



### Small Grants – Project Completion and Impact Report

*Instructions to grantees: please complete all fields, and respond to all questions listed below.*

<b>Organization Legal Name</b>	<i>Environment for Life (E.f.L)</i>
<b>Project Title</b>	Assessing the Biodiversity Value of Olive Sites in Mount Hermon KBA & Identifying the Environmental Impacts of Various Agricultural Practices
<b>Grant Number</b>	19
<b>Date of Report</b>	16 October 2019

#### CEPF Hotspot: Mount Hermon KBA - Lebanon

**Strategic Direction:** Strategic Direction 3: Promote the maintenance of traditional land use practices necessary for the conservation of Mediterranean biodiversity in priority corridors of high cultural and biodiversity value.

**Grant Amount:** 20,000 USD

**Project Dates:** 15 April 2019 – 15 October 2019

#### PART I: Overview

##### 1. Implementation Partners for this Project (*list each partner and explain how they were involved in the project*)

Stakeholder Groups	Involvement in the project	Interest	Influence
<b>Ministries</b>			
Ministry of Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participated to the preparatory meetings with the EFL Management, in particular with the Ministry of Agriculture General Director.</li> <li>• Participated in the final workshop to adjust the recommendations based on national interest.</li> <li>• Declared their readiness to present any kind of any related statistics,</li> </ul>	High	Medium

Stakeholder Groups	Involvement in the project	Interest	Influence
	<p>studies and information available at the ministries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Declared their readiness to participate in the project's second phase.</li> </ul>		
Ministry of Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Declared their readiness to present any kind of any related statistics, studies and information available at the ministries.</li> <li>Declared their readiness to participate in the project's second phase.</li> </ul>	High	Medium
Ministry of Economy and Trade		High	Medium
Ministry of Industry		High	Medium
<b>Government Departments</b>			
Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture in Zahle and Bekaa (CCIAZ)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participated to the preparatory meetings with the EFL Management.</li> <li>Declared their readiness to present any kind of any related statistics, studies and information available at the CCIAZ.</li> <li>Declared their readiness to participate in the project's second phase.</li> </ul>	High	Medium
<b>Local Authorities</b>			
JSMF-Mount Hermon Municipality Federation and member Municipalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cooperated with EFL on the proposed scope of work and supporting CEPF and EFL initiative.</li> <li>Participated in all meetings with the Project experts.</li> <li>Signed an MOU with EFL related to the implementation of the project.</li> <li>Participated actively in the organization of the final workshop and contributed financially to cover some of its expenses.</li> <li>Participated with CEPF management and EFL to set a primary vision for the second phase of the project.</li> </ul>	High	High
Municipalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participated in the final workshop to discuss project results and filled the assessment evaluation sheet.</li> <li>The municipalities of the selected sites receive CEPF-EFL delegation and expressed their vision for the project second phase.</li> </ul>	High	High
Muktars	Not yet.	Low	Low

Stakeholder Groups	Involvement in the project	Interest	Influence
<u>Governates /and Kaim – makam<sup>1</sup></u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Kaim-makam participated personally in the final workshop to discuss project results and filled the assessment evaluation sheet.</li> </ul>	Medium	Medium
<b>Non-Governmental Organizations/Community Groups</b>			
Environmental Groups and associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participated in the final workshop to discuss project results and filled the assessment evaluation sheet.</li> </ul>	High	Medium
Youth Organization		Medium	Low
Women empowerment associations		Medium	Low
<b>Direct Beneficiary Communities</b>			
Agriculture Cooperatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participated in the final workshop to discuss project results and filled the assessment evaluation sheet.</li> </ul>	High	Medium
Farmers and land owners		High	High
Pressing factories		High	Medium
Firms		Medium	Low
<b>Post-secondary Institutions</b>			
Research, design, advocacy and development Institutions	Not yet	Medium	Low
Analytical Laboratories		Medium	Low
<b>Certification Organizations Public Advisory Committees/ Civil Societies</b>			
LIBNOR (Lebanese institute for norms and standardization)		Medium	Low
<b>Employees / Volunteers</b>			
Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participated in the final workshop to discuss project results and filled the assessment evaluation sheet.</li> </ul>	Low	Low
<b>Residents in the Area</b>			
Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participated in the final workshop to discuss project results and filled the assessment evaluation sheet.</li> </ul>	Medium	Low
Individuals		Low	Low
Households		Low	Low
<b>Other Private Interests</b>			
Hotels & Restaurants	Participated in the final workshop to discuss project results. (the workshop was organized in a restaurant “Layali Wadi Al Taim”. Hotel Al Kanz was informed about the project and is ready to cooperate in the future activities.	Medium	Low

<sup>1</sup> Kaim – Makam means a governor of a small district, who has direct administrative authorization over the municipalities.

## **2. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project**

The project was a preparatory grant to establish the biodiversity value of Mount Hermon KBA and study the negative impacts of the modern olive farming techniques and document at the same time the positive environmental impacts of traditional and conventional agricultural practices. Also, the results of the preparatory phase served as an introduction to start a second phase project to mainstream the Good Agricultural Practices in Mount Hermon KBA and open markets, thus alleviate the socio-economic situation in the area.

The biodiversity value of the Mount Hermon KBA was studied thoroughly and a baseline is now established in this understudied KBA. The results clearly indicate that the site qualifies designation as a biodiversity significant area.

The link between biodiversity and existing olive farming in Mount Hermon KBA is more elaborated during this preparatory phase, results show that traditional olive farming techniques are more environmentally friendly and more rich in biodiversity.

### **Component 1, Activity 1.1**

**A study of the Biodiversity value of the site on Ecological, Physical, Socio-economic, Institutional and management levels was produced.**

#### **Results related to Flora:**

The study indicated the presence of 221 taxa, from it 24 are narrow endemics. This pronounced endemism represents the most important feature characterizing the flora of the mountain. The endemics are rather diffused over the different studied sites. These preliminary findings indicate the pronounced plant biodiversity richness of the Lebanese side of Mt Hermon. The climatic and geomorphological diversity and the isolation effect of its topography have rendered the mountain a home for a rich variety of wildlife including many rare and endemic plant species. Although not yet completed, this work is the first comprehensive contribution to the checklist of the Hermon flora in Lebanon and can be considered the basis for compiling a complete checklist, and supporting the evaluation efforts of the diversity of the Lebanese flora in general. This study highlights the vital role that Mt Hermon plays in the conservation of many economically important wild plants and in the resilience of local livelihoods.

#### **Results related to fauna diversity – mammals**

After Interviewing and questioning the inhabitants and stakeholders of the study area, it appeared that 12 mammal species occur in it. At the national level, it appears that most of the mentioned mammals of the study area are ranging from vulnerable to critically endangered.

#### **Results related to fauna diversity – Birds**

The resulting list of birds is shown below:

- 95 species
- 36 old records

- 93 new records
- 6 globally threatened species
- 1 near threatened species
- 14 biome restricted species

The presence of the Syrian Serin as one of the breeding species, the occurrence of 14 biome restricted species and the record of the globally threatened Sociable Lapwing, make the study area a true IBA.

The protection of such species as: Masked Shrike, Syrian Serin, Cretzschmar's Bunting, Sardinian Warbler, Mistle Thrush, European Robin, Black-eared Wheatear, Blackbird, Black Redstart and Eurasian Jay, requires enforcement of the Hunting Law, banning the use of illegal pesticides, raising awareness among the public, educating students, providing advocacy to decision-makers and monitoring of the results using the following species as indicators, due to their sensitivities to changes in farming habitats from traditional to conventional.

Mount Hermon area should be designated as IBA in the second phase of the project.

### **Results related to Herpetofauna**

Beside the data that was mentioned from Rachaya, the questioning of shepherds, elderly people and interested in wildlife persons, lead the project to set a list of 1 amphibian and 10 reptiles, from which three species are classified as globally threatened (endangered) in accordance with the IUCN criteria. It is true that the snakes are not among the threatened species but they are rarifying very fast due to persecution that doesn't distinguish between venomous and non-venomous ones.

### **Overall conclusion resulted from the Biodiversity value study in Mount Hermon KBA**

- Regardless of whether the biodiversity assessment in Rachaya District is made in organic or conventional farming areas, the biodiversity that was found is rich and contains various species that are globally threatened and much more of species that are nationally threatened, including 8 species of warblers that characterize the Mediterranean Biome.
- However, this biodiversity is in need of protection and conservation efforts, especially that our observations indicated that some olive groves on slopes with degraded traditional stone walls or without stone walls, is characterized by eroded soils that constitute a real environmental issue. The eroded soil leads to poverty in plant species and subsequently in consumers of plant species and their fauna of invertebrates and small vertebrates.
- Studies in Lebanon and elsewhere in Italy, Spain and Greece, showed that organic olive groves host about 40% higher species richness, which indicates, as in other similar studies, that the organic olive cultivation methods have a higher capacity to support biodiversity, since wild plants as primary producers in the ecosystem that provides habitats and feeding

and breeding resources are the foundation for the biodiversity of insects, mammals, birds and reptiles naturally occurring in traditionally managed olive groves.

- The ground flora of olive groves is thus essential to support and conserve biodiversity in agricultural landscape for the future. The ground flora adds the stratification of the olive trees where all participate in an association with the fauna as follow:
  - Large, old trees – invertebrates, small mammals, reptiles, and birds
  - Grassy understory – flora, invertebrates
  - Stone walls and terraces – reptiles
  - Patches of semi-natural vegetation on or off the farm – essential refuges for flora and fauna

In combination, these associations create great structural diversity and a rich ecosystem. Local studies illustrated this, but a Lebanese overview of the biodiversity value of the olive ecosystem is lacking.

- By restricting or forbidding tillage and promoting organic olive cultivation, not only biodiversity would be enhanced; this could also prevent further soil erosion and create a more heterogenic agricultural landscape with higher biological and cultural values.
- On another hand and during our assessment of the biodiversity of Rachaya District, many factors appeared to be putting a pressure on the biodiversity of this area. The most important factor of them is the negligence that is illustrated by the abandoned olive groves due to zero management effort. This could be referred to social reasons that need to be explored too. However, it would be also beneficial to conduct field studies in Rachaya District in order to know:
  - 1) which species are more affected by practices in olive groves and how,
  - 2) what are the bird species associated to olive groves.

#### **Component 1, Activities 1.2 & 1.3-**

**The negative impacts of new agricultural practices on biodiversity & analysis of the drivers to traditional olive farming changes and alternatives to practitioners to maintain traditional farming and adopt best agricultural practices at Olive Sites in Mount Hermon KBA, were identified.**

A combined report was produced for the activities 1.2 & 1.3 to show that there are three broad types of plantation in olive farming:

- ***Low-input traditional plantations and scattered trees***, often with ancient trees and typically planted on terraces, which are managed with few or no chemical inputs, but with a high labor input.
- ***Intensified traditional plantations*** which to some extent follow traditional patterns but are under more intensive management making systematic use of artificial fertilizers and pesticides and with more intensive weed control and soil management. There is a

tendency to intensify further by means of irrigation, increased tree density and mechanical harvesting.

- **Intensive modern plantations of smaller tree varieties**, planted at high densities and managed under an intensive and highly mechanized system, usually with irrigation.

Within the concept of the above listed olive farming types, five kinds of agricultural farming in Rashaya, Kawkaba and Kfarmeshki were indicated:

- **The first kind**: is of olive groves on terraces made by traditional stone walls,
- **The second kind**: is of olive groves on slopes without terraces,
- **The third kind**: is of olive groves in levelled plains,
- **The fourth kind**: is of abandoned or neglected olive groves, and
- **The fifth kind**: is of abandoned olive groves that are replaced by wild scrubs, shrubs or trees.

In addition, the traditional groves vary in cultivar composition, tree density, degree of mechanization and chemical inputs, they are still the most widespread production system and a landmark of Rashaya landscapes. The first three kinds are either rain-fed or irrigated olive groves.

The project came out with a description of the main positive and negative impacts in olive grove farming in Mount Hermon KBA, as listed below (Activity 1.2):

<b>Actual positive impact seen in Traditional olive grove farming</b>	<b>Potential positive impact expected in olive grove farming</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Low use of agro-chemicals.</li> <li>- Herbaceous understory irregularly grazed or rarely ploughed.</li> <li>- Stone walls and patches of wild vegetation are attractive to wildlife and subsequently increasing the biodiversity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fauna and flora considered and maintained.</li> <li>- Scenic values of landscapes are appreciated.</li> <li>- Traditional and cultural values of landscapes are esteemed.</li> <li>- Landscapes are barriers to wildfires.</li> <li>- Terrain and soil conserved from erosion.</li> <li>- Aquifer is not depleted.</li> </ul>
<b>Actual negative impact seen in intensified olive grove types</b>	<b>Potential negative impact expected in intensified olive grove types</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High toxicity due to systematic use of pesticides/insecticides.</li> <li>- Reduced live in herbaceous understory due to repeated cultivation and use of herbicides.</li> <li>- Reduced biodiversity due to removal and replacement of old trees.</li> <li>- Depletion of aquifers due to tendency towards irrigation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fauna and flora are not considered nor maintained.</li> <li>- Scenic values of landscapes are lost</li> <li>- Traditional and cultural values of landscapes are missed.</li> <li>- Landscapes that reduce the risk of wildfires are gone.</li> <li>- Eroded Soil.</li> <li>- Biocide runoff to water body.</li> </ul>

Main drivers behind the changes from traditional to conventional olive orchard are listed below (Activity 1.3):

<b>Socio-economic and cultural drivers</b>	Abandonment of orchards due to immigration or search for more rewarding jobs.
	Intensification of farming to increase incomes.
	Modernization of practices to increase incomes.
	Uncontrolled use of fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, insecticides and agrochemicals in general.
	Planting on slopes without terraces.
	Negligence of terraces and stone walls maintenance due to same reasons of abandonment or to poverty.
	Un-appreciation of the role of grazing the understory of olive groves.

Recommendation for the top priority measures:

- Adoption of High Nature Value farming system with low grazing impact on vegetation.
- Understory and presence of a mosaic of semi-natural patches.
- Repair and maintenance of deteriorating traditional stone walls.
- Lowering management intensity of olive groves and reduce tendency towards irrigation.
- Reduce the use of pesticides whilst avoiding wide spectrum insecticides.
- Replace the use of herbicides by traditional and low intensity grazing or ploughing.
- Keep old trees in place as they are attractive to birds.
- Set a strategy to moving towards less “zibar” and better oil quality.
- Focus on organic olive oil as this is becoming more popular in Lebanon and the region
- Production of extra virgin olive oil, favored or not, is like organic olive oil, holds favorable prospects due to having a growing export potential.
- More studies are needed to protect traditional olive groves farming from intensified farming systems.

**Component 2, Activity 2.1**

**Setting a Stakeholders’ engagement plan**

A stakeholder analysis was performed on all levels (Governmental, private sector, NGOs etc.), the methods of engagement were identified, and the analysis covers Information about the Grantor and Grantee, Introduction about the project and its approach and objective in line with the strategic direction and investment priorities, Information about the previous stakeholder engagement activities and the project stakeholders engagement programme, Consultation methods, Stakeholder Analysis, Other engagement activities and approach to information dissemination, Stakeholders engagement outcomes, Resources and responsibilities, Grievance Mechanism, Monitoring, evaluation and reporting...Etc.

The stakeholders analysis serves as a basis to strengthen the relation between all the stakeholders in the Mount Hermon Olive sector, and organizes the inter-relationship between all the project players during the implementation of the second phase.

**Component 3, Activity 3.1**

**A stakeholders workshop to present Assessment results and discuss future plans, was organized**

The organized workshop that was conducted on the 7th of October in Mount Hermon area-Rashaya city, showed the following results:

- High interest from the stakeholders to minimize the negative impacts of conventional agricultural practices in the olive sector.
- High interest towards the use of Good Agricultural Practices.
- Confirming the belief that the biodiversity value of the Mount Hermon KBA is an added value that will attract future investment to the area.
- The positive assessment attendees reports, connected to the workshop methodology and the project objectives, showed the high appreciation for the project methodology to strengthen the relationship between the stakeholders in the Olive and olive oil sectors.
- The workshop confirms the need of such consultation method to raise awareness.

**Component 4, Activity 4.1**

**A full application to CEPF under SD3 using outcomes of the preparatory grants, was submitted.**

The Application was submitted to CEPF, using the achievements of the preparatory phase in the small grant, within specified requirements and using specified templates.

**Component 5, Activity 5.1, 5.2 & 5.3**

**Progress and Final reports to CEPF, were submitted**

All reports were submitted on timely basis, and the team gained an extensive experience in running such kind of projects.

**3. Briefly describe actual progress towards each planned long-term and short-term impact (as stated in the approved proposal)**

*List each long-term impact from your proposal*

- a. Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal)

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Impact Summary</b>
Identify the Biodiversity value of the site.	A detailed biodiversity assessment of Mount Hermon KBA was produced.
Identify the negative impact of the used agricultural practices on olive orchards and the ways of its minimization and convey the results to the concerned stakeholder to discuss future plans.	The negative impact of the used agricultural practices on olive orchards, and the ways of its minimization were identified, and the results were conveyed to the stakeholders in a workshop, that was organized in Rashaya city-Mount Hermon KBA.

Impact Description	Impact Summary
<p>After completion of the preparatory phase, a second phase will benefit from the preparatory phase outcomes to be translated to actual dissemination of best practices, linking producers with market, working on certification schemes, and subsidies.</p>	<p>The outcomes of the preparatory phase were used in an application that was submitted to CEPF towards a second project phase to set the Good Agricultural practice, and open new markets for the olive oil product, and work on branding and certification and subsidies.</p>

b. Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
<p>1- To confirm the biodiversity value of the olive oil sector in Mount Hermon KBA.</p>	<p>A detailed biodiversity assessment of Mount Hermon KBA was produced.</p>
<p>2- A comprehensive and detailed description of the environmental impact (problems and benefits) of olive production in Mount Hermon KBA, including the three locations within the KBA (Rashaya, Kawkaba and Kfarmishki).</p>	<p>The negative impact of the used agricultural practices on olive orchards, and the ways of its minimization were identified.</p>
<p>3- Produce a detailed stakeholders analysis and engagement plan to inform development of second phase implementation.</p>	<p>A Detailed stakeholders analysis and engagement plan was prepared</p>
<p>4- Produce a detailed project application for CEPF under SD3 including detailed biodiversity assessment of the site, impacts of current agricultural practices to biodiversity and project intervention to maintain positive impacts and or reform negative impacts through approach/s that ensure benefits to local communities (farmers and land owners).</p>	<p>The application for a second phase project, using the outcomes of the preparatory phase, were produced and submitted to CEPF. The projects in its second phase is focusing on EFL intervention to maintain positive impacts and or reform negative impacts through approach/s that ensure benefits to local communities (farmers and land owners).</p>

**4. Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impacts**

**Challenges/Success of the project toward achieving its long-term impacts**

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Success</b>
Identify the Biodiversity value of the site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of published research on biodiversity in Mount Hermon.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project established very important baseline data for the biodiversity value indicators.</li> </ul>
Identify the negative impact of the used agricultural practices on olive orchards and the ways of its minimization and convey the results to the concerned stakeholder to discuss future plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of published research on Olive plantation agricultural practices specific to Mount Hermon area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project listed the types of olive farming , specific to the Mount Hermon area and selected sites, and identified the positive and negative impacts in olive farming and the drivers behind the changes in olive plantation practices.</li> <li>The results of the preparatory phase project were successfully conveyed in a stakeholders' workshop.</li> </ul>
After completion of the preparatory phase, a second phase will benefit from the preparatory phase outcomes to be translated to actual dissemination of best practices, linking producers with market, working on certification schemes, and subsidies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In mount Hermon there is a weakness on how to access International funding, caused by the fact that the area was not targeted by International Donors, except for some small projects or activities, not related to agriculture development and environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The success of the preparatory project phase is a proof that BirdLife International and CEPF, in cooperation with EFL and the local community representatives, can make a promising difference in such projects.</li> </ul>

**Challenges/Success of the project toward achieving its short-term**

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Impact Summary</b>
1- To confirm the biodiversity value of the olive oil sector in Mount Hermon KBA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of published research on biodiversity in Mount Hermon.</li> </ul>	The project established very important and fresh data for the flora, fauna diversity - mammals, fauna diversity birds and herpetofauna, and suggested a set of recommendation and measures

Impact Description	Challenges	Impact Summary
<p>2- A comprehensive and detailed description of the environmental impact (problems and benefits) of olive production in Mount Hermon KBA, including the three locations within the KBA (Rashaya, Kawkaba and Kfarmishki).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of published research on Olive plantation agricultural practices specific to Mount Hermon area.</li> </ul>	<p>on how to protect the biodiversity value in Mount Hermon KBA, on technical and socio-economic levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project listed the types of olive farming , and the kinds of the agricultural farming specific to the selected three sites: Rashaya, Kawkaba and Kfarmeshki</li> <li>• The project came out with a description of the main positive and negative impacts in olive grove farming in Mount Hermon KBA.</li> <li>• The project identified and listed the main socio-economic drivers that are behind the changes from traditional to conventional olive plantation.</li> </ul>
<p>3- Produce a detailed stakeholders analysis and engagement plan to inform development of second phase implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of communication between all the stakeholders involved in the Olive and olive oil sectors.</li> <li>• The farmers and cooperatives are not in regular contact with the ministry of agriculture and chamber of Commerce, agriculture and industry in Zahle with regards to good agricultural practices.</li> <li>• The distance from Beirut to Mount Hermon is around 100 Km which make it not easy for expert to visit the sites on regular bases to conduct face-to-face consultation meeting due to the minimal budget allocated to the preparatory project phase.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A stakeholders and beneficiaries analysis was undertaken to detail all the players in the project from both the public and private sectors institutions in addition to local community representatives, research institutions and universities, cooperatives, individuals, and related olive firms and pressing mills, etc. The analysis scrutinized the ways of communication between all the stakeholders and the mechanism of complains.</li> <li>• The conducted workshop gave an opportunity for all the stakeholders and beneficiaries to fruitfully communicate, the fact that will impact the strong cooperation in the project's second phase.</li> <li>• The second project phase, as</li> </ul>

Impact Description	Challenges	Impact Summary
		per the submitted application to CEPF, is considering a fair travel and consultation budget to make an easier access to the area with the possibility of short stays, in order to meet the stakeholders, discuss project progress and organize consultation and brainstorming sessions.
4- Produce a detailed project application for CEPF under SD3 including detailed biodiversity assessment of the site, impacts of current agricultural practices to biodiversity and project intervention to maintain positive impacts and or reform negative impacts through approach/s that ensure benefits to local communities (farmers and land owners).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To submit on time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The success of the preparatory project phase project outcomes helped in on-timely forming of a very logical application for a second phase project, funded by CEPF under SD3, to guarantee adoption of the positive impacts of agricultural practices in the olive sector, and push towards a positive intervention to maintain positive impacts and/ or to reform negative impacts through approach/s that ensure benefits to local communities, such as high quality olive oil... and thus open markets.</li> </ul>

**5. Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?**

Several unexpected impacts took place during the implementation of the preparatory project phase such as:

- The unexpected variety of species (flora, fauna diversity -mammals, fauna diversity birds and herpetofauna ) that confirmed the biodiversity value of the Mount Hermon KBA was amounted to 14 species, while it was enough to locate 6 species to consider Mount Hermon Area as KBA.
- The support and extensive interest of the Ministry of Agriculture was sensed through the key speech given during the workshop.
- The massive support of the local authorities (Kaim-Makam, JSMF and municipalities) in logistics, and through in-cash and in-kind contribution to the project.

- The cooperative spirit of the attendees and their positive evaluation of the project was strongly detected (74% from them assessed the project through filling an assessment evaluation sheet, 85% from them positively evaluated the workshop, 97% believe that determining the biodiversity value in Jabal al-Sheikh (Hermon) region is important to attract investments in the agricultural and environmental sectors, and 82% think that it is time to reduce the negative impacts of modern agricultural practices and return to the promotion of traditional practices in the olive sector).
- The valuable variety of ideas and needs proposed by the stakeholders and beneficiaries in the assessment and project evaluation sheets served as a basis to adjust the foreseen components and activities in the project's second phase, and was clearly reflected in EFL application to CEPF.
- The after preparatory phase meetings and site visits that took place in Mount Hermon KBA in the presence of the Local authorities, CEPF and EFL management, shows a huge interest in implementing the coming phase, and absolute readiness for an extensive cooperation to alleviate the situation in the olive and olive oil sectors.

## **PART II: Project Components and Products/Deliverables**

### **6. Components (as stated in the approved proposal)**

*List each component and product/deliverable from your proposal*

#### **6. Describe the results for each deliverable:**

<b>Component</b>		<b>Activity</b>		<b>Deliverable</b>
<b>Sub #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Sub #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Results for Deliverable</b>
1	Identifying the Biodiversity value of the site and the negative impact of various agricultural practices.	1.1	Conduct a survey and prepare a report to Identify the biodiversity value of the site and its relationship to current agricultural practices.	The report was submitted to CEPF
		1.2	Prepare a report to Identify the negative impacts of new agricultural practices on biodiversity & promote proper options to minimize negative impacts through maintaining traditional olive farming practices that supports biodiversity.	Both reports prepared and submitted.
		1.3	Prepare a report to analyze the drivers to traditional olive farming changes and alternatives which can be provided to practitioners to maintain traditional farming and adopt best agricultural practices.	
2	Setting a stakeholder engagement	2.1	Prepare a detailed stakeholders' analysis and engagement plan to	The report was submitted

Component		Activity		Deliverable
Sub #	Description	Sub #	Description	Results for Deliverable
	plan.		support project implementation.	
3	Organizing a stakeholders workshop to present Assessment results and discuss future plans.	3.1	Organize a specialized workshop to Inform the Stakeholders about the engagement plan and discuss future actions for the olive sector in Mount Hermon KBA , in cooperation with Jabal Al Sheik Municipality Federation (JSMF).	The workshop was conducted
4	Submitting a full application to CEPF under SD3 using outcomes of the preparatory grants.	4.1	After consultation and approval from CEPF, prepare and submit an application to CEPF within specified requirements and using specified templates.	The Application was submitted
5	Reporting to CEPF.	5.1	Monthly email update to the Programme Officer on the progress of Component 1 and Component 2.	Reports were submitted on Montly basis
		5.2	Final Budget Report.	Submitted
		5.3	Final Completion Report.	Submitted

**7. Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.**

The reports that were attached previously:

- a. A report to Identify the biodiversity value of the site and its relationship to current agricultural practices.
- b. A combined report to:
  - identify the negative impacts of new agricultural practices on biodiversity & promote proper options to minimize negative impacts through maintaining traditional olive farming practices that supports biodiversity.
  - analyze the drivers to traditional olive farming changes and alternatives which can be provided to practitioners to maintain traditional farming and adopt best agricultural practices.

- c. A report detailing stakeholders' analysis and engagement plan to support project implementation.
- d. Assessment and Evaluation report for the workshop and the project in general.
- e. Six progress reports (narrative & Financial) submitted on monthly basis.
- f. Final project report (narrative and Financial).
- g. Printing material (note books, role-ups, folders, stickers).
- h. Planting a tree as a sign of appreciation to the donors.
- i. Application to CEPF requesting to finance a second project phase.

### **PART III: Lessons, Sustainability, Safeguards and Financing**

#### **Lessons Learned**

#### **8. Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building.**

Consider lessons that would inform:

- *Project Design Process (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)*

The project design considered the essential need to confirm the biodiversity value of the mount Hermon area as a KBA. This introduction to biodiversity is the key approach to future projects that can assist the local community in adopting any agricultural and/or environmental reforms to alleviate the socio-economic situation in Mount Hermon KBA.

Also, the project design targeted one of the most critical and important sectors in people's life, such as the olive and olive oil sector. The selection of this sector, that lacks serious and profound attention from both the Lebanese government and international community, motivated the local authorities (Jabal Al sheik " Mount Hermon" Municipality Federation, municipalities etc.), stakeholders and beneficiaries to react positively towards the right choice of project components and activities.

- *Project Implementation (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)*

The project contracted three experts with extensive experience in biodiversity, agriculture and management. All these experts delivered successful reports that respond to the set project objectives.

The signed MOU between EFL and Jabal Al Sheik municipality federation (JSMF) facilitated meetings (the final workshop) in Rashaya district, and supported the project with earlier performed studies, and with the needed available information about the local stakeholders (landowners and Mills Owners) that are supposed to benefit from the project results.

The belief in the project motivated JSMF to contribute financially to the project implementation. The in-kind and cash contribution from the behalf of JSMF will be properly reflected in the final financial report to CEPF and is highly appreciated.

In addition, the project contracted a volunteer ecologist (fresh graduate from the American University in Beirut) to assist the project management in the implementation of project activities. This experience shows a great interest from the fresh graduates to follow on biodiversity and agricultural reforms, which is a promising factor for future development on the level of academic research.

It is also encouraging the excellent media coverage for the conducted final workshop.

- *Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community*

The assessment and evaluation questionnaire given to the attendees in the final workshop, helped in understanding the conservation community needs for Good Agricultural and Manufacturing Practices in the olive and olive oil sectors.

Their written suggestions in the assessment questionnaire oriented EFL to design the submitted application to CEPF, with regards to project second phase, in such a way to definitely serve the interest of stakeholders and beneficiaries involved in the olive sector.

The questionnaire and discussions which took place during the final workshop showed that there is still a crucial need to combat the illegal Killing of Birds and regulation of hunting.

### **Sustainability / Replication**

#### **9. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.**

The submitted application to CEPF included a component for pilot projects and actual incentives that will guarantee sustainability of actions in the olive and olive oil sectors. An example for these suggested pilot projects are those related to:

- a. Olive Oil Mills upgrade.
- b. Terracing.
- c. Traps and harvesting tools.
- d. Branding and Packaging.
- e. Organic fertilizers.
- f. Water Tanks for irrigation & stainless steel Oil tanks
- g. Irrigation systems.
- h. Registration of intellectual property rights for creative ideas in Olive sector & manufacturing of Pilot Samples.
- i. Training on implementation of Good Agricultural and Manufacturing Practices. (for example: pay for an expert to operate a mill, or agricultural consultant for a certain site or farms).

The used methodology in designing and implementing the project might be replicable in any surrounding area in Mount Hermon, or in Lebanon.

**Safeguards N/A**

**10. If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social or environmental safeguards that your project may have triggered.**

**Additional Funding**

**11. Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of CEPF investment**

**a. Total additional funding (US\$)**

**b. Type of funding**

Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source, categorizing each contribution into one of the following categories:

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
Jabal Al Sheik Municipality Federation (JSMF)	A	1700	- In-cash contribution for 1700 USD (related to the workshop). - In-kind contribution amounted to 600 USD (Project local focal point for 6 months).
Environment for Life (EFL)	A	3300	- In – kind contribution

\* Categorize the type of funding as:

- A *Project Co-Financing (other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B *Grantee and Partner Leveraging (other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project)*
- C *Regional/Portfolio Leveraging (other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project)*

**Additional Comments/Recommendations**

**12. Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF.**

EFL recommends that CEPF facilitates the receiving of funds at the soonest, for the start-up of the second phase and to guarantee the smooth continuation of the project in Mount Hermon KBA.

**PART IV: Impact at Portfolio and Global Level**

N/A

CEPF requires that each grantee report on impact at the end of the project. The purpose of this report is to collect data that will contribute to CEPF’s portfolio and global indicators. CEPF will aggregate the data that you submit with data from other grantees, to determine the overall impact of CEPF investment. CEPF’s aggregated results will be reported on in our annual report and other communications materials.

**Ensure that the information provided pertains to the entire project, from start date to project end date.**

**Contribution to Portfolio Indicators**

**13. If CEPF assigned one or more Portfolio Indicators to your project during the full proposal preparation phase, please list these below and report on the project’s contribution(s) to them.**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Narrative</b>
3.2 Traditional products that demonstrate positive impacts on biodiversity, seeing a positive market trends	research undertaken to evaluate the impact of olive oil on biodiversity
3.3 Local authorities recognize importance of traditional, biodiversity-friendly land-use practices and engage in supporting	Established a new aspect of communication between the concerned Governmental departments and institutions, related to adoption of traditional agricultural practices in the olive sector.

**Contribution to Global Indicators**

**Please report on all Global Indicators (sections 16 to 23 below) that pertain to your project.**

N/A

**14. Key Biodiversity Area Management**

**Number of hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) with improved management**

Please report on the number of hectares in KBAs with improved management, as a result of CEPF investment. Examples of improved management include, but are not restricted to: increased patrolling, reduced intensity of snaring, invasive species eradication, reduced incidence of fire, and introduction of sustainable agricultural/fisheries practices. Do not record the entire area covered by the project - only record the number of hectares that have improved management.

If you have recorded part or all of a KBA as newly protected for the indicator entitled “protected areas” (section 17 below), and you have also improved its management, you should record the relevant number of hectares for both this indicator and the “protected areas” indicator.

Name of KBA	# of Hectares with strengthened management *	Is the KBA Not protected, Partially protected or Fully protected? Please select one: NP/PP/FP
N/A		

*\* Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were improved due to implementation of a fire management regime in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were improved due to invasive species removal in the second year, the total number of hectares with improved management would be 500.*

### 15. Protected Areas

N/A

#### 15a. Number of hectares of protected areas created and/or expanded

Report on the number of hectares of protected areas that have been created or expanded as a result of CEPF investment.

Name of PA*	Country(s)	# of Hectares	Year of legal declaration or expansion	Longitude**	Latitude**
N/A					

*\* If possible please provide a shape file of the protected area to CEPF.*

*\*\* Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).*

#### 15b. Protected area management

N/A

If you have been requested to submit a Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), please follow the instructions below. If you have not been requested to submit a METT, please go directly to section 16.

Should you want to know more about the monitoring of protected area management effectiveness and the tracking tool, please click [here](#).

Download the METT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with the protected area authorities to fill it out. Please go to the Protected Planet website [here](#) and search for your protected area in their database to record its associated WDPA ID. Then please fill in the following table:

WDPA ID	PA Official Name	Date of METT*	METT Total Score

*\* Please indicate when the METT was filled by the authorities of the park or provide a best estimate if the exact date is unknown. And please only provide METTs less than 12 months old.*

Please do not forget to submit the completed METT together with this report.

## 16. Production landscape

N/A

Please report on the number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity, as a result of CEPF investment. A production landscape is defined as a landscape where agriculture, forestry or natural product exploitation occurs. Production landscapes may include KBAs, and therefore hectares counted under the indicator entitled “KBA Management” may also be counted here. Examples of interventions include: best practices and guidelines implemented, incentive schemes introduced, sites/products certified and sustainable harvesting regulations introduced.

### Number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity.

Name of Production Landscape*	# of Hectares**	Latitude***	Longitude***	Description of Intervention
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*\* If the production landscape does not have a name, provide a brief descriptive name for the landscape.*

*\*\*Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were strengthened due to certification in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were*

strengthened due to new harvesting regulations in the second year, the total number of hectares strengthened to date would be 500.

\*\*\* Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).

**17. Beneficiaries**

N/A

CEPF wants to record two types of benefits that are likely to be received by individuals: structured training and increased income. Please report on the number of men and women that have benefited from structured training (such as financial management, beekeeping, horticulture) and/or increased income (such as from tourism, agriculture, medicinal plant harvest/production, fisheries, handicraft production) as a result of CEPF investment. Please provide results since the start of your project to project completion.

**17a. Number of men and women receiving structured training.**

# of men receiving structured training *	# of women receiving structured training *
N/A	N/A

*\*Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received structured training in beekeeping, and 3 of these also received structured training in project management, the total number of men who benefited from structured training should be 5.*

**17b. Number of men and women receiving cash benefits.**

# of men receiving cash benefits*	# of women receiving cash benefits*
N/A	N/A

*\*Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received cash benefits due to tourism, and 3 of these also received cash benefits from increased income due to handicrafts, the total number of men who received cash benefits should be 5.*

### 18. Benefits to Communities

CEPF wants to record the benefits received by communities, which can differ to those received by individuals because the benefits are available to a group. CEPF also wants to record, to the extent possible, the number of people within each community who are benefiting. Please report on the characteristics of the communities, the type of benefits that have been received during the project, and the number of men/boys and women/girls from these communities that have benefited, as a result of CEPF investment. If exact numbers are not known, please provide an estimate.

18a. Please provide information for all communities that have benefited from project start to project completion.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics (mark with x)							Type of Benefit (mark with x)									# of Beneficiaries	
	Subsistence economy	Small landowners	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Other*	Increased access to clean water	Increased food security	Increased access to energy	Increased access to public services (e.g. health care, education)	Increased resilience to climate change	Improved land tenure	Improved recognition of traditional knowledge	Improved representation and decision-making in governance forums/structures	Improved access to ecosystem services	# of men and boys benefiting	# of women and girls benefiting
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*If you marked "Other" to describe the community characteristic, please explain:

**18b. Geolocation of each community**

Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the community, to the extent possible, or upload a map or shapefile. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).

Name of Community	Latitude	Longitude
N/A	N/A	N/A

**19. Policies, Laws and Regulations**

Please report on change in the number of legally binding laws, regulations, and policies with conservation provisions that have been enacted or amended, as a result of CEPF investment. “Laws and regulations” pertain to official rules or orders, prescribed by authority. Any law, regulation, decree or order is eligible to be included. “Policies” that are adopted or pursued by a government, including a sector or faction of government, are eligible.

**19a. Name, scope and topic of the policy, law or regulation that has been amended or enacted as a result of your project**

No.	Name of Law, Policy or Regulation	Scope (mark with x)			Topic(s) addressed (mark with x)															
		Local	National	Regional/International	Agriculture	Climate	Ecosystem Management	Education	Energy	Fisheries	Forestry	Mining and Quarrying	Planning/Zoning	Pollution	Protected Areas	Species Protection	Tourism	Transportation	Wildlife Trade	
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

19b. For each law, policy or regulation listed above, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

No.	Country(s)	Date enacted/ amended MM/DD/YYYY	Expected impact	Action that you performed to achieve this change
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2				
3				

## 20. Sustainable Financing Mechanism

N/A

Sustainable financing mechanisms generate financial resources for the long-term (generally five or more years). Examples of sustainable financial mechanisms include conservation trust funds, debt-for-nature swaps, payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes, and other revenue, fee or tax schemes that generate long-term funding for conservation.

All CEPF grantees (or sub-grantees) with project activities that pertain to the creation and/or the implementation of a sustainable financing mechanism are requested to provide information on the mechanism and the funds it delivered to conservation projects during the project timeframe, unless another grantee involved with the same mechanism has already been or is expected to be tasked with this.

CEPF requires that all sustainable financing mechanism projects to provide the necessary information at their completion.

### 20a. Details about the mechanism

Fill in this table for as many mechanisms you worked on during your project implementation as needed.

NO.	Name of financing mechanism	Purpose of the mechanism*	Date of Establishment**	Description***	Countries
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2					
3					

\*Please provide a succinct description of the mission of the mechanism.

\*\*Please indicate when the sustainable financing mechanism was officially created. If you do not know the exact date, provide a best estimate.

\*\*\*Description, such as trust fund, endowment, PES scheme, incentive scheme, etc.

### 20b. Performance of the mechanism

For each Financing Mechanism listed previously, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

NO.	Project intervention*	\$ Amount disbursed to conservation projects**	Period under Review (MM/YYYY -MM/YYYY)***
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
2			
3			

\*List whether the CEPF grant has helped to create a new mechanism (Created a mechanism) or helped to support an existing mechanism (Supported an existing mechanism) or helped to create and then support a new mechanism (Created and supported a new mechanism).

\*\*Please only indicate the USD amount disbursed to conservation projects during the period of implementation of your project and using, when needed, the exchange rate on the day of your report.

\*\*\*Please indicate the period of implementation of your project or the period considered for the amount you indicated.

Please do not forget to submit any relevant document which could provide justification for the amount you stated above.

## 21. Biodiversity-friendly Practices

N/A

Please describe any biodiversity-friendly practices that companies have adopted as a result of CEPF investment. A company is defined as a legal entity made up of an association of people, be they natural, legal, or a mixture of both, for carrying on a commercial or industrial enterprise. While companies take various forms, for the purposes of CEPF, a company is defined as a for-profit business entity. A biodiversity-friendly practice is one that conserves or uses biodiversity sustainably.

### Number of companies that adopt biodiversity-friendly practices

No.	Name of company	Description of biodiversity-friendly practice adopted during the project
1	N/A	N/A
2		
...		

## 22. Networks & Partnerships

N/A: please fill this based on the partnerships established and the stakeholders engagement

Please report on any new networks or partnerships between civil society groups and across to other sectors that you have established or strengthened as a result of CEPF investment. Networks/partnerships should have some lasting benefit beyond immediate project implementation. Informal networks/partnerships are acceptable even if they do not have a Memorandum of Understanding or other type of validation. Examples of networks/partnerships include: an alliance of fisherfolk to promote sustainable fisheries practices, a network of environmental journalists, a partnership between one or more NGOs with one or more private sector partners to improve biodiversity management on private lands, a working group focusing on reptile conservation. Please do not use this tab to list the partners in your project, unless some or all of them are part of such a network / partnership described above.

### Number of networks and/or partnerships created and/or strengthened

No.	Name of Network	Name of Partnership	Year established	Did your project establish this Network/ Partnership? Y/N	Country(s) covered	Purpose
1	<i>Municipal</i>	<i>Municipal</i>	2019	Y	Mount	Strengthening

		<i>partnership</i>			Hermon KBA	the inter-relationship between the municipal partners in the field of olive agro-practices.
2	Public-Private	Government –Local partnership	2019	Y	Mount Hermon KBA	Establishing a new aspect of communication between the public and private sectors, related to adoption of traditional agricultural practices in the olive sector.
3	Public	Inter-public partnership	2019	Y	Mount Hermon KBA	Establishing a new aspect of communication between the concerned Governmental departments and institutions, related to adoption of traditional agricultural practices in the olive sector.
4	Private	<i>Inter-community partnership</i>	2019	Y	Mount Hermon KBA	Establishing an environment of cooperation specific to the olive and olive oil sector between all the project stakeholders and beneficiaries.
5	Management	<i>Inter-managerial partnership</i>	2019	Y	Mount Hermon KBA	Strengthening the inter-relationship

						between all the project components through the various dissemination methods, and implementation of grievance mechanism, the fact that will raise the trust among all the project players.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- a. *A new Municipal partnership based on CEPF investment and resulted from the project:* Before the project, the Jabal A Sheik Municipality Federation was not discussing any issues to proof the biodiversity value of the site among the member municipalities, and didn't study any of the negative impacts of conventional and modern agricultural practices in the olive oil sector. No relation between the biodiversity and the olive sector were foreseen before the CEPF investment in the area. The project, especially during the workshop, promoted a new concept of this neglected relationship, where all the municipal stakeholders were able to establish a new approach of communication related to adoption of traditional agricultural practices in the olive sector. This fact was sensed during the workshop assessment activity, and during the visit of CEPF management to the selected sites in the municipalities.
- b. *A new partnership between the Ministry of Agriculture and the Jabal Al Sheik Municipality Federation:* The Ministry of Agriculture recognized the importance of the project and the interlinkage between the biodiversity value of Mount Hermon KBA and the olive sector, and declared its readiness to cooperate with the Municipality federation and Agro-cooperatives in the KBA area (advices on the type of used pesticides, harvesting tools, some guidelines, etc.).
- c. *The interlinkage between the Public sectors institutions:* The ministry of industry, and the chamber of commerce, industry and agriculture promised the project management to join the project in its second phase, and thus being a main stakeholders. The project management is looking to attract all the proposed stakeholders and beneficiaries, earlier listed in the submitted to CEPF 'Stakeholders Engagement Plan'.
- d. *The Olive pressing mills, cooperative and Olive land owner and the Municipal Federation:* The project established an environment of cooperation between the project stakeholders. As per our knowledge, the stakeholders and beneficiaries that attended the final workshop started contacting the municipality federation to ask about the second project phase.
- e. *The stakeholders and beneficiaries network:* The earlier submitted to CEPF stakeholders engagement plan explained the methodology of strengthening the inter-relationship between all the project components through the various dissemination methods such as: regular correspondence, website and social media, one-on-one interviews, formal and public meetings, focus group meetings, workshops, roundtable discussions, surveys and site visits. The proposed "Grievance Mechanism" will allow the communities and affected parties to raise complaints and grievances, in order to respond to and resolve the issues in an appropriate manner. This "Grievance mechanism" will strengthen the inter-relationship and trust among all the project players.

## 23. Gender

N/A

If you have been requested to submit a Gender Tracking Tool (GTT), please follow the instructions provided in the Excel GTT template. If you have not been requested to submit a GTT, please go directly to Part V.

Should you want to know more about CEPF Gender Policy, please click [here](#).

Download the GTT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with your team to fill it out. Please do not forget to submit the completed GTT together with this report.

### **Part V. Information Sharing and CEPF Policy**

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

**18. Name: Dr. Saleem Hamadeh**

**19. Organization: Environment for Life – E.f.L**

**20. Mailing address: Rehawi bldg. 3rd floor, Achrafieh, Sasine Sq., Beirut, Lebanon. P.O.Box 5171**

**21. Telephone number: +9613616693**

**22. E-mail address: [Saleem.hamadeh@gmail.com](mailto:Saleem.hamadeh@gmail.com); [projects@efl-leb.org](mailto:projects@efl-leb.org)**