run under the UNDP Support to National Implementation Modality. Please refer to ProDoc Section 7 *Governance and Management Arrangements* for details about project setup and institutional arrangements.

Coordination

22. The project will coordinate with several relevant institutions and on-going initiatives, including the interventions carried out by co-financing partners. These are indicated in detail in the ProDoc in Section 1.3 *Baseline*

⁸ As per the GEF-6 Corporate Results Framework in the GEF Programming Directions and GEF-6 Gender Core Indicators in the Gender Equality Action Plan, provide information on these specific indicators on stakeholders (including civil society organization and indigenous peoples) and gender.

⁹ Same as footnote 8 above.

scenario, Table 2 *Stakeholders, their respective mandates and their relationship with the project* (after §118) as well as in Table 6 *Co-Financing* (after §186). A few are mentioned in the following:

- *Ministry of Environment* – MoE is set to follow-up on the draft law, already introduced, on the protection of mountain areas and the project will support the MoE as necessary in this endeavour. Furthermore, the project will also support the MoE in developing the mountain lands component of the planned Master Plan for the Protection of Mountain Plateaus, Natural Areas, Beaches, Green Areas, and Agricultural Areas through the provision of technical documents and policy briefs. Between them, these two strategic documents will ensure a better focus on environmental protection, impact abatement, no net loss, rehabilitation, compliance, and sustainable land use on a landscape-wide approach.
- *Ministry of Agriculture*. MoA is the UNCCD focal point for Lebanon. It manages rangelands and agricultural activities and is responsible for forestry legislation and enforcement. It designates protected forests and regulates grazing permits and agreements on municipal lands. The MoA will be consulted and involved throughout the project, and provide advice and expertise for project activities at the local level. The project will also coordinate with the on-going Hilly Areas for Sustainable Agriculture Development (HASAD) project financed by IFAD, OPEC and the government and the National Afforestation/Reforestation Programme.
- *Council for Development and Reconstruction*. CDR's major functions are to prepare investment plans for Lebanon, design, plan and implement programmes and projects for reconstruction and development and mobilize external financing from development partners. CDR is also responsible for selecting, in cooperation with line ministries, the institutions for the implementation of programmes and projects. More recently, CDR has focused on land use and land use planning and this is a particular area for collaboration with the project in its endeavours to instill a SLM and LDN ethic into land use planning in Lebanon.
- *Lebanon Reforestation Initiative*. LRI is started as a project funded by the US Forest Service in 2010. Its strategic goals include improving the management and conservation of forests and contributing to Lebanon's LDN national targets. With funding from USAID worth US\$9 million, LRI is currently working on a variety of activities related to reforestation, forest management and sustainable land management, including rehabilitating quarries. The project is set to collaborate with these initiatives as they apply to the project localities, for mutual benefit.
- *Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment*, a GEF/UNDP project with a total budget of USD 21,237,671 (GEF contribution of USD 3,187,671) with a focus on the Bekaa Valley and surrounding hill catchments. The project, which is on-going, aims to develop institutional tools at national level which will provide the MoE and other agencies with the know-how, means and mechanisms for promoting sustainable land use. As such, the Qaraoun Project initiatives will be complemented by project initiatives in the mountain environment and collaboration is seen as being mutually beneficial.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7 Benefits. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

23. Please refer to ProDoc *Sections 3.2 Project benefits and beneficiaries, 3.4 Gender equality and the empowerment of women, 5 Project Results Framework* and the LD-PMAT in Annex 4.

A.8 Knowledge Management. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

24. The project will implement the adopted Communication and Knowledge Management Strategy (see ProDoc Annex 19) so as to manage the knowledge and information which will accrue from the survey under Output 1.1, the Land Use Planning process, the application of the SEA process, the compliance monitoring activities, and other data generation and gathering activities associated with the land degradation neutrality approach. The ensuing database will be made accessible by local authorities and others, to keep all those involved in the permitting, running and management of mountain land use, up to date with the latest statistics and developments (disaggregated by sex, if applicable). The strategy will also enable the project to communicate its message widely by developing and using KM products such as knowledge bases, expert systems, information repositories, group decision support systems, and intranets, so as to reach a cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder audience. Through its website, the project will share its experiences on LDN with the GEF, UNCCD and member countries proposing to apply the concept and contribute to the international discussion on LDN, including information on gender and LDN.

25. Collaboration on knowledge management will take place between the project and other initiatives of the MoE such as the Mountain Lands Database and the Quarries Master Plan. Likewise, the project will share knowledge with implementing partners such as the Lebanon Reforestation Initiative (LRI) and the Council for Development and Reconstruction (CDR), both of which are assisting the project through co-financing agreements. The project will also collaborate with the project on Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment which is an on-going GEF/UNDP project which aims to develop a sustainable land management approach in the Bekaa Valley, to the east of the Mount Lebanon range and the project's localities.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1 *Consistency with National Priorities.* Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.:

26. Please refer to PRODOC Section 2.4 Project alignment

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:


27. The project results as outlined in the project results framework will be monitored annually and evaluated periodically according in line with the M&E framework defined in ProDoc Section 6 *Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan* and Annexes 2 and 3 to ensure the project effectively achieves these results. Please refer to these sections for details.

28. M&E will moreover be specifically supported through the dedicated *Project Outcome 3: Project monitoring and evaluation, communication, knowledge management and financial mechanisms* through which this project monitoring and evaluation plan will also facilitate learning and ensure knowledge is shared and widely disseminated to support the scaling up and replication of project results.

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person, Telephone, Email
Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator, UNDP-GEF		4/23/2018	Yves de Soye Regional Technical Advisor, Ecosystems +33 682 758944, yves.desoye@undp.org

PART IV: ANNEXES

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please refer to Section 5 *Project Results Framework* in the ProDoc, page 33.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

GEFSec / STAP COMMENTS	ACTION TAKEN AT PROJECT FORMULATION
GEFSec comments: <i>Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning? By CEO endorsement, additional detail is expected on the following design elements... [These] points are expected to be included by the project proponent in the work program of the PPG.</i>	
1. Detailed plan, cost breakdown and justification for funding pilots in degraded quarries. The 'polluter pays principle' should be applied as appropriate.	The PPG carried out consultations with local government to explore potential localities and specific quarries location and other details will be determined following the survey in Output 1.1. The project will work on publicly-owned (mostly municipal) quarries (Output 1.4). The project will not provide financial support to private quarry owners where the polluter-pays principle will apply. However, they will benefit through the promotion of the technical studies that will showcase the rehabilitation techniques successfully tested by the project. Detailed plans and firm cost breakdowns can only be arrived at after actual specific quarries have been identified and technical and engineering studies carried out.
2. Details on funding of review and update of Quarries Master Plan	In response to GEFSec, the Quarries Master Plan is being reviewed and updated by the government and not by the project so the details are not ours to share. The project will support MoE and the National Council for Quarries to instil the principles of LDN into the process. See Output 2.2
3. Elaboration on the concept of "consideration of offsets" within the output 3.5 financing mechanisms for LDN.	The PPG Finance Specialist explored mining offsets as well as the polluter pays principle and their application in Lebanon. The topic was also explored in consultations with the Ministry of Finance during the PPG. Offsets will be considered within a broad package of financial mechanisms. This is a substantial task and will be carried out as a specialized activity during project implementation. See Output 3.3
4. Assessment and discussion of the climate change risk and application of resilience thinking.	The risks resulting from climate change have been reflected in Table 3. <i>Potential risks to project success and proposed mitigation measures</i> and Annex 10 <i>UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Template</i>
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.	The project is now more clearly linked to the LDN Framework. National LDN Targets are still being developed. The project is in full consultation and is keeping abreast of developments. See for example Section 2.1 and Indicators 4, 5 and 6
STAP comments <i>To strengthen the project design STAP recommends addressing the following points:</i>	
6. STAP encourages Lebanon and UNDP to apply innovative financing for valuing and managing ecosystem services to support access to resources and markets	As noted in response to 3 above, the PPG has carried out studies on the issue of financing. Further work is envisaged as a specialized activity during project implementation. See Output 3.3
7. An evaluation of restorative approaches will support learning and further uptake of	This is specifically covered under Output 3.2.

LDN, which will be important to countries setting their LDN targets. Thus, STAP encourages UNDP and Lebanon to share its experiences on LDN with the GEF, UNCCD and other countries proposing to apply the concept	Exchanges with WOCAT were added.
8. In the project document, the components should be detailed further to include the information listed in the project description summary. Currently, there is more information about the components in the project description summary than in the component section 1.3.	Section 3.1: Expected Results provides a narrative with details of each Output
9. It will be important to detail in the project design a description of the methods, or approach, used for assessing the suitability of land for restoration or rehabilitation. STAP suggests that a land potential assessment would be beneficial.	The PPG carried out extensive explorations for potential project localities – see Annexes 16-18. ProDoc has identified and characterized two broad localities in Akkar and Jbeil Districts. Section 2.5 provides criteria for the selection of specific sites for specific pilot activities. This will take place following the comprehensive survey to be carried out under Output 1.1
10. STAP also encourages the project developers to think carefully about the indicators that will be used to monitor the global environmental benefits. Therefore, in addition to biodiversity conservation indicators, and meeting targets on sustainable land management (page 5), the project developers are encouraged to consider indicators for land rehabilitation, or land restoration, related to ecosystem services.	Indicators have been set with this in mind and to be in harmony with the national LDN Targets which are still being developed
11. STAP recommends that the project developers seek close interaction with Lebanon's participation in the LDN Target Setting Programme, and detail the methods for measuring and monitoring LDN.	Project development has proceeded in full consultation with the efforts to set national LDN Targets and there is mutual support. However, the project is slightly ahead
12. It will be useful to include in the land use planning policy a mechanism to estimate the likely cumulative effects of land degradation, so that rehabilitation can be planned, in order to achieve LDN. The forthcoming report and brief on the Land Degradation Neutrality Conceptual Framework explains this concept further, and may be helpful in designing the project: - UNCCD/Science-Policy Interface (2016). Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality. A Report of the Science-Policy Interface. Barron J. Orr, Annette L. Cowie, et al. (Forthcoming). United Nations Convention on Desertification (UNCCD), Bonn, Germany, - UNCCD/Science-Policy Interface (2016). Land in balance. The scientific conceptual framework for land degradation neutrality (LDN). Science-Policy Brief 02. September 2016. United Nations Convention to combat Desertification (UNCCD), Bonn, Germany	These two references and others have been used extensively in setting the framework for the project which is pioneering LDN as a conceptual approach. Project design was amended to give the LDN framework and aspects more weight. See Section 2.1 and Outputs under Component 2.
13. To complement the background and the problem description, STAP suggests the following report from the Joint Research Centre that details the soils in Lebanon and the drivers of land degradation, including soil erosion, soil salinity, soil pollution, and other factors: Yigini, Y. et al. "Soil Resources of Mediterranean and Caucasus Countries, Extension of the European Soil Database". (2013). http://eusoiils.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ESDB_Archive/eusoiils_docs/other/EUR25988EN.pdf Lebanon and UNDP may also consider using the maps in the JRC report to complement the description of the project sites in the project document.	Thank you for this reference, the report was indeed very useful (see Sections 1.1 and 1.2) and the citation under Output 1.5 which aims to rehabilitate degraded agricultural land. Unfortunately, the maps are not at an adequate scale.
14. The JRC soil resources report states that "only about 70km2 of land located in North Lebanon and central Bekaa plain is characterized in terms of heavy metal content, land quality and suitability for specific agricultural and non-agricultural uses." The authors recommend assessing soil quality nationwide to control crop cultivation on suitable land. STAP supports this recommendation and encourages the project developers to undertake an assessment of heavy metals in the project sites before encouraging restoration, or rehabilitation of lands for agricultural purposes.	It was not possible for the PPG to carry out a nation-wide survey, however, the JRC report has been taken into account and the issue is reflected in the list of criteria for site selection (see Section 2.5). See also Output 1.1
15. It would be valuable to describe in detail the mountain ecosystems during the project design along with the social and economic traits of the target sites. This will inform the components and their implementation.	This has been done in Sections 1.1 and 1.2 of ProDoc to the extent possible for the project localities. Detailed information at the local level is not available in Lebanon. Background notes/details are in Annexes 17 and 18
16. STAP proposes identifying the climate risks, and the adaptive management responses to address stresses, such as climate. One source for climate data that the project developers may wish to use is the CGIAR's portal: https://ccafs.cgiar.org/downscaled-gcm-data-portal#.V-lmoSErKuk . STAP also suggests the following document as a source of information on climate adaptation in Lebanon: Haydamous, P. et al "Lebanon's agricultural sector policies: considering inter-regional approaches to adaptation to climate change". 2016. https://www.aub.edu.lb/ifi/publications/Documents/policy_memos/2015-	Same as response to comment 4 above

2016/20160213_lebanon_agricultural.pdf 17. STAP recommends applying the Resilience, Adaptation Pathways Transformation Assessment (RAPTA) Framework. The RAPTA Framework can assist countries in assessing and reporting on resilience. It allows for considerations of social, economic and environmental changes in order to focus efforts where interventions will be more effective. Lebanon and UNDP can apply the RAPTA to assess the current and proposed land uses, and identify the most appropriate sites for restoration and rehabilitation, given the current conditions, constraints and stresses (e.g. influx of Syrian refugees into Lebanon and the possible increased demand for food, and pressure on land resources; climate change). RAPTA can then help to focus efforts where interventions will be most effective through a structured approach to learning that enables constant improvement and adaptation to change.	RAPTA, with a specific reference, has been added to the list of criteria for site selection in Section 2.5. Added to phase 2 of Output 1.1
18. In the project document, provide detail on the innovative financial mechanisms proposed, including offsets. Offsets are a controversial strategy that requires strong safeguards, to ensure like-for-like substitution. The Land Degradation Conceptual Framework referred to in point 3 includes discussion and guidance on this issue.	ProDoc narrative for Output 3.3 provides an extensive list of financial mechanisms which have been assessed/evaluated by the PPG and will be developed further as appropriate as a key project activity
19. The table of barriers identifies deficiencies in skills and capacity for assessment and management of rehabilitation, and implementation of good practice in agriculture and forestry. It is not clear how the project response, listed in the table, will address these specific gaps. This should be addressed in project design.	Several more explicit references to capacity development, including on LDN, were added to project outputs under different outcomes. Output 2.3 addresses the issue of capacity.
GEF Council Comments	
20. Germany refers to the recommendations of STAP to enhance the project design, particularly the stronger embedment in the national LDN	The LDN framework was more explicitly integrated into project design and background. However there are limitations given that the LDN Targets haven't been adopted to date
21. The United States would like to recommend that UNDP coordinate this proposal with the following related activities: - USAID Lebanon Reforestation Initiative. This initiative works with local communities and nurseries to grow and plant native tree species around the country. - The US Department of State, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs recently approved and is collaborating with the Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI, specifically George Aldridge) to fund a study of flora and fauna in Lebanon. It will mostly survey native fauna and should provide data on how native wildlife impacts trees and other plants. The data would prove useful for further conservation efforts, including this proposed initiative.	LRI and MERI are identified as a Project Partner, particularly for activities under Output 1.2 and 1.2, respectively, and discussions were carried out.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹⁰

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$91,324 (as of 17 April 2018)			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent Todate</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A - Technical review and stakeholder consultations	62,000	49,324	12,676
Component B - Institutional and management arrangements, co-financing investments	24,000	14,124.48	9,875.52
Component C - Consolidation, Validation and Finalisation of Key Outputs	5,324	4,000	1,324
Total	91,324	67,448.48	23,875.52

NB: The PPG 2018 budget is fully committed and will be spent before the end of the month.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used):

N/A

¹⁰ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.