Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment, Lebanon

Mid-Term Review – Draft Report

C4 EcoSolutions

CARBON I CONSERVATION I CLIMATE I COMMUNITY

Nicholas Tye

November 2018

Table of contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations 3
Executive Summary 4
1. Introduction 10
1.1 Purpose of the MTR and objectives 10
1.2 Key outputs of the MTR 10
1.3 Methodological approach and scope of the MTR 10
1.4 Structure of the MTR 12
2. Project description and background context 12
2.1 Project background 12
2.2 Problems that the project sought to address 13
2.3 Main projects stakeholders 13
2.4 Expected results of the project 15
3. Findings 16
3.1 Project design 16
3.2 Effectiveness and efficiency of the project 32
3.3 Progress towards results 33
3.4 Project implementation and adaptive management 42
3.5 Sustainability 45
4.1 Conclusions 47
4.2 Recommendations 48
Annex 1 – MTR ToRs 50
Annex 2 – Interview guide used for data collection 71
Annex 3 – Ratings scales 72
Annex 4 – List of institutions interviewed 73
Annex 5 – List of documents reviewed 74
Annex 6 – Co-financing table 75
Annex 7 – Signed MTR final report clearance form 76
Annex 8 – Mission pictures 77

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CAS	Central Administration of Statistics
CO	Country Office
DGUP	Directorate General for Urban Planning
DUP	Detailed Urban Plan
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FMP	Forest Management Plan
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GoL	Government of Lebanon
ha	Hectare
ILUMPs	Integrated Land Use Management Plans
KII	Key Informant Interview
LD	Land Degradation
LARI	Lebanese Agricultural Research Institute
LRA	Litani River Authority
LUIMS	Land Use Information Management System
LUP	Land use plan
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MoE	Ministry of Environment
MTR	Mid-Term Review
PIF	Project Identification Form
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
RMP	Rangeland Management Plan
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SLMQ	Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment, Lebanon
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Assignable, Realistic, Time-related
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

Executive Summary

Project Title: Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment, Lebanon		
GEF Project ID (PMIS #):	5229 (4642)	
Country:	Lebanon	
Region:	Middle East	
GEF Focal Area:	Land Degradation	
Project Start date:	28 January 2016	
Midterm Review completion date:	7 December 2018	
Intended completion date:	31 December 2019	
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Environment	
Project Financing:	*Total costs (US$):* **$3,487,671**	*at Midterm Review:* **$353,199**

The United Nations Development Programme has commissioned an independent, mid-term review of the Global Environment Facility funded project entitled "Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment, Lebanon". This is a four-year project launched in January 2016 with the overall objective: "Sustainable land and natural resource management alleviates land degradation, maintains ecosystem services, and improves livelihoods in the Qaraoun Catchment".

The project has three outcomes: i) *Landscape level uptake of SLM measures avoids and reduces land degradation, delivering ecosystem and development benefits in the Qaraoun Catchment*; ii) *Pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the Qaraoun Catchment are reduced*; and iii) *Institutional strengthening and capacity enhancement for promoting sustainable forest and land management in the Qaraoun Catchment through an INRM approach across the landscape***.** Together, these outcomes will promote large-scale adoption of SLM in the Qaraoun Catchment and beyond.

Project progress summary

Project implementation was significantly delayed at the beginning of the project. This delay in implementation is attributable to:

- delays in signing the relevant documents;
- delays in hiring the PMU; and
- seasonality which means that the implementation of forest and rangeland restoration interventions is restricted to certain times of the year (October – February).

The delays experienced at the beginning of the project has meant that, at the time of the MTR, most of the progress made by the project has been towards preparing for the on-the-ground forest, rangeland and agricultural SLM interventions.

The project has established excellent relationships with a broad range of stakeholders that will facilitate future implementation of activities. All stakeholders interviewed during the MTR spoke highly of the project, had a clear understanding of the project objectives and the role that they could play in achieving them, and reported regular and efficient communication with the project team. It is notable that the project has actively built strong relationships with stakeholders outside of the Ministry of Environment that can contribute to the achievement of the project outcomes. For instance, the project has established designated focal points for forest, rangeland and agricultural activities within the Ministry of Agriculture. The active inclusion of a broad range of stakeholders in the preparatory work that has taken place has created a strong sense of ownership among stakeholders and will promote the sustainability of the project.

In addition to relationship building, the project has developed a strong scientific foundation for the upcoming implementation of on-the-ground interventions. Three major assessments have been undertaken; land degradation assessment, ecological assessment and socio-economic assessment. The results of these assessments have allowed for the development of: i) an informed and transparent method for selecting project intervention sites; ii) detailed scientific methodologies for forest, rangeland and agricultural SLM interventions; and iii) a comprehensive database to inform the development of land use plans. Moving forward, the project should build on the results of these assessments during the development of detailed urban plans, the Land Use Information Management System and the Land Use Monitoring System.

The project has made good progress towards the development of land use plans. Currently, consultants are busy developing a Master land use plan covering all of West Bekaa, Zahle and Rachaya. Following this, detailed urban plans covering specific sites in West Bekaa and Rachaya will be developed.

Another notable achievement has been the preparation of national guidelines for i) management of rangelands outside of forests; and ii) forest management. These guidelines will inform the development of forest and rangeland management plans.

Table 1. MTR rating and achievement summary table for Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment, Lebanon.

Measure	Rating	Achievement Description
Project strategy	n/a	*Strengths* The project strategy is well designed to meet its objectives. The design includes appropriate risk mitigation measures and activities that will promote the sustainability of interventions. The project was designed with extensive stakeholder consultation, is country-driven and is aligned with national priorities. *Weaknesses* Some of the indicators/targets included in the results framework do not meet the SMART criteria. There are also no indicators to measure gender equality in the current results framework. Alternative indicators are proposed in the MTR.
Progress towards results	Project objective: Sustainable land and natural resource management alleviates land degradation, maintains ecosystem services, and improves livelihoods in the Qaraoun Catchment **Moderately Satisfactory**	Although SLM measures are yet to be implemented on-the-ground, the project has completed the necessary preparatory activities that will allow for the implementation of forest, rangeland and agricultural SLM interventions. The baseline assessments conducted are high quality and provide a solid scientific foundation for site selection and SLM intervention design. The project has also build strong relationships with various stakeholders that will facilitate the implementation of future activities. Five alternative income generating activities have been identified: • Beekeeping and honey production • Grape molasses production • Rural tourism • Dried fruits production • Kechek production
	Outcome 1: Landscape level uptake of SLM	The project has completed the necessary preparatory activities that will allow for the implementation of forest,

	measures avoids and reduces land degradation, delivering ecosystem and development benefits in the Qaraoun Catchment **Moderately Satisfactory**	rangeland and agricultural SLM interventions. Achievement include the following. • Land degradation assessment. • Ecological assessment. • Socio-economic assessment, including a perception survey. • Site for interventions have been selected based on the assessments. • Scientific methodologies for SLM interventions have been developed. • A greenhouse has been constructed to supply seeds for rangeland SLM interventions. In addition, a cold room at the LARI is being refurbished/rehabilitated to receive seedlings to be used in reforestation, to prevent their rooting prior to planning season. • An imprinter and seeder for rangeland restoration has been designed and constructed. • An MoU has been signed with LARI to identify roles and responsibilities for rangeland management coupled with an agreement for LARI to utilise the greenhouse and existing seedbank to supply seeds for the rangeland restoration activities. In addition, LARI is testing fodder mix protein content to identify appropriate species for rangeland restoration activities. *Remaining challenges*: There has been limited progress towards the implementation of agricultural SLM interventions. There is limited time remaining in the project to implement all of the planned on-the-ground activities.
	Outcome 2: Pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the Qaraoun Catchment are reduced **Moderately Satisfactory**	The project is developing a Master land use plan, coupled with a strategic environmental assessment, for West Bekaa, Zahle and Rachaya. The draft is to be completed in early 2019. The Master land use plan will incorporate sustainability and SLM considerations. Following the development of the Master plan, detailed urban plans for specific sites in West Bekaa and Rachaya will be developed. The project is preparing national guidelines for: i) management of rangelands outside of forests; and i) forest management. Training on these guidelines is also being provided. The national guidelines developed inform the development of both forest management plans and rangeland management plans. These will allow for the upscaling of SLM interventions across the target districts. Outside of the project's direct interventions, the project is also supporting: • designation of Anjar Kfarzabad as a RAMSAR wetland. • designation of Mt Hermon as a UNESCO Biosphere site. *Remaining challenges*: There has been limited progress towards strengthening the capacity of local governments to enforce land use plans.

	Outcome 3: Institutional strengthening and capacity enhancement for promoting sustainable forest and land management in the Qaraoun Catchment through an INRM approach across the landscape **Moderately Unsatisfactory**	The project has done well to identify opportunities to mainstream SLM. The project is supporting the integration of SLM into the Forest Law and is producing national guidelines that include SLM considerations. The project is also working with FAO to mainstream SLM concepts in academic curricula for technical schools and universities. *Remaining challenges*: Institutional strengthening and capacity development are currently taking place in an *ad hoc* manner. The project has yet to formalise an approach for capacity development. The project has made limited progress towards strengthening the capacity of local governments to enforce land use plans or developing economic incentives/disincentives for adherence to land use plans.
Project implementation and adaptive management	**Satisfactory**	• The project is well managed. The PMU is highly capable and enthusiastic, and have developed strong working relationships with the MoE and UNDP CO. • The project has demonstrated adaptative management, for example through the process followed to select project sites and through the revision of work plans following delays at the start of the project. • Strong relationships have been built with a range of stakeholders, roles and responsibilities of stakeholders are clear and cooperation is efficient. • Work planning is efficient and takes place regularly. • The project has adequate monitoring and evaluation systems in place. • Reporting takes place regularly and efficiently. • The objectives and planned activities of the project are well communicated to all stakeholders. Remaining challenges: • The project needs to report on co-financing commitments. • The project should complete the GEF LD Tracking tool to include the mid-term results of the project.
Sustainability	**Likely**	Sustainability was integrated into the design of the project and continues to be considered during implementation. In general, risks to sustainability are well considered and appropriate mitigation strategies are in place. The strong sense of project ownership that has been built with stakeholders involved in project implementation will promote the sustainability of interventions. In addition, the development of LUPs, national guidelines and proposed policy revisions that will remain in place after the project has finished will contribute the sustainability of SLM within Lebanon.

Main conclusions

- The project is well managed. The PMU is highly capable and enthusiastic, and have developed strong working relationships with the MoE, UNDP CO and other relevant stakeholders.
- Given the delays experienced at the beginning of the project and the current low rate of disbursement, it is likely that the project will require a no-cost extension of at least one year in order to achieve its intended targets.
- The project is generally well designed to meet its objectives. The design includes appropriate risk mitigation measures and activities that will promote the sustainability of the interventions. The MTR does, however, note that two of the outputs stipulated in the project document are highly ambitious and may not be achievable within the timeframe and resources of the project. These are outputs 2.4 and 3.2. The project may consider limiting the scope of these outputs.
- Not all of the indicators/targets included in the current results framework adhere to the SMART criteria. The MTR has proposed modifications to the results framework.
- The project has developed a strong scientific foundation for the upcoming implementation of on-the-ground interventions. Three major assessments have been undertaken; land degradation assessment, ecological assessment and socio-economic assessment. Moving forward, the project should build on the results of these assessments during the development of detailed urban plans, the Land Use Information Management System and the Land Use Monitoring System.
- The project has demonstrated excellent communication with all project stakeholders. All stakeholders have d a clear understanding of the project objectives and the role that they could play in achieving them. The project should continue this regular communication moving forward.
- Innovation is a strength of the project. Not only is SLM a relatively new concept in Lebanon, but the project has actively sought new approaches for project implementation. An example of the innovation shown by the project is the design and construction of a new imprinter with seeder for rangeland restoration. The project should continue to seek innovative solutions for SLM in Lebanon.

Table 2: Summary of recommendations

Rec #	Recommendation[1]	Entity responsible
Project Design:		
A.1	**As SLM is a relatively new concept in Lebanon, the project should ensure that results of the SLM interventions, land us plan development process and scientific information collected in the preparatory assessments are communicated to a wide audience.**	**PMU/UNDP**
A.2	**The project is developing scientifically rigorous methodologies for forest and rangeland restoration. The project should ensure that these scientific protocols are shared widely to guide further restoration efforts in the country.**	**PMU/UNDP**
A.3	The project could consider translating the restoration projects into Arabic to ensure that they are available to a wide range of stakeholders.	PMU/UNDP
A.4	It would be beneficial if the project reported on risks identified as moderate severity in the PIRs.	PMU/UNDP
A.5	**The project may consider limiting the scope of Output 2.4 to strengthening the capacity of the MoE and targeted municipalities to enforce compliance with land use plans. It may be beyond the scope of the project to establish enforcement measures.**	**PMU/UNDP**

[1] Key recommendations are bolded.

A.6	**The project may consider limiting the scope of Output 3.2 to developing a range of proposed economic incentives/disincentives to promote adherence by the agricultural sector to sustainable land use practices. It may be beyond the scope of the project to trial or implement these incentives/disincentives.**	**PMU/UNDP**
A.7	The project should focus on involving women in the alternative income generating activities.	PMU/UNDP
A.8	**Where possible, the results framework of the project should be amended to include gender-disaggregated indicators.**	**PMU/UNDP**
Effectiveness and efficiency:		
B.1	**The project should consider a no-cost extension of 12 – 18 months to account for the delays experienced at the start of the project and ensure that there is enough time available to achieve all of the desired objectives.**	**PMU/UNDP**
Progress towards results:		
	See recommendation B.1	
	The scientific foundation established by the project is impressive. However, the project should consider moving forward with pilot activities to learn implementation modalities while the scientific assessments are still being completed.	**PMU/UNDP**
C.1	**The implementation of agricultural SLM interventions should begin as soon as possible. This is to ensure that the project reaches its intended targets. In addition, agricultural interventions demonstrate benefits over the short-term and can enhance community buy-in for SLM interventions.**	**PMU/UNDP**
C.2	The project should develop a formal workplan for capacity development and institutional strengthening activities to ensure that it reaches its intended targets.	**PMU/UNDP**
	See recommendation A.5	
	See recommendation A.6	**PMU/UNDP**
Project implementation and adaptive management:		
	See recommendation B.1	**PMU/UNDP**
D.1	The PMU should prepare a report that shows actual and planned co-financing commitments.	PMU/UNDP
	See recommendation A.8	**PMU/UNDP**
D.2	The PMU should complete the GEF LD Tracking tool to include the mid-term results of the project.	PMU/UNDP
Sustainability:		
	See recommendation A.2	**PMU/UNDP**
E.1	The PMU should ensure that the independent consultant team developing the LUPs continues this engagement with municipalities to promote ownership of the LUPs.	PMU/UNDP

1. Introduction

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has commissioned an independent, mid-term review of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded project entitled "Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment, Lebanon". This is a four-year project launched in January 2016 with the overall objective: "Sustainable land and natural resource management alleviates land degradation, maintains ecosystem services, and improves livelihoods in the Qaraoun Catchment".

The project is currently supporting communities and local governments to implement sustainable land management in three districts within the Qaraoun Catchment, namely West Bekaa, Zahle and Rachaya.

1.1 Purpose of the MTR and objectives

The purpose of this MTR is to assess project performance to date (regarding relevance, effectiveness, efficiency), identify successes and challenges faced, and provide recommendations to ensure that the project meets it's intended targets. The objectives of the MTR are to 'assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the project document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability'.

1.2 Key outputs of the MTR

The intended outcome of the review is to analyse project performance to date and develop recommendations aimed at improving performance for the remainder of the project. The MTR also contains an executive summary that can act as a standalone document and an annotated ratings table.

1.3 Methodological approach and scope of the MTR

In line with the UNDP Evaluation Policy and UNDP Guidance for conducting mid-term reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-funded projects[2], this MTR is undertaken approximately halfway through project implementation. The review team was comprised an independent international consultant – Nicholas Tye – from C4 EcoSolutions with support from the project team. Data from both secondary and primary sources were collected, analysed and triangulated to ensure consistency, credibility and validity of the information. Documents including the project document, PIRs, Logical Framework (logframe), meeting minutes, work plan and reports were reviewed to gather relevant information from secondary sources. Moreover, quantitative and qualitative data were collected from primary sources mainly through key informant interview (KIIs) and visits to the target sites. More specifically, the MTR achieves its aim and objectives by:

- undertaking a critical analysis of the project's Logical Framework (logframe) indicators and targets by assessing how "SMART" (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound) they are, and suggesting specific amendments/revisions as necessary;
- evaluating the clarity, practicality and feasibility of a project's objectives and outcomes given its timeframe;

[2]http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf

- examining the extent to which the project is on track to reach its objective and outcome targets; and
- recommending corrective actions to keep project implementation on track and for effective use of remaining resources.

This MTR is based on:

- a comprehensive desktop review of project documents (see Annex 5 for a list) to review the project strategy and progress;
- a review of the project's Logical Framework to evaluate targets and indicators and, if necessary, suggest changes;
- an analysis of the financial and programme management to measure the success of the project in achieving its outcomes;
- interviews with project's implementers and partners as well as project's beneficiaries (see Table 3 for a list); and
- observations at the project sites (see Annex 8 for pictures of project sites).

During a mission organised from 7 to 13 October 2018, the reviewer conducted individual and group interviews with project's implementers, partners, beneficiaries and consultants to solicit first-hand information at national, district and municipality levels (see Table 3). The approach adopted by the reviewer to collect this information was an open discussion tailored around four main themes: i) relevance of the project, progress and satisfaction on project implementation; ii) effectiveness and efficiency of the project and partnerships established; iii) gain from, or need for, capacity building; and iv) challenges and opportunities for future direction. In addition to KIIs conducted in Beirut, the reviewer visited the districts of West Bekaa, Zahle and Rachaya where the project is being implemented.

Table 3: Summary of stakeholders interviewed in the MTR

Institution/group	Participants	Position	Remarks
Project Team	Ms. Nour Masri	Project Manager	
	Eng. Dominique Choueiter	Project Officer	
	Ms. Tala Moukaddem	Project Assistant	
	Ms. Jihan Seoud	UNDP Programme Manager: Energy and Environment	
Ministry of Environment	Dr. Joseph Al Asmar	Advisor to the Minister	
	Dr. Manal Moussallem	Advisor to the Minister	
Ministry of Agriculture	Dr Chadi Mohanna	Director of rural development and natural resources	
	Ms. Zeina Tamim	Head of department rangelands and public gardens on rangelands – Focal Point for SLMQ	
	Ms. Sylva Koteiche	Forestry Department – Focal Point for SLMQ	
	Ms. Pascale Milan	Head of legal department	
	Ms. Ellen Ayoub	Forestry Department	
Ministry of Environment	Eng. Adel Yacoub	Head of natural resources protection department, Technical focal point for SLMQ	
	Ms. Nancy Khoury	Head of registrar, Operational assistant to Minister of Environment on GEF matters	
Union of municipalities (Lake municipalities)	Eng. Yehia Daher	President of the Union of Lake Municipalities Mayor of Qaraoun	

Union of municipalities (Jabal el Cheikh)	Cheikh Saleh Abou Mansour	President of the Union of Municipalities – Jabal el Cheikh	
Lebanese Agricultural Research Institute (LARI)	Dr. Michel Afram	Director General of LARI	Meeting at LARI included a visit to the greenhouse installed by the project, and the seed bank that will supply rangeland restoration interventions.
	Eng. Joseph Kahwaji	Feed Quality Control Department	
	Eng. Joelle Breidy	Seed bank	
Hobeika Freres industries	Eng. Camille Hobeika	Partner of Hobeika Freres	Meeting at Hobeika included a demonstration of the imprinter designed and produced through the project for rangeland restoration.
University of Balamand	Dr. George Mitri	Land degradation mapping team	
ELARD	Mr. Serge Yazigi Mr. Ricardo Khoury Ms. Rana Zbeidy	Land use planning team	
Socio-economic assessment team	Ms. Hania Chahal	Socio-economic assessment team	

1.4 Structure of the MTR

The MTR consists of the following:

- an **executive summary** providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the review;
- an **introduction** providing the purpose and objectives, expected outputs and methodology of the review;
- a brief **overview of the evaluated project**, its development context, the problems that the project sought to address, the project objective and expected results, and key project partners and stakeholders;
- **review findings** on project strategy, effectiveness and efficiency, progress towards results, project implementation and adaptive management, and project sustainability;
- **review conclusions** and recommendations for corrective actions for the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the project; and
- **annexes** including Terms of Reference, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, guideline for interviews and co-finance info.

2. Project description and background context

2.1 Project background

The 4-year project *Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment* (SLMQ) is financed the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and is nationally implemented by the Ministry of Environment (MoE) of the Government of Lebanon (GoL) and by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) under the 'support to national implementation' modality.

The goal of the project is to promote sustainable land and natural resource management in the Qaraoun Catchment that alleviates land degradation, maintains ecosystem services and

improves livelihoods. Ecosystems in the Qaraoun Catchment provide a range of ecosystem services to local communities, including the supply of water for urban use and food production. Despite the importance of these ecosystems to communities, deforestation, expansion of urban settlements and inappropriate placement of infrastructure developments is causing widespread land degradation within the catchment. These factors, coupled with high levels of pollution within the Litani River, are reducing the supply of ecosystem services to surrounding communities and threatening their livelihoods. The GoL has recognised this problem and the need for interventions to reduce pollution and prevent land degradation, and this has created an enabling environment for the implementation of the SLMQ project. The project will build on existing structures put in place by the GoL to coordinate with the different institutions and departments relevant in the context of sustainable land management (SLM).

To promote sustainable land management within the Qaraoun Catchment, the project will work at three levels. Firstly, it will carry out local level interventions under Outcome 1 where specific SLM practices will be implemented on specific farms, forests and rangelands within three targeted districts in the catchment (namely West Bekaa, Zahle and Rachaya). Secondly, it will upscale tested approaches to the district level through the formulation of land use plans under Outcome 2. Thirdly, the project will prepare for higher level replication across all three districts of the catchment and beyond through the improvement of institutional capacities, an effective knowledge management system and an attractive economic incentives scheme under Outcome 3.

2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

The Qaraoun Catchment is an important source of source of water for urban use and food production, an important source of ecosystem services and a habitat for threatened biodiversity. However, deforestation, expansion of urban settlements and inappropriate placement of infrastructure developments is causing widespread land degradation within the catchment. This degradation of ecosystems within the catchment is reducing the supply of important ecosystem services and threatening the livelihoods of surrounding communities.

As noted by the National Action Programme to Combat Desertification[3], development and productivity are essential but should not be at the expense of the environment. The project is designed to engineer a paradigm shift from unsustainable to sustainable land management in the Qaraoun Catchment. The project will promote an integrated approach towards fostering sustainable land management – seeking to balance environmental management with development needs.

2.3 Main projects stakeholders

The project is hosted by the MoE in close coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Public Works and Transport (Directorate General for Urban Planning (DGUP)), Ministry of Energy and Water, Council for Development and Reconstruction, Litani River Authority (LRA), Lebanese Agricultural Research Institute (LARI), Municipalities and Unions of Municipalities, NGOs, Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and other international organisations.

The main stakeholders involved in this project are further detailed in the table below:

[3] Ministry of Agriculture, Lebanon (2003) *National Action Programme to Combat Desertification*.

Table 4: Stakeholders' involvement

STAKEHOLDER	ROLE AND/OR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PROJECT	RELEVANT PROJECT COMPONENT
Ministry of Environment (MoE)	MoE is the Executing Agency/Implementation Partner for the project as the national environment agency in Lebanon, responsible for all environmental protection issues. Its responsibilities are: i) to strengthen environmental inspection and enforcement; ii) to promote sustainable management of land and soil; iii) to preserve and promote Lebanon's natural resources; iv) to promote safe hazardous and non-hazardous waste management; and v) to control pollution and regulate activities that impact the environment. The MoE facilitates functioning of the Project Management Unit (PMU), especially in regard to liaison with government authorities from different sectors. MoE will take a lead in the upstream activities of the project as well as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) on which the Land Use Plans (LUPs) will be founded. MoE will ensure coordination with other relevant projects and initiatives and will be active in monitoring PCU performance.	As EA/IP for the project will be involved in work across all three Outcomes and most Outputs
Ministry of Agriculture (MoA)	The Ministry of Agriculture oversees the majority of land use in Lebanon. It is also the National Focal Point for the UNCCD. More specifically, it has responsibility for the management of forests, rangelands and agricultural activities. The MoA is therefore a key stakeholder and partner for the project. It provides advice and expertise for project activities at the local level, facilitate forests activities, as well as leads in the development and implementation of rangeland management protocols.	Main input will be made to Outcome 1; but also Outcomes 2 and 3. More specifically, MoA will contribute to Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3
Lebanese Agricultural Research Institute (LARI)	The LARI is a public institution dedicated to research for the development and advancement of the agricultural sector in Lebanon. It falls under the Ministry of Agriculture but continues to enjoy administrative and financial autonomy. LARI is involved in the project agricultural activities and povides advice and expertise for the innovative approaches and tools that the project will develop in its search for sustainable land management practices.	Main input will be related to Outcome 1, especially Output 1.3. Advice will also be sought under Outcome 2, specifically for Outputs 2.2, and 2.4.
Council for Development and Reconstruction (CDR)	The Council for Development and Reconstruction has three main tasks: compiling a plan and a time schedule for the resumption of reconstruction and development, guaranteeing the funding of projects, and supervising their execution and utilization by contributing to the process of rehabilitation of public institutions, thus enabling it to assume responsibility for the execution of a number of projects under the supervision of the Council of Ministers. More recently, CDR has focused on land use and land use planning and as such is a key stakeholder and partner for the project. It provides advice and expertise for the LUP activities of the project and shares ownership of the resulting plans.	Primarily work under Outcome 2, especially Output 2.2; but also involved in work under Outcome 3, Output 3.1
Qaraoun Catchment Districts, Municipal Unions and other Municipalities	The three Districts of interest to the project comprise a number of Municipalities, many of which have combined to form Unions. These local administrations are charged with the day-to-day management of all public works within their area of jurisdiction including water and waste networks, waste disposal, internal roads, and urban planning. They are key stakeholders and partners for the project Land Use Planning activities for which they will provide local knowledge and collaboration. They will also adopt and implement the LUPs and as such are among the main beneficiaries of the project. Furthermore, they will cooperate with the project in its reforestation and related activities, as well as the coordination of rangeland management.	Primarily work under Outcome 2, all four Outputs ; but also involved in work under Outcome 3
Ministry of Public Works and Transport	The Directorate General for Urban Planning (DGUP) of the Ministry of Public Works and Transport has responsibility for land use planning in Lebanon, although to date this has focussed on the urban environment. As the entity with legal responsibility for land use planning the DGUP is a major stakeholder for the project and will advise and assist the project with its LUP activities and provide the legal framework for their development, adoption and ultimate implementation.	Will contribute to Outcome 2 (especially Output 2.2) and serve as the avenue through which the results will be provided for

		government endorsement
Wider Public, Communities and the Private Sector	The involvement of the wider public and communities in ecosystem conservation is an important part of this project. Land owners and employers, other private sector exponents, farmers, shepherds, farmers associations and cooperatives, and other communities in the localities where the project is active, are the prime beneficiaries of the project. They will be involved fully in the design, testing, evaluating and eventually upscaling of project approaches and tools for Sustainable Land Management.	Opportunities will be provided for meaningful participation under Outcomes 2 and 1 – in particular Output 2.2, but also 1.2 and 1.3
Environmental NGOs and community groups	The environmental NGOs and community groups experienced in various aspects of the project will be involved as much as possible *e.g.* Forests activities (Jouzour Loubnan, Friends of the Cedars of Bcharre Committee, Association for Forests, Development and Conservation); Arable land activities such as organic farming and slow food (Greenline Association); Nature-based tourism development (e.g. trail development – Lebanon Mountain Trail Association, Baldati, etc.).	Mainly Outcomes 1 and 2, but possibly also Output 3.4
Academia	University staff and students from relevant institutions are invited to participate in activities for which they are seen to have the necessary expertise, advice, knowledge and/or capabilities.	Primarily Outcomes 1 and 2
Professional organisations	Organizations such as Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture, Syndicate of Industrialists, Order of Engineers and Architects are invited to participate in project activities as relevant to their areas of interest and expertise.	Outcome 2 and Outcome 3
The Litani River Authority (LRA)	The Litani River Authority (LRA) was formed in 1954 to facilitate the integrated development of the Litani River Basin. Its major achievement is the hydroelectric development project that has brought about major hydrological changes to the Litani River Basin. The project sees the LRA as a most important institution in the Qaraoun Catchment and is seen as a source of advice on hydrologic matters. The LRA is also a prospective beneficiary of the project as a result of its expected positive impact on lake water quality.	While not directly involved in project implementation, the LRA and MoEW will assist with evaluating the impacts of the project and may contribute specifically to Output 2.3.
Ministry of Energy and Water (MoEW)	The MoEW will collaborate with the project by monitoring water quality and quantity in the Litani River and the evaluation of the project success, as well as in the process of policy and legislation review.	
Central Administration of Statistics (CAS)	The CAS has published Environment statistics with data on water, the seabed, air pollution, soil, biodiversity, forests, wildlife and flora and waste. Some of this data is of interest to the project and CAS will be invited to collaborate in project activities such as surveys which will lead to the SEA and the LUPs. Statistics will also be helpful in evaluating the project's results and impacts.	CAS may be able to assist with the setting up and subsequent implementation of the Land Use Monitoring Programme (Output 2.3)

2.4 Expected results of the project

Overarching outcomes expected from this project include: i) *Landscape level uptake of SLM measures avoids and reduces land degradation, delivering ecosystem and development benefits in the Qaraoun Catchment*; ii) *Pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the Qaraoun Catchment are reduced*; and iii) *Institutional strengthening and capacity enhancement for promoting sustainable forest and land management in the Qaraoun Catchment through an INRM approach across the landscape***.** Together, these outcomes will promote large-scale adoption of SLM in the Qaraoun Catchment and beyond.

Table 5. Project components, outcomes and outputs

Outcomes	Outputs
1. Landscape level uptake of SLM measures avoids and reduces land degradation, delivering ecosystem and development benefits in the Qaraoun Catchment	1.1: Measures to restore and rehabilitate degraded forests identified, demonstrated and integrated into existing FMPs.
	1.2: Techniques and management mechanisms for sustainable rangeland management developed and tested, and appropriate infrastructure established to operationalize SLM.
	1.3: Implementation of sustainable agriculture management regime that integrates SLM considerations.
2. Pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the Qaraoun Catchment are reduced	2.1: A Land Use Information Management System (LUIMS) established.
	2.2: Integrated Land Use Management Plans (ILUMPs) developed, piloted, evaluated and refined as necessary for West Bekaa, and Rachaya, ensuring optimal allocation of land to generate development benefits and critical environmental benefits in tandem.
	2.3: Land Use Monitoring System developed and implemented to update and maintain the LUIMS, identify trends and ensure that any changes in land use remain within acceptable limits; to include remedial measures that will be triggered by the monitoring.
	2.4: Compliance and enforcement capacity heightened where necessary.
3. Institutional strengthening and capacity enhancement for promoting sustainable forest and land management in the Qaraoun Catchment through an INRM approach across the landscape	3.1: Recommendations to remove barriers to SLM in Lebanon integrated into relevant policies, legislation, procedures.
	3.2: Economic incentives and disincentives designed and set in place to promote adherence by the agriculture industry (including forests and rangelands) to the reformed policies and regulation.
	3.3: Institutional and human capacity enhanced for professionals, administrators, NGOs and community leaders leading to an increased level of SLM consideration in land use planning and management.
	3.4: A knowledge management and outreach programme for SLM developed and implemented to inform and help compliance, enhance sustainability, and prepare for replication and up-scaling.

3. Findings

3.1 Project design

The project aims to introduce SLM practices in the Qaraoun Catchment to maintain and enhance ecosystem services and thereby protect the livelihoods of local communities. To achieve this, the project will: i) implement SLM interventions in forests, rangelands and agricultural lands; ii) develop land use plans, that integrate SLM, for the target sites; and iii) strengthen national and local institutional capacity for the upscaling of SLM. Through this approach, which is fully aligned with and supported by Lebanon's national and international commitments to combat desertification and promote sustainable development, the project will demonstrate the environmental, social and economic benefits of SLM. This, in return, will promote the long-term investments of stakeholders from the public and private sector to restore and protect functional ecosystems.

Table 6 below provides an analysis of the design of the project as outlined in the project document to identify whether the project strategy is effective to achieve the desired objective

and outcomes. The following elements of the project design are reviewed: i) incorporation of lessons learned; ii) extent to which the project is country-driven; iii) risk management strategy; iv) alignment with country priorities; v) decision-making processes; vi) likelihood of results being achieved within the project timeframe and resources; and vi) integration of gender considerations. Where necessary, recommendations to improve the project design are provided.

Table 6: Project design assessment

Category	Comments	Recommendations
Integration of lessons learned	- SLM is a relatively new concept in Lebanon and there are not many projects to draw lessons learned from. However, lessons learned from past projects on ecosystem restoration and environmental management have been integrated into the project design. - UNDP has implemented several projects in Lebanon, and lessons learned, particularly regarding project management and implementation, have been integrated to the project design.	- As SLM is a relatively new concept in Lebanon, the project should ensure that results of the SLM interventions, land use plan development process and scientific information collected in the preparatory assessments are communicated to a wide audience.
Country-driven process	- Stakeholders from various ministries, universities, and local authorities were consulted for the preparation of the project to ensure that the project is aligned with national priorities. - The project includes activities that are well-aligned with existing national policies/strategies on environmental management. - The MoA has launched a reforestation project that aims to plant 40 million trees. The project is well-aligned with this priority and can contribute knowledge and technical expertise to guide tree-planting outside of the project target sites. - MoA is undertaking a revision of the Forest Law to integrate sustainable management principles. The project is contributing to this process by drafting text for the rangeland management section.	- The project is developing scientifically rigorous methodologies for forest and rangeland restoration. The project should ensure that these scientific protocols are shared widely to guide further restoration efforts in the country. - The project could consider translating the restoration projects into Arabic to ensure that they are available to a wide range of stakeholders.
Risk management	- The UNDP Environmental and Social screening procedure was conducted during the development of the project document. - The project document identifies five potential risks – one with high severity, three with moderate severity and one with low-medium severity. - The MTR concurs with the risk rating, and the mitigation measures as they are stated in the project document. - The PIR reports on the high severity risk, *Insecurity and political unrest resulting in considerable delays and postponement of project implementation* and describes the mitigation actions being undertaken. The MTR concurs that this risk is well managed and currently does not pose a significant threat to the project achieving its objectives.	- It would be beneficial if the project reported on risks identified as moderate severity in the PIRs.

Alignment with country priorities/country ownership	- The project strategy is well-aligned with national environmental policy measures, including: • Activation of the national strategy for the management of forest fires • Follow up the implementation of the national plan for reforestation and combating desertification • Promotion of natural sites and reserves and biodiversity • Activation of the environmental management of water basins • Planning for urbanization and reducing its environmental implications - The project contributes to the alleviation of pollution in the Litani River and Qaraoun Lake, which is national priority of the GoL. - The PMU is housed within the MoE, which strengthens ownership of the of project's activities within the MoE.	n/a
Decision-making processes	- An extensive stakeholder consultation process was conducted during the development of the project document. Stakeholders consulted included, *inter alia*: • MoE • MoA • LARI • CDR • DGUP • LRA • Municipalities - The MTR notes that the project continues to include a broad range of stakeholders in decision-making processes during implementation. In particular, the project has developed strong working relationships with MoE, MoA, LARI and targeted municipalities. There are also plans in place to ensure that local community members will be consulted during the implementation of on-the-ground activities.	n/a
Likelihood of results being achieved within the project timeframe and resources	- The project experienced delays at the start of implementation (see Section 3.2). Despite these delays, the project has now completed most of the preparatory work – conducting several scientific assessments, procuring relevant consultancies and developing strong stakeholder engagement mechanisms – and is in a position to begin the on-the-ground implementation of planned interventions.	- The project may consider limiting the scope of Output 2.4 to strengthening the capacity of the MoE and targeted municipalities to enforce compliance with land use plans. It may be beyond the scope of the project to establish enforcement measures. - The project may consider limiting the scope of Output 3.2 to developing a range of proposed economic

	Most of the outputs stipulated in the project document therefore appear achievable. - The MTR does, however, note that two of the outputs stipulated in the project document are highly ambitious and may not be achievable within the timeframe and resources of the project. These are outputs 2.4 and 3.2. <u>Output 2.4: Compliance and enforcement capacity heightened where necessary.</u> The project document states that the focus of this output is 'the enhanced operational, surveillance, interception and prosecution capabilities of agencies implementing (and enforcing) the Land Use Plans so as to stop unplanned conversion of natural habitat, unsustainable application of agricultural chemicals, and non-compliance with land use permits and conditions'. While the project can certainly contribute to increasing the capacity of targeted institutions to enforce compliance with LUPs through training and the development of LUPs, indicator 3.4 *Existence of enforcement measures in promoting adherence to land use criteria, regulations, and guidance* implies that the project will also establish enforcement measures. The establishment of enforcement measures is likely to be a complicated (involving many ministries) and time-consuming activity, and it is the opinion of the MTR that this is beyond the scope of the project given its stated timeframe and resources. <u>Output 3.2: Economic incentives and disincentives designed and set in place to promote adherence by the agriculture industry (including forests and rangelands) to the reformed policies and regulation.</u> The project document states that under this output a range of economic incentives and disincentives will be trialled at the project sites before they are proposed to the GoL. Developing and then trialling economic incentives/disincentives is likely to be a time-consuming process involving many different stakeholders at the local level. Given that little work has taken place towards achieving this output to date, it is the opinion of the MTR that the project is unlikely to develop, trial and then propose a range of economic	incentives/disincentives to promote adherence by the agricultural sector to sustainable land use practices. It may be beyond the scope of the project to trial or implement these incentives/disincentives.

	incentives/disincentives within the remaining timeframe of the project.	
Gender issues	- A gender strategy is included in the project document. The strategy focuses on including the views of women in the design of project interventions and in the development of land use plans. There are no specific activities aimed at promoting gender equity. - To date, the project has implemented the gender strategy, and women have been consulted during project implementation. In particular, the socio-economic assessment specifically consulted women to identify alternative income generating activities. - There are no gender-disaggregated indicators included in the project's results framework.	- The project should focus on involving women in the alternative income generating activities. - Where possible, the results framework of the project should be amended to include gender-disaggregated indicators.

The project's logical framework was revised during the inception phase. A critical analysis of this revised project logframe and indicators (Table 7) is conducted in light of the 'SMART' criteria, as described below:

- *Specific*: Indicators use clear language, describing a specific future condition.
- *Measurable*: Indicators have measurable aspects making possible to assess whether they were achieved or not.
- *Achievable*: Indicators must be within the capacity of the partners to achieve.
- *Results-based*: Indicators must make a contribution to selected priorities of the national development framework.
- *Time-bound*: Indicators are never open-ended; there should be an expected date of accomplishment.

Based on this critical analysis, alternative indicators/targets are proposed where necessary. A justification for any proposed changes is also included in the table.

Table 7: SMART assessment of project logical framework

Components/ Outcomes/ Outputs	Indicator	Target for end of project	SMART assessment and comments	Proposed new indicator	Proposed new target for end of project	Justification
Project objective	0.1 Alleviation of land degradation – Area in target districts managed according to	>25% implementation within the project target areas	• There is a mismatch between the indicator (area measured in ha) and the target (percentage implementation). This renders the indicator	0.1 Alleviation of land degradation, measured as: Area (ha) in target districts managed according to SLM principles	24,300 ha of land in the target districts managed according to SLM principles.	• The target is converted to an area (ha) measurement to match the indicator. • The revised target is the sum of the areas targeted by the project in forests (10,300 ha), rangelands (10,000 ha) and agriculture (4,000 ha).

	SLM principles		unclear and therefore difficult to measure.			
	0.2 Maintenance of ecosystem services – such as food, medicinal herbs, and timber products from forests, rangelands, and soil nutrient balance	Increased recognition of the value of natural resource management/ecosystem services - Target to be established during baseline phase	• There is a mismatch between the indicator (list of ecosystem services) and the target (recognition of the value of ecosystem services). This renders the indicator unclear and therefore difficult to measure.	<u>Option 1</u>: 0.2 Maintenance of ecosystem services, measured as: Increased recognition of the value of ecosystem services among target communities, measured as: Change in the classification of the level of water utilised for agriculture (classified as high, medium or low) Percentage change in the number of reports documented for non-compliance with zoning permits <u>Option 2</u>: 0.2 Maintenance of ecosystem	The classification the level of water utilised for agriculture remains the same or decreases (i.e. moves from high to low) 10% increase in the number of reports documented for non-compliance with zoning permits <u>Option 2</u>:	Two options for a revision to the indicator are proposed. The first option intends to quantitatively measure 'recognition of ecosystem services, while the second option aims to measure a specific ecosystem service as a proxy for the wider range of ecosystem services maintained. <u>Option 1</u>: • The indicator is revised to reflect a recognition of the value of ecosystem services among target communities. It is assumed that an increased recognition in the value of ecosystem services will lead to the maintenance of these services by target communities. • It is difficult to measure a *recognition of the value of ecosystem services*, and therefore the indictor is further detailed to list two specific sub-indicators: i) Change in the classification of the level of water utilised for agriculture; and ii) percentage change in the number of reports documented for non-compliance with zoning permits. These specific sub-indicators were suggested – and measured – in the socio-economic assessment as a means of assessing the recognition of the value of

				services, measured as: Change in total soil organic carbon in the targeted area	Total soil organic carbon remains the same or increases in the targeted area	ecosystem services. It is assumed that a decrease in the level of water utilised for agriculture reflects an increased recognition among community members (farmers) of the value of ecosystem services as they are no longer over-exploiting this resource. Similarly, it is assumed that an increase in the number of reports documented for non-compliance with zoning permits reflects an increased recognition of ecosystem services among local government as they are now enforcing environmental protection legislation. <u>Option 2</u>: • The indicator is revised to measure a specific ecosystem service rather than a recognition of the value of ecosystem services. • Soil organic carbon is proposed as an ecosystem service that may be measured as it was quantified using remote-sensing during the land degradation assessment. Therefore, a baseline for this proposed indicator exists.
	0.3 Improvement in livelihoods – Project communities are	Income level and/or consumption proxies show an improvement of 10% in quality of	• The indicator (and associated target) is unclear, listing participation, income level and consumption proxies	0.3 Improvement in livelihoods: Improved quality of life among target		• The indicator is reworded to clarify that a change in the quality of life of targeted communities will be measures. It is assumed that an improvement in livelihoods within targeted

	participating in SLM interventions and have improved their quality of life (measured by income level and/or consumption proxies)	life – target to be established during baseline phase	are possible measures. It is unclear which of these should be measured.	communities, measured as: Number of new economic opportunities created within targeted communities	Five new economic opportunities created in target communities	community will lead to an improved quality of life. • It is difficult to measure a *quality of life*, and therefore the indictor is further detailed with a specific sub-indicator: number of new economic opportunities created within targeted communities. This sub-indicator was suggested – and measured – in the socio-economic assessment as a means of assessing quality of life.
Outcome 1	1.1 Recovery trend in degraded forests contributing to connectivity in remnants isolated forest pockets within targeted areas	300 ha of forests by end of project	• There is a mismatch between the indicator (recovery trend – which is assumed to be measured as a time series change) and the target (area). This renders the indicator unclear and therefore difficult to measure.	1.1 Area of degraded forest restored to improve forest patch connectivity.	300 ha of degraded forest – in targeted areas that improve overall forest patch connectivity – restored by the end of the project	• The indicator has been reworded to clarify the units of measurement. • The target reflects the concept on landscape connectivity, specifying that the areas targeted for restoration must be chosen based on their potential to improve connectivity. • This indicator reflects only that area where direct restoration by the project will take place. The additional 10,000 ha of forest where SLM will be implemented through forest management plans is captured in indicator 0.1.
	1.2 Area of degraded rangelands recovered in targeted areas through SLM techniques achieving the	Turnaround in 10,000 ha of rangelands	• The target is slightly ambiguous, with no clear definition of how to measure 'turnaround'.	1.2 Existence of SLM tools and techniques for the improved management of 10,000 ha of degraded rangelands in targeted areas to	SLM tools and techniques exist for the improved management of 10,000 ha of degraded rangelands in targeted areas.	• Indicator is reworded slightly to clarify what will be measured. • Target is reworded to reflect what will be measured, but the targeted area remains the same.

	main three attributes of ecosystem status: • Soil/Site Stability • Hydrologic function • Integrity of the Biotic Community			achieve the main three attributes of ecosystem status: • Soil/Site Stability • Hydrologic function • Integrity of the Biotic Community		
	1.3 Uptake of SLM measures in arable land in target areas.	SLM principles applied in 5% of land (4,000 ha) by end of project, with potential for replication to 100%. Introduction of SLM or related certification.	• There is a slight mismatch between the indicator and the target.	Area of arable land in targeted areas where SLM measures are being applied.	SLM measures are being applied, either directly or through replication, in 4,000 ha of arable land in targeted areas.	• The indicator and target are reworded to match one another, but the principle behind the indicator and the targeted area remain the same.
	1.4 Percentage of land users in project localities in each of the three Districts that are	>25% implementation within the project target areas	• The indicator is specific and measurable. However, there is the opportunity to integrate a gender consideration into the indicator.	Percentage of land users (gender-disaggregated) in project localities in each of the three Districts that are applying SLM	>15% of land users (of which at least 30% are women) in project localities in each of the three Districts that are applying SLM	• Gender disaggregation is integrated into the indicator to improve the project's ability to report on gender equality within the results framework • The target is reworded to clarify what will be measured.

	applying SLM approaches in upland forests, rangelands, and valley arable lands		• The target is slightly ambiguous as there is no clear definition of 'implementation'. • It is also noted that the target of 25% of land users is highly ambitious and may not be achievable within the scope of the project.	approaches in upland forests, rangelands, and valley arable lands	approaches in upland forests, rangelands, and valley arable lands.	• A reduction in the target from 25% to 15% of land users is proposed. This change is in line with the proposed revision to indicator 0.1, which targets ~15% (24,300 ha of a total of ~160,000ha) for SLM implementation.
Outcome 2	2.1 Existence of Integrated local or district level Land Use Plans in West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts	SLM and wider sustainability considerations are integrated into existing or newly developed local or district level Land Use Plans in the West Bekaa and Rachaya districts (91,000 ha) – area to be confirmed	• The indicator is slightly unclear and does not reflect the integration of SLM into local or district land use plans.	Number of local or district level land use plans in the targeted areas that integrate SLM approaches and thereby reduce pressure on natural resources.	At least 10 newly developed local or district level land use plans in the targeted areas that integrate SLM approaches.	• The indicator is revised to reflect the number of local or district level land use plans that specifically integrate SLM approaches. • The target is set at 10 local or district level land use plans. These plans may be a Master Plan for all targeted districts, or local detailed urban plans (DUPs).
	2.2 Reduction in pressure on rangeland resources in the high country of West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts – as shown by species composition	An improvement of 20% (>10,000 ha) in targeted areas	- There is a mismatch between the indicator (which mentions reduction in pressure measured through species composition and productivity) and the target (measured as area). - It is unclear how species composition and productivity relate to a reduction	Reduction in pressure on rangeland and forest resources, measured as: Species diversity (alpha diversity) in rangelands and forests	An increase in species diversity (alpha diversity) in rangelands and forests	- Given the ambiguity in the current indicator/target, the unclear link between the indicator and the overall outcome, and the apparent repetition between this indicator and indicator 1.1, a range of new indicators are suggested. - These indicators are suggested as quantitative means of measuring a reduction in pressure on natural resources.

	and productivity		in pressure on rangeland resources. - The target appears similar to that measured in indicator 1.2.	Change in productivity in rangelands and forests	An increase in productivity in rangelands and forests	- Considering that the original indicator 2.3 (see below) is similar, although applied to forests instead of rangelands, it is suggested that these ecological indicators could be combined. - A range of indicators are listed, however, they may not all need to be measured. The most applicable indicator/s may be selected by the project team, or alternative/additional indicators included. • The first new indicator aims to measure species diversity. It is assumed that an increase in species diversity correlates with reduced pressure on rangeland and forest resources. Species diversity in rangelands and forests was measured during the ecological assessment and therefore a baseline is available. • The second indicator measures productivity in rangelands and forests, as was suggested in the original indicator. It is assumed that increased productivity correlates with reduced pressure on rangeland and forest resources. This assumption should be carefully examined, however, as productivity may be influenced by factors (e.g. annual rainfall) outside of the project's control. Productivity was measured using remote-sensing during the ecological assessment

						and therefore baseline data exists.
	2.3 Reduction in pressure on forest resources in West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts – as shown by the level of regeneration and recruitment of seedlings	An improvement of 8% (+ 500 ha) when compared with control in West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts	- There is a mismatch between the indicator (which mentions reduction in pressure measured through level of regeneration and recruitment of seedlings) and the target (measured as area). - It is unclear how level of regeneration and recruitment of seedlings will be measured. - Given the intended interventions of the project, it may not be achievable to measure level of regeneration and recruitment of seedlings across such a large area. - The target appears similar to that measured in indicator 1.1.	Existence of a Land Use Management System (LUIMS) and Land Use Monitoring System to inform the integration of SLM into land use plans. <u>Option 2</u>: Indicator/target is removed.	A Land Use Management System (LUIMS) and a Land Use Monitoring System developed to inform the integration of SLM into land use plans. <u>Option 2</u>: Indicator/target is removed.	- Given the ambiguity in this indicator, and the proposal above (see indicator 2.2) to measure ecological indicators for both rangelands and forests simultaneously, an entirely new indicator is proposed. - The new indicator measures the existence of a Land Use Management System (LUIMS) and a Land Use Monitoring System that inform the integration of SLM into land use plans. It is assumed that the provision of up-to-date information that informs land use planning – along with the implementation of these land use plans – will result in reduced pressure on natural resources. - The new indicator links to Output 2.1 and Output 2.3 of the project.
Outcome 3	3.1 Capacity development indicator score for Land Use Planning and Management in West	By end of project an overall score of > 50%	• Indicator and target are clear, measurable, and seem achievable within the scope of the project.	No change	> 50% overall capacity development indicator score for Land Use Planning and Management in West Bekaa and	

	Bekaa and Rachaya Districts at districts and municipalities level.				Rachaya Districts at districts and municipalities level.	
	3.2 Acceptance level of the value of SLM as a rational approach for land use measured by: Attitude and level of compliance survey (maybe integrate in the socio-economic assessment – mid-term would include the attitude assessment. Target group: Key stakeholders (local decision makers, selected households of farmers, shepherds,	Increase acceptance and implementation (20%)	• There is a slight mismatch between the indicator and target. • It is noted that this is a difficult indicator to measure and requires the knowledgeable design of an acceptance assessment.	Percentage change in the knowledge level of SLM as a rational approach for land use. *Target group: Key stakeholders (district and municipality officials, selected households of farmers, shepherds, etc. in Zahle, West Bekaa, and Rachaya)*	20% increase in the knowledge level of SLM as a rational approach for land use.	• The indicator and target are reworded to match one another, but the principle behind the indicator remains the same. • NOTE: Level of knowledge was assessed during the socio-economic assessment. Change in knowledge may be measured by repeating the knowledge assessment. Alternatively, change in knowledge may be assessed with scorecards before and after training events.

	etc. in Zahle, West Bekaa, and Rachaya)					
	3.3 Extent of mainstreaming of SLM at the national and local levels into: - policy, regulatory frameworks, and strategies, planning and reporting - Investments and extension services Target audience: MoA, MoE, CDR, and other key agencies, as well as West Bekaa, Zahle, and Rachaya District administrations and municipalities	Targets to be established under Output 3.1.	• There is no clear methodology for assessing the extent of mainstreaming included in the indicator. • No target has been established.	Potential options: Existence of targets for SLM in national and/or local: policies, regulatory frameworks, strategies, and land use plans. Existence of SLM practices in training curricula for agricultural schools. Existence of extension services to support the implementation of SLM.	Targets for SLM are included in national and/or local: policies, regulatory frameworks, strategies, and land use plans SLM practices are integrated into the training curricula for agricultural schools. There are extension services available to communities in Zahle, West Bekaa, and Rachaya to support the implementation of SLM.	• In order to clarify how mainstreaming of SLM will be measured, a range of potential indicators are proposed. • A range of indicators are listed, however, they may not all need to be measured. The most applicable indicator/s may be selected by the project team, or alternative/additional indicators included. • The first indicator is intended to measure mainstreaming of SLM into policies/plans. • The second indicator is intended to measure the mainstreaming of SLM into training curricula. • The third indicator is intended to measure the mainstreaming of SLM into the ongoing work of relevant ministries.

	3.4. Existence of enforcement measures in promoting adherence to land use criteria, regulations, and guidance.	Increase reporting on cases of non-compliance received by MoE/MoJ (10%)	• There is a slight mismatch between the indicator (existence of enforcement) and the target (non-compliance reporting). This renders the indicator unclear.	Enforcement of measures promoting adherence to land use regulations and guidance, measured as: Percentage change in the number of reports documented for non-compliance with zoning permits.	10% increase in the number of reports documented for non-compliance with zoning permits	• The indicator has been reworded to match the target. • NOTE: This indicator is similar to the new indicator proposed for indicator 0.2. If the indicator for 0.2 is adopted, then this indicator 3.4 may not be necessary.

3.2 Effectiveness and efficiency of the project

The project is nationally implemented by the MoE and by the UNDP under the 'support to national implementation' modality. A project management unit (PMU) has been established within the MoE and coordinates project activities. The Head of the Natural Resources Protection Department is the designated technical focal for the project.

The PMU is comprised of one project manager, one project assistant and one project officer. It is responsible for day-to-day project implementation including technical guidance, partnership management, communication and operation management. The MTR notes the effectiveness of the PMU, in particular given the limited number of staff and its significant responsibilities for project implementation. The project sites are also located away from the central offices in Beirut, and the MTR recognises the effectiveness of the PMU in managing activities in the three target districts.

Project implementation was significantly delayed at the beginning of the project. This delay in implementation is attributable to:

- delays in signing the relevant documents;
- delays in hiring the PMU; and
- seasonality which means that the implementation of forest and rangeland restoration interventions is restricted to certain times of the year (October – February).

The delay to project implementation has resulted in minimal resource utilisation (Table 8).

Table 8: Project expenditure

Project financing:	$3,487,671
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2018:	$353,198
Cumulative disbursement against total approved amount (in project document):	10.13%

The low rate of resource utilisation is mostly attributable to the delays experienced at the start of the project. The MTR notes that the PMU has now completed most of the preparatory work – procuring relevant consultancies, developing strong stakeholder engagement mechanisms and conducting several scientific assessments – required in order to begin the on-the-ground implementation of project activities. The PMU has also developed the required work plans to increase the rate of project implementation moving forward. Despite these efforts to increase the rate of implementation, it is noted that there is a lot to do in the remaining timeframe in order for the project to achieve its desired objectives.

Recommendation:
The project should consider a no-cost extension of 12 – 18 months to account for the delays experienced at the start of the project and ensure that there is enough time available to achieve all of the desired objectives.

3.3 Progress towards results

In this section, the project's progress towards results is evaluated based on the data provided in the project document, PIRs, Result Framework, inception and workshop reports, field observations and interviews conducted with relevant project partners (implementing/executing partners as well as project beneficiaries).

Please note that progress is measured against the existing project results framework. Please see Section 3.1 for a critical assessment of the results framework and proposed revisions to targets and indicators.

Table 9. Evaluation of project progress.

Components/ Outcomes/ Outputs	Indicator	Baseline level	End-of-project target	Midterm level and assessment	Achievement rating	Justification for rating
Project objective: Sustainable land and natural resource management alleviates land degradation, maintains ecosystem services, and improves livelihoods in the Qaraoun Catchment	0.1 Alleviation of land degradation – Area in target districts managed according to SLM principles	No explicit SLM practices in the Qaraoun Catchment	>25% implementation within the project target areas	0% Although SLM measures are yet to be implemented on-the-ground, the project has completed the necessary preparatory activities that will allow for the implementation of forest, rangeland and agricultural SLM interventions. These preparatory activities include the following. • Land degradation assessment to identify target sites for interventions. • Ecological assessment to identify the species – and species mix – that will be used for forest and rangeland SLM interventions. • Discussions with municipalities and farmers to inform the design of interventions and identify potential sites for interventions. • Construction of a greenhouse to supply seeds and seedlings for forest and rangeland SLM interventions. • Construction of an imprinter for rangeland restoration.	MS	Although SLM measures are yet to be implemented on-the-ground, the project has completed the necessary preparatory activities that will allow for the implementation of forest, rangeland and agricultural SLM interventions. The baseline assessments conducted are high quality and provide a solid scientific foundation for site selection and SLM intervention design. If SLM interventions are implemented in the areas identified in the baseline assessments and the identified alternative income

	0.2 Maintenance of ecosystem services – such as food, medicinal herbs, and timber products from forests, rangelands, and soil nutrient balance	Ecosystem services taken for granted and not recognized as dependent on wise land use	Increased recognition of the value of natural resource management/ ecosystem services - Target to be established during baseline phase	Recognition of value of ecosystem services[4]: • Low: 51% • Medium: 34% • High: 15% *(values obtained from the socio-economic assessment).* Baseline scores for the 'recognition of the value of ecosystem services' were established in the socio-economic assessment. An analysis was undertaken to determine the dependence of local communities particularly farmers and herders, on natural resources. The analysis determined that local communities are highly dependent on natural resources, but their recognition of his varied. Farmers are more aware of their dependence on ecosystem services than herders. The project – through training, demonstration of SLM interventions and discussions with relevant stakeholders – aims to increase these scores.		generating activities are realised, the project is likely to reach its targets. A concern is the limited time remaining to implement these interventions.
	0.3 Improvement in livelihoods – Project communities are participating in SLM interventions and have improved their quality of life (measured by	Baseline will be established by surveying representative selected communities, as an early activity of project inception (see Output 2.2)	Income level and/or consumption proxies show an improvement of 10% in quality of life – target to be established during baseline phase	Income levels and quality of life proxies are still to be quantified in targeted communities in the socio-economic assessment. Five alternative income generating activities have been identified: • Beekeeping • Grape molasses • Rural tourism • Dried fruits • Kechek		

[4] - Low recognition: does not depend on agriculture or herd management for living and have little recognition of value of natural resources
- Medium recognition: has other means of income but will be affected with limited access to natural resources, and have medium recognition of natural resources
- High recognition: has no alternative than agriculture or herd management, and highly dependent on this as main source of income

	income level and/or consumption proxies)			The project is actively seeking partnerships with NGOs operating at the project sites that are promoting SLM agricultural practices and promoting alternative income generating activities.		
Outcome 1: Landscape level uptake of SLM measures avoids and reduces land degradation, delivering ecosystem and development benefits in the Qaraoun Catchment	1.1 Recovery trend in degraded forests contributing to connectivity in remnants isolated forest pockets within targeted areas	In target districts, up to 500 ha of forests are badly degraded	300 ha of forests by end of project	0 ha. The project has completed the necessary preparatory activities that will allow for the implementation of forest restoration interventions. Sites have been selected based on the ecological and land degradation assessment, and methodologies – including the species mix – for forest restoration have been developed. These methodologies focus on: i) improving existing forest patches; ii) increasing the size of existing forest patches; iii) creating new patches of restored forest; and iv) creating buffer zones around forest patches. The project has also identified connectivity corridors in the landscape – one linking forest patches in the mountainous areas and one linking wetlands and riparian zones. The project has hired a team to restore 114 ha of degraded forest. The riparian strip linking Ammiq Wetland to Kfarzabad is also being rehabilitated (stretching over 25 km). The project is also working on developing a Decision Support System for rehabilitation of degraded lands based on the Integrated Planning Approach, including Climate Change and Community perception as criteria for decision-making.	MS	The project intends to meet its targets through the direct implementation of SLM interventions, and through the replication of SLM interventions according to FMPs, RMPs and LUPs. The project has completed preparatory activities for the implementation of forest, rangeland and agricultural SLM interventions. In addition, the project is developing forest management plans, rangeland management plans and land use plans (that include agricultural areas) that integrate SLM considerations. If these interventions are implemented and the plans developed are adhered to, the project is likely to reach the specified targets. While much of the preparatory work for the SLM interventions has been completed, the limited time remaining in
	1.2 Area of degraded rangelands recovered in targeted areas through SLM techniques achieving the	In target districts, up to 51,400 ha of rangelands are badly degraded – estimate to be refined through the first survey	Turnaround in 10,000 ha of rangelands	0 ha The project has completed preparatory activities that will allow for the implementation of rangeland restoration interventions. These include: • Land degradation assessment to identify target sites for interventions.		

	main three attributes if ecosystem status: -Soil/Site Stability -Hydrologic function -Integrity of the Biotic Community	under Output 2.2		• Ecological assessment to identify the species – and species mix – that will be used for rangeland SLM interventions. • Construction of a greenhouse to supply seeds for rangeland SLM interventions. • Construction of an imprinter and seeder for rangeland restoration. • Signed an MoU with LARI to identify roles and responsibilities for rangeland management coupled with an agreement for LARI to utilise the greenhouse and existing seedbank to supply seeds for the rangeland restoration activities. • Testing fodder mix protein content with LARI – the results of which will be integrated into the rangeland restoration activities. • Establishing experimental plots to measure the impact of grazing on rangelands and determining the species mix and its protein content. The project is also preparing to develop rangeland management plans (RMPs) – based on the National guidelines for management of rangelands outside of forests that is also being developed through the project (see indicator 2.2 below) – that will cover more than 10,000 ha in West Bekaa and Rashaya. In preparation for the RMPs, the project developed a national rangelands map based on a methodology used in Greece, pending field validation.		the project for the on-the-ground implementation of these interventions is a concern. Also of concern is the limited progress towards to the implementation of agricultural SLM interventions. The project will need to fast-track implementation in order to meet its targets before the project ends.
	1.3 Uptake of SLM measures in arable land in target areas.	Few if any farmers and other land users apply SLM measures knowingly	SLM principles applied in 5% of land (4,000 ha) by end of project, with potential for replication to 100%. Introduction of SLM or related certification.	0% A needs assessment has been conducted in West Bekaa, Zahle and Rachaya to identify requirement for agricultural SLM interventions. Meetings have been conducted with multiple stakeholders (municipalities, local authorities, land owners) to integrate their views into the design of the agricultural SLM interventions.		

				Because seasonality is less of a factor for the agricultural SLM interventions, the project has focussed on forest and rangeland interventions. Agricultural activities are planned to begin in 2019.		
	1.4 Percentage of land users in project localities in each of the three Districts that are applying SLM approaches in upland forests, rangelands, and valley arable lands	Current level in project target areas is very low (see Output 2.2)	>25% implementation within the project target areas	0 % The project has completed preparatory activities for the implementation of forest, rangeland and agricultural SLM interventions (see description of indicators 1.1 – 1.3). In addition, the project is developing forest management plans, rangeland management plans and land use plans (that include agricultural areas) that integrate SLM considerations. If these interventions are implemented and the plans developed are adhered to, the project is likely to reach the specified target.		
Outcome 2: Pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the Qaraoun Catchment are reduced	2.1 Existence of Integrated local or district level Land Use Plans in West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts	Existing Land Use Plans do not reflect natural resource limitations and sustainability considerations	SLM and wider sustainability considerations are integrated into existing or newly developed local or district level Land Use Plans in the West Bekaa and Rachaya districts (91,000 ha) – area to be confirmed	Draft Master land use plan for West Bekaa, Zahle and Rachaya that integrates SLM considerations. The project is developing a Master land use plan, coupled with a strategic environmental assessment, for West Bekaa, Zahle and Rachaya. The draft is to be completed in early 2019. The master land use plan will incorporate sustainability and SLM considerations. Following the development of the master plan, detailed urban plans (DUPs) covering 74,000 ha in West Bekaa and Rachaya will be developed, knowing that the masterplan covering all three districts will be integrating the results of the project assessments. The information collected and generated through the development of these LUPs will form the basis for the Land Use Information Management System.	MS	The development of LUPs (Mater land use plans and DUPs is progressing well. The project is on track to meet its land use planning targets. The information collected and generated through the development of these LUPs will form the basis for the Land Use Information Management System and the Land Use Monitoring System. The project has completed preparatory activities for the implementation of forest and rangeland SLM interventions. In addition,

	2.2 Reduction in pressure on rangeland resources in the high country of West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts – as shown by species composition and productivity	51,400 ha of rangelands considered degraded. To be refined through first survey (see Output 2.2)	An improvement of 20% (>10,000 ha) in targeted areas	0% The project has completed preparatory activities that will allow for the implementation of rangeland restoration interventions (see indicator 1.2 for details) The project is also preparing national guidelines for management of rangelands outside of forests. Training on these guidelines is also being provided. The national guidelines for management of rangelands outside of forests will inform the development of rangeland management plans (RMPs) covering more than 10,000 ha in West Bekaa and Rashaya. The project is performing a review of laws and regulations relating to rangelands and preparing of legal texts to be incorporated in the updated Lebanese Forest Law. These revisions will integrate rangeland SLM interventions into the Forest Law. In addition, draft farm leasing contracts that require leasees to implement SLM measures have been prepared.		the project is developing FMPs and RMPs that integrate SLM considerations. These plans form the basis for replication of forest and rangeland interventions across the target areas to reduce pressure on natural resources. The development of guidelines for both management of rangelands outside of forests and forest management will further promote replication of forest and rangeland interventions across the target areas to reduce pressure on natural resources.
	2.3 Reduction in pressure on forest resources in West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts – as shown by the level of regeneration and recruitment of seedlings	6,032 ha of forests estimated to be degraded. To be refined through survey (see Output 2.2)	An improvement of 8% (+ 500 ha) when compared with control in West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts	0% The project has completed the necessary preparatory activities that will allow for the implementation of forest restoration interventions (see indicator 1.1 for details). The project has hired a team to restore 114 ha of degraded forest. The riparian strip linking Ammiq Wetland to Kfarzabad is also being rehabilitated (stretching over 25 km). At a broader scale, the project is preparing national forest management guidelines.		

				Training on these guidelines is also being provided. The national forest management guidelines will inform the development of forest management plans (FMPs). The following FMPs are complete/planned: • General forest management plan (12,982 ha covered) is complete, • Detailed management plans for 5 to 7 representative forest stands are planned. The project is also going to develop a manual documenting lessons learned during restoration activities. This manual could then be upscaled into national guidelines for forest restoration. Outside of the project's direct interventions, the PMU is also supporting: • designation of Anjar Kfarzabad as a RAMSAR wetland. • designation of Mt Hermon as a UNESCO Biosphere site. All of the above-mentioned activities will contribute to a reduction in pressure on forest resources in West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts.		
Outcome 3: Institutional strengthening and capacity enhancement for promoting sustainable forest and land management in the Qaraoun Catchment through an INRM	3.1 Capacity development indicator score for Land Use Planning and Management in West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts	Current score for West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts in 33.3%	By end of project an overall score of > 50%	33.3% A Master land use plan and DUPs are being developed by the project. Facilitated meetings and focus group discussions conducted with local planning authorities during the development of these LUPs is expected increase their capacity for sustainable land use planning. The project has not yet developed a formal approach for capacity development (Output 3.3).	MU	The project has done well to identify opportunities to mainstream SLM. The project is supporting the integration of SLM into the Forest Law and is producing national guidelines that include SLM considerations. It is likely to meet its mainstreaming targets.

approach across the landscape	3.2 Acceptance level of the value of SLM as a rational approach for land use measured by: Attitude and level of compliance survey (maybe integrate in the socio-economic assessment) Target group: *Key stakeholders (local decision makers, selected households of farmers, shepherds, etc. in Zahle, West Bekaa, and Rachaya)*	Current level in project target areas is very low (see Output 2.2)	Increase acceptance and implementation (20%)	The socio-economic assessment conducted a perception survey in the targeted sites to quantify the farmers and herders views on the value of natural resources. Both farmers and herders acknowledge the importance of water and land and are dependent upon these resources for their livelihoods. However, this acknowledgment does not translate into sustainable land use practices. The current understanding of the value of SLM remains low at the project sites. By demonstrating SLM interventions in forest, rangeland and agricultural land, the project intends to increase understanding of the value of SLM among local communities. The project has not yet developed a formalised knowledge management and outreach programme (Output 3.3), although elements are in place.		However, institutional strengthening and capacity development is currently taking place in an *ad hoc* manner. The project has yet to formalise an approach for capacity development. There is therefore a risk that the project may not attain its capacity development and institutional strengthening targets. Given the limited time remaining, it is a concern that the project has yet to begin work on strengthening enforcement capacity (Output 2.4) or developing economic incentives/disincentives (Output 3.2).
	3.3 Extent of mainstreaming of SLM at the national and local levels into: - policy, regulatory frameworks, and strategies, planning and reporting - Investments and extension services	Baseline to be established under Output 3.1.	Targets to be established under Output 3.1.	SLM is being mainstreamed into the Forest Law (on-going update into the Forest and Rangelands Law). National guidelines for management of rangelands outside of forests and forest management are being developed. The project has planned to develop national guidelines for riparian forest restoration. The project is mainstreaming SLM into the work of the Basin Committee. Given their similar objectives, the project is coordinating with the MoA to combine the national SLM committee and national committee on combatting desertification and		

	Target audience: *MoA, MoE, CDR, and other key agencies, as well as West Bekaa, Zahle, and Rachaya District administrations and municipalities*			land degradation. This will facilitate the mainstreaming of SLM. The project is working with FAO to mainstream SLM concepts in academic curricula for technical schools and universities.		
	3.4. Existence of enforcement measures in promoting adherence to land use criteria, regulations, and guidance.	None exist at present	Increase reporting on cases of non-compliance received by MoE/MoJ (10%)	No enforcement measures in place. The project has yet to begin work on strengthening enforcement capacity (Output 2.4) or developing economic incentives/disincentives (Output 3.2).		

Green = Achieved	**Yellow** = On target to be achieved	**Red** = Not on target to be achieved

Recommendations based on project progress:

- The project should consider a no-cost extension of 12 – 18 months to account for the delays experienced at the start of the project and ensure that there is enough time available to achieve all of the desired objectives.
- The scientific foundation established by the project is impressive. However, the project should consider moving forward with pilot activities to learn implementation modalities while the scientific assessments are still being completed.
- The implementation of agricultural SLM interventions should begin as soon as possible. This is to ensure that the project reaches its intended targets. In addition, agricultural interventions demonstrate benefits over the short-term and can enhance community buy-in for SLM interventions.
- The project should develop a formal workplan for capacity development and institutional strengthening activities to ensure that it reaches its intended targets.
- The project may consider limiting the scope of Output 2.4 to strengthening the capacity of the MoE and targeted municipalities to enforce compliance with land use plans. It may be beyond the scope of the project to establish enforcement measures.

- The project may consider limiting the scope of Output 3.2 to developing a range of proposed economic incentives/disincentives to promote adherence by the agricultural sector to sustainable land use practices. It may be beyond the scope of the project to trial or implement these incentives/disincentives.

3.4 Project implementation and adaptive management

This section reviews the project implementation in order to identify challenges and suggest adjustments or additional measures to support implementation more effectively.

Table 8: Review of project implementation and adaptive management

Category	Comments/Observations	Recommendations
Management arrangements	- There is no significant deviation in the current management arrangements as compared to that described in the project document. - The use of the Committee for Combatting Pollution in the Qaraoun Lake (Basin Committee) and the Litani River Authority as the Technical Advisory Group for the project has improved the relevance of the project. This committee meets regularly which means that the project receives regular feedback and guidance. - The designation of separate focal points within the relevant ministries for forest, rangeland and agricultural restoration respectively has aided project implementation. - Roles and responsibilities of national and local project partners are clear (as per partners' interviews). - The project has demonstrated adaptative management, for example through the process followed to select project sites and through the revision of work plans following delays at the start of the project. <u>UNDP Country Office (CO)</u> - The UNDP CO provides good and timely support to the PMU through the Energy and Environment division. - The UNDP CO has assisted the PMU to manage project delays. - Realistic annual reporting is taking place. - Critical risks identified are being adequately mitigated.	n/a
Work planning	- The start of project implementation was delayed (please refer to Section 3.2). - Work plans are being developed/updated regularly and are result-based. - The project's logical framework was revised during the inception stage. A critical assessment of this revised logical framework is presented in Section 3.1, along with additional proposed revisions.	Please see recommendations in Section 3.1 and 3.2.

Finance and co-finance	- The project finances are run through UNDP as per the support to NIM implementation modality, and there are strong financial controls in place. - Annual audits have taken place. - The rate of disbursement has been significantly lower than anticipated. Please see Section 3.2 for further details. - From the reports received by the MTR, it does not appear that the project has reported on co-financing commitments.	The PMU should prepare a report that shows actual and planned co-financing commitments.
Project level monitoring and evaluation systems	- Project monitoring and evaluation is proceeding well. Sufficient resources have been allocated to M&E activities. - The MTR is implemented on time – about halfway into project implementation. - Baseline assessments have taken place. These include: i) land degradation assessment; ii) ecological assessment; and ii) socio-economic assessments. The assessments have produced baseline data and identified indicators that will be measured throughout project implementation. It is planned to monitor the identified indicators in mid-2019 and at the end of the project. - PIRs have been completed in 2017 and 2018. - The current project monitoring and evaluation system is weak when it comes to measuring gender results.	Where possible, the project's monitoring and evaluation system should report on gender considerations and include gender-disaggregated indicators.
Stakeholder engagement	- The project has been successful in developing strong stakeholder engagement mechanisms. All stakeholders interviewed during the MTR reported that project maintained regular contact, sought their input in decision-making processes and clearly communicated roles and responsibilities. - There is strong support for the project from the MoE (reported by both the technical focal point and advisors to the Minister of Environment). - There is strong support for the project from project partners, including MoA, LARI and municipalities. - Engagement with community members has been relatively limited up until now (limited to the socio-economic assessment), but plans are in place to engage communities once on-the-ground implementation of project activities begins.	n/a
Reporting	- Inception report, PIRs and project board meeting minutes are prepared and available. - Issues/challenges identified in the PIRs have been addressed. - The project has demonstrated adaptative management, for example through the process followed to select project sites and through the revision of work plans following delays at the start of the project. - At the time of the MTR, the project team were in the process of completing the mid-term results for the GEF LD Tracking tool.	The PMU should complete the GEF LD Tracking tool to include the mid-term results of the project.

Communication	- All project stakeholders interviewed during the MTR reported regular, clear and effective communication with the project. Roles and responsibilities of project partners are clearly understood. - The project is detailed on the UNDP Lebanon website[5]. - A story on the SLMQ project titled "Protect, restore, reduce – working towards land degradation neutrality in Lebanon" has been included in the UNDP/GEF publication 'Listening to our Land – Stories of Resilience'[6] - The project has been included in press releases from UNESCO for their joint work on the designation of the Mt Hermon Biosphere and the implementation of integrated planning in Lebanon.	n/a
Overall Project Implementation & Adaptive Management rating	**S**	

[5] http://www.lb.undp.org/content/lebanon/en/home/library/environment_energy/SUSTAINABLE-LAND-MANAGEMENT-IN-THE-QARAOUN-CATCHMENT-SLMQ-PROJECt.html

[6] https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Environment%20and%20Energy/biodiversity/UNDP%20Listening%20to%20our%20land%20lowres.pdf

3.5 Sustainability

The MTR recognises that UNDP considered sustainability in the design of the SLMQ project. In addition, the PMU continues to consider the sustainability of the project outcomes during implementation. Examples of how the project is working to ensure the sustainability of the project outcomes are listed below.

- The Committee for Combatting Pollution in the Qaraoun Lake (Basin Committee) and the Litani River Authority serve as the Technical Advisory Group for the project. The functioning of these institutions is not reliant on project resources. By integrating SLM considerations into the ongoing work of these institutions, the project is promoting the continued implementation of SLM after the project ends.
- The greenhouse where seedlings for the project's forest and rangeland restoration activities will be grown has been constructed on the grounds of LARI. The project has entered into a memorandum of understanding with LARI which will see the continued functioning of this greenhouse once the project ends.
- The project is working with FAO to integrate SLM into academic and technical training curricula for universities and technical schools. This will ensure that there will be the expertise required to continue implementing SLM once the project has ended.
- The project is contributing to the revision of the national Forest Law – contributing text for the management of rangelands. The revised law will require SLM in rangelands, which will ensure the sustainability of this approach.
- The project is developing national guidelines for: i) management of rangelands outside of forests; and ii) forest management. These guidelines will continue to inform forest and rangeland management plans after the project ends.

Table 11 provides an assessment of financial, socio-economic, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks that may affect the sustainability of the project outcomes.

Table 9: Assessment of project sustainability

	Risk to sustainability	Mitigation measures	Recommendations
Financial	- The GoL does not allocate sufficient resources to the continued implementation of SLM once the project has ended.	- The project is promoting the integration of SLM into the ongoing forest restoration activities of the GoL (through the 40 million trees initiative and the training of relevant actors).	The project is developing scientifically rigorous for forest and rangeland restoration. The project should ensure that these scientific protocols are shared widely to guide further restoration efforts in the country.
Socio-economic	- Insecurity and political unrest at the project sites result in interventions not being implemented and therefore SLM measures cannot be upscaled once the project ends. - Municipalities do not take ownership of the LUPs developed and they are not implemented and enforced once the project ends.	- The PMU with the support of the CO implements a continuous monitoring of the security situation in the country. The UN also constantly assesses country and localized risk in all areas where it operates through the unified UN Security System. This allows for sufficient lead time to plan adequate response actions and adjustment in project	The PMU should ensure that the independent consultant team developing the LUPs continues this engagement with municipalities to promote ownership of the LUPs.

	- Alternative income generating activities promoted by the project are not implemented by community members.	activities. This should continue through the duration of the project. - The project has established mechanisms to engage with municipalities and promote ownership of outputs. The PMU should ensure that the independent consultant team developing the LUPs continues this engagement with municipalities to promote ownership of the LUPs. - Alternative income generating activities were identified through a socio-economic assessment that included thorough community engagement.	
Institutional framework and governance	- Restoration of forests and defining no-development zones in the Qaraoun Catchment may encounter resistance from production sectors such as infrastructure, mining and agriculture and local communities, limiting the sustainability of these interventions.	The project is ensuring that forest restoration interventions and LUPs are designed and implemented with the full participation of stakeholders from government, non-government and the private sector, fostering an understanding of the need for striking the right balance between development and safe-guarding of ecosystems for the services they provide.	n/a
Environmental	- Over-grazing limits the success of the rangeland rehabilitation interventions and they are not replicated. - The species used for rangeland and forest restoration are unsuitable for the project site and restoration interventions cannot be upscaled.	- The project has undertaken an extensive land degradation and socio-economic assessment to identify appropriate area for rangeland restoration. A map of rangelands inside and outside of forests has been produced. The project is also engaging local shepherds to identify appropriate sites and obtain their buy-in for rangeland restoration interventions. This includes mapping their space use patterns to identify grazing routes and grazing hotspots. This information will be integrated into rangeland management plans. - The project has undertaken an environmental assessment to identify the locally appropriate species for forest and rangeland restoration. The species identified are being promoted restoration activities being undertaken by other institutions.	n/a
Overall Sustainability rating[7]	L		

[7] The four-point scale used is: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (ML) and Unlikely (U).

4. Conclusions and recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

The evaluation of the Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment project is overall satisfactory. The project experienced significant delays at the start, but since those challenges were overcome the project has been notably well managed, has developed a strong foundation for the future implementation of interventions, and has plans in place to achieve most of its targets.

The main conclusions of the MTR are:

- The project is well managed. The PMU is highly capable and enthusiastic, and have developed strong working relationships with the MoE, UNDP CO and other relevant stakeholders.
- Given the delays experienced at the beginning of the project and the current low rate of disbursement, it is likely that the project will require a no-cost extension of at least 12 – 18 months in order to achieve its intended targets.
- The project is generally well designed to meet its objectives. The design includes appropriate risk mitigation measures and activities that will promote the sustainability of the interventions. The MTR does, however, note that two of the outputs stipulated in the project document are highly ambitious and may not be achievable within the timeframe and resources of the project. These are outputs 2.4 and 3.2. The project may consider limiting the scope of these outputs.
- Not all of the indicators/targets included in the current results framework adhere to the SMART criteria. The MTR has proposed modifications to the results framework.
- The project has developed a strong scientific foundation for the upcoming implementation of on-the-ground interventions. Three major assessments have been undertaken; land degradation assessment, ecological assessment and socio-economic assessment. Moving forward, the project should build on the results of these assessments during the development of detailed urban plans, the Land Use Information Management System and the Land Use Monitoring System.
- The project has demonstrated excellent communication with all project stakeholders. All stakeholders have a clear understanding of the project objectives and the role that they could play in achieving them. The project should continue this regular communication moving forward.
- Innovation is a strength of the project. Not only is SLM a relatively new concept in Lebanon, but the project has actively sought new approaches for project implementation. An example of the innovation shown by the project is the design and construction of a new imprinter with seeder for rangeland restoration. The project should continue to seek innovative solutions for SLM in Lebanon.

4.2 Recommendations

Table 12: Recommendations

Rec #	Recommendation[8]	Entity responsible
Project Design:		
A.1	**As SLM is a relatively new concept in Lebanon, the project should ensure that results of the SLM interventions, land us plan development process and scientific information collected in the preparatory assessments are communicated to a wide audience.**	**PMU/UNDP**
A.2	**The project is developing scientifically rigorous methodologies for forest and rangeland restoration. The project should ensure that these scientific protocols are shared widely to guide further restoration efforts in the country.**	**PMU/UNDP**
A.3	The project could consider translating the restoration projects into Arabic to ensure that they are available to a wide range of stakeholders.	PMU/UNDP
A.4	It would be beneficial if the project reported on risks identified as moderate severity in the PIRs.	PMU/UNDP
A.5	**The project may consider limiting the scope of Output 2.4 to strengthening the capacity of the MoE and targeted municipalities to enforce compliance with land use plans. It may be beyond the scope of the project to establish enforcement measures.**	**PMU/UNDP**
A.6	**The project may consider limiting the scope of Output 3.2 to developing a range of proposed economic incentives/disincentives to promote adherence by the agricultural sector to sustainable land use practices. It may be beyond the scope of the project to trial or implement these incentives/disincentives.**	**PMU/UNDP**
A.7	The project should focus on involving women in the alternative income generating activities.	PMU/UNDP
A.8	**Where possible, the results framework of the project should be amended to include gender-disaggregated indicators.**	**PMU/UNDP**
Effectiveness and efficiency:		
B.1	**The project should consider a no-cost extension of 12 – 18 months to account for the delays experienced at the start of the project and ensure that there is enough time available to achieve all of the desired objectives.**	**PMU/UNDP**
Progress towards results:		
	See recommendation B.1	
	The scientific foundation established by the project is impressive. However, the project should consider moving forward with pilot activities to learn implementation modalities while the scientific assessments are still being completed.	**PMU/UNDP**
C.1	**The implementation of agricultural SLM interventions should begin as soon as possible. This is to ensure that the project reaches its intended targets. In addition, agricultural interventions demonstrate benefits over the short-term and can enhance community buy-in for SLM interventions.**	**PMU/UNDP**
C.2	The project should develop a formal workplan for capacity development and institutional strengthening activities to ensure that it reaches its intended targets.	**PMU/UNDP**
	See recommendation A.5	
	See recommendation A.6	**PMU/UNDP**
Project implementation and adaptive management:		

[8] Key recommendations are bolded.

	See recommendation B.1	**PMU/UNDP**
D.1	The PMU should prepare a report that shows actual and planned co-financing commitments.	PMU/UNDP
	See recommendation A.8	**PMU/UNDP**
D.2	The PMU should complete the GEF LD Tracking tool to include the mid-term results of the project.	PMU/UNDP
Sustainability:		
	See recommendation A.2	**PMU/UNDP**
E.1	The PMU should ensure that the independent consultant team developing the LUPs continues this engagement with municipalities to promote ownership of the LUPs.	PMU/UNDP

Annex 1 – MTR ToRs

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full*-sized project titled *Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment (SLMQ)* (PIMS #4642) implemented through the *Ministry of Environment*, which is to be undertaken in *2018*. The project started on the *28th of January 2016* and is in its *second* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*

(http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf)

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project title:	Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment, Lebanon
Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Environment
PRODOC Signature	28 Jan 2016
Project duration	48 months
Total budget (in cash):	**USD 3,487,671**
• *GEF contribution*	USD 3,187,671
• *UNDP contribution*	USD 300,000

The 4-year project, titled "Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment" or "SLM Qaraoun" is financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and is nationally implemented by the Ministry of Environment (MoE) of the Government of Lebanon (GoL) and by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) under the Support to National Implementation Modality.

The project was designed to: achieve sustainable land management in the Qaraoun Catchment. More specifically, it is aiming to obtain alleviation of land degradation, maintenance of ecosystem services and an improvement in livelihoods as targeted by the Objective. The Qaraoun catchment is characterized by its important role in providing ecosystem services in the area in addition to being a source of water for urban use and food production. Despite its crucial functions, the catchment suffers from accelerating land degradation attributable to historic deforestation, expansion of urban settlements, and inappropriate infrastructure placement. National momentum has shed the light on the increasingly important pollution levels in the area creating an enabling environment for the Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment project, and specifically for introducing improved land management practices at the local level. The project will build on the existing structure to coordinate with the different institutions and departments relevant in the context of SLM.

To achieve this, the project will be working at 3 levels. Firstly, it will carry out local level interventions under Outcome 1 where specific SLM practices will be implemented in 3 districts in specific farms, forests and rangeland areas within selected landscapes. Secondly, it will upscale its tested approaches to the district level through the formulation of land use plans under Outcome 2. Thirdly, the project will prepare for higher level replication across all four districts and beyond through the improvement of institutional capacities, an effective knowledge system and an attractive economic incentives scheme under Outcome 3.

The project is hosted by the Ministry of Environment in close coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Public Works & Transport & DGUP, Ministry of Energy & Water, Council of Development and Reconstruction (CDR), Litani River Authority (LRA), Lebanese Agriculture Research Institute (LARI), Municipalities and Unions of Municipalities, NGOs, Investment Development Authority of Lebanon, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and other international organizations.

3.OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR evaluator will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the project considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR evaluator will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR evaluator is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[9] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[10] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to:

1. Ministry of Environment
2. Ministry of Agriculture
3. Ministry of Public Works and Transport - Directorate General of Urban Planning
4. Council for Development & Reconstruction (CDR)
5. Litani River Authority
6. Lebanese Agriculture Research Institute (LARI)
7. Unions of municipalities and municipalities

Additionally, the MTR evaluator is expected to conduct field missions to Lebanon, including the following three project districts: Rashaya, West Bekaa and Zahle.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

[9] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.

[10] For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator[11]	Baseline Level[12]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[13]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[14]	Achievement Rating[15]	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.

[11] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[12] Populate with data from the Project Document
[13] If available
[14] Colour code this column only
[15] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)

- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[16] Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table. No more than 15 recommendations should be provided.

Ratings

The MTR will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

[16] Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for SLMQ Project

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *20* working days over a time period of *6* weeks, and shall not exceed two months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	*2 days*	*05 August 2018*
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	*5 days*	*13 – 17 August 2018*
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	*1 day*	*17 August 2018*
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	*8 days*	*10 September 2018*
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) *(note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)*	*4 days*	*28 September 2018*

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	Consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	Consultant presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex C) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit

4	**Final Report***	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is *UNDP Lebanon Country Office*.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The MTR consultant will be responsible for liaising with the Project Team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

The team composition will consist of one international consultant. The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

- **Demonstrated understanding of the Land Degradation GEF Focal Area and related work on Sustainable Land Management ;**
- Experience in gender including on sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Sustainable Land Management GEF Focal Area
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in Arab States region;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Higher degree in natural resource management or environmental science or environmental policy or land management or closely related field

The selection of consultants will be based on the below:

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

The award of the contract should be made to the individual Consultant whose offer has received the highest score out of the following criteria:

Technical Criteria weight: 70%

Financial Criteria weight: 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum technical score of 70 points would be considered for the financial evaluation.

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical Competence	70%	100
Academic Qualifications (relevant) Master's degree: (10 points) PhD: (12 points) Relevant trainings/certificates: + 3 Points		15
Years of Relevant Experience 10 Years: (10 points) Above 10 years (20 points)		20
Relevant Experience Experience in required technical field (10 points) Experience in undertaking GEF evaluations (5 points) Experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (5 points) Regional knowledge and experience; (5 points) Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Sustainable Land Management GEF Focal Area; (5 points) Experience with UN or international donor project(s) evaluation; (5 points)		35
Financial (Lower Offer/Offer*100)	30%	100
Total Score	Technical Score * 0.7 + Financial Score * 0.3	

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTR report

60% upon finalization of the MTR report

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[17] provided by UNDP;

b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[18]);

c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address *Arab African International Bank Bldg, Riad El Solh Street, Nejmeh, Beirut, Lebanon* in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment project Midterm Review" or by email at the following address ONLY: (fill email) by ***(time and date).*** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

17 https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

18 http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the *SLMQ* Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[19]

i. Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
- MTR time frame and date of MTR report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- MTR team members
- Acknowledgements

ii. Table of Contents

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*
- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
- MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table

2. Introduction *(2-3 pages)*
- Purpose of the MTR and objectives
- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
- Structure of the MTR report

3. Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*
- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list

4. Findings *(12-14 pages)*

4.1 Project Strategy
- Project Design
- Results Framework/Logframe

4.2 Progress Towards Results
- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
- Management Arrangements

[19] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

- Work planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

4.4 Sustainability

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

5. Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)*

5.1 Conclusions

- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

5.2 Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes

- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- MTR mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)*

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

(Questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit)

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[20]

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at _____ *(Place)* on _____ *(Date)*

Signature: _____

[20] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)

4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #4642)*

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report	MTR team response and actions taken

Annex 2 – Interview guide used for data collection

Below is the interview guide that was used as support for the discussions with project implementers, partners and beneficiaries. Face-to-face interviews and Focus Group Discussions were organised around the four main themes underlined in the table: i) satisfaction; ii) collaboration and partnering; iii) knowledge management and capacity building; and iv) future direction. The reviewer used open discussion oriented around these four themes and the related questions to collect qualitative and quantitative data relevant to the MTR.

Table A2.1. Survey guide for project management, partners and beneficiaries

1	**Satisfaction**
1.1	What, in your view, have been the key achievements thus far; i.e. what would not have happened, or happened as quickly without the project?
1.2	To what extent is the project's work aligned with key priorities of your organisation?
1.3	What are areas in which the project could do better in terms of quality of interactions, processes that the project uses, technical work or knowledge sharing? Please give examples.
1.4	Please comment on how well the project is addressing or incorporating into its work emerging priorities, such as the renewed emphasis on gender equality, sustainability or country ownership?
2	**Collaboration and partnering**
2.1	Is the project doing enough to partner with other relevant organisations, including local organisations? In what ways are they working well? Are any important connections not being made, and if this is the case, how can they improve?
3	**Knowledge management and capacity building**
3.1	How are the project's products shared among partners and among relevant organisations? Are lessons learned captured, compiled and shared? Are project results shared and used to facilitate replication of best practices? How could this process be improved?
3.2	In your view, is the project addressing capacity building needs of the beneficiary community organisations (e.g. CBOs and cooperatives, relevant line ministries) and local governmental institutions? Please elaborate.
4	**Future direction**
4.1	Given your experience with the project, what are the strengths and weaknesses of this project and what would you like to see changed in future project designs?
4.2	What are the technical gaps or emerging priorities that need to be addressed, either in the remainder of this project, or in a follow-on one?

Annex 3 – Ratings scales

Progress towards results were rated according to the scale presented in the table below.

Ratings for Progress Towards Results		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

As per the ToRs of the MTR, sustainability on the following four-point scale: Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (ML) and Unlikely (U).

Annex 4 – List of institutions interviewed

Institution/group	Participants	Position	Remarks
Project Team	Ms. Nour Masri	Project Manager	
	Eng. Dominique Choueiter	Project Officer	
	Ms. Tala Moukaddem	Project Assistant	
	Ms. Jihan Seoud	UNDP Programme Manager: Energy and Environment	
Ministry of Environment	Dr. Joseph Al Asmar	Advisor to the Minister	
	Dr. Manal Moussallem	Advisor to the Minister	
Ministry of Agriculture	Dr Chadi Mohanna	Director of rural development and natural resources	
	Ms. Zeina Tamim	Head of department rangelands and public gardens on rangelands – Focal Point for SLMQ	
	Ms. Sylva Koteiche	Forestry Department – Focal Point for SLMQ	
	Ms. Pascale Milan	Head of legal department	
	Ms. Ellen Ayoub	Forestry Department	
Ministry of Environment	Eng. Adel Yacoub	Head of natural resources protection department, Technical focal point for SLMQ	
	Ms. Nancy Khoury	Head of registrar, Operational assistant to Minister of Environment on GEF matters	
Union of municipalities (Lake municipalities)	Eng. Yehia Daher	President of the Union of Lake Municipalities Mayor of Qaraoun	
Union of municipalities (Jabal el Cheikh)	Cheikh Saleh Abou Mansour	President of the Union of Municipalities – Jabal el Cheikh	
Lebanese Agricultural Research Institute (LARI)	Dr. Michel Afram	Director General of LARI	Meeting at LARI included a visit to the greenhouse installed by the project, and the seed bank that will supply rangeland restoration interventions.
	Eng. Joseph Kahwaji	Feed Quality Control Department	
	Eng. Joelle Breidy	Seed bank	
Hobeika Freres industries	Eng. Camille Hobeika	Partner of Hobeika Freres	Meeting at Hobeika included a demonstration of the imprinter designed and produced through the project for rangeland restoration.
University of Balamand	Dr. George Mitri	Land degradation mapping team	
ELARD	Mr. Serge Yazigi Mr. Ricardo Khoury Ms. Rana Zbeidy	Land use planning team	
Socio-economic assessment team	Ms. Hania Chahal	Socio-economic assessment team	

Annex 5 – List of documents reviewed

Project documents
- PIF
- Project document
- Project document annexes
- CEO Endorsement request
- Revised project results framework
- Project progress presentation

Annual work plans:
- SLMQ annual work plan 2016
- SLMQ annual work plan 2017
- SLMQ annual work plan 2018

PIRs:
- SLMQ PIR 2017
- SLMQ PIR 2018

Inception reports:
- SLMQ inception report
- Minutes of meeting: Inception project board meeting

Project board meeting minutes:
- Minutes of meeting: Inception project board meeting
- Minutes of project board meeting 2017

Minutes of meetings:
- Minutes of meeting: SLMQ with SALMA project
- Minutes of meeting: Roundtable on rangelands
- Minutes of meeting: Presentation of results of legal gap analysis and draft forest management guidelines

Project reports:
- SMLQ Socio-economic assessment
- SMLQ Key socio-economic performance indicators
- SLMQ Perception survey
- SLMQ Ecological assessment – Inception Report
- SLMQ Ecological assessment – methodology of work
- SMLQ Ecological assessment – preliminary integrated monitoring programme
- SMLQ Land degradation assessment

Terms of references:
- Land use planning and strategic environmental assessment ToR
- Riparian restoration ToR

Other:
- Committee for Combatting Pollution in the Qaraoun Lake roadmap
- Committee for Combatting Pollution in the Qaraoun Lake members list

Annex 6 – Co-financing table

[to be completed]

Source of co-financing	Name of co-financier	Type of co-financing	Amount confirmed at CEO endorsement	Actual amount contributed at stage of MTR	Actual % of expected amount
GEF agency	UNDP	Grant	450,000		
National Government	Ministry of Environment	Loan	17,600,000		
Total			**18,050,000**		

Annex 7 – Signed MTR final report clearance form

Pending upon clearance of the MTR final report.

Annex 8 – Mission pictures

Figure 1: View over project sites in Bekaa valley

Figure 2: Imprinter designed by the project to be used for rangeland rehabilitation interventions

Figure 3: Greenhouse at LARI constructed by the project. The greenhouse will supply seedlings for forest and rangeland restoration.