

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2023

Reporting from 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

**INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE THIS PIR**

1. *Instructions in blue are directed to Task Managers / Administrative Officers*
2. *Instructions in red are directed to Project Managers and Executing Agencies*
3. When filling up the respective cells, use the Normal style from the template. The text will look like this.

**1. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION**

**1.1. Project details**

Identification Table	GEF ID.: 4086		Umoja no.: SB-000686.36			
	SMA IPMR ID: 20039		Grant ID: S1-32GFL-000537/P1-33GFL-000225			
	Project Short Title: <i>Jordan/IMP_BS</i>					
Project Title	Implementation of National Biosafety Framework for Jordan					
Duration months	<i>Planned</i>	36 months				
	<i>Extension(s)</i>	31/08/2018 & 36 months	31/08/2021 & 12 Months	31/08/2022 & 12 Months	31/08/2023 & 12 Months	31/12/2023
Project Type	Medium Size project					
Project Scope	National					
Countries	Jordan					
GEF financing amount	USD\$884,000.00					
Co-financing amount	USD\$905,000.00					
Date of CEO Endorsement	28 September 2010					
UNEP Project Approval Date	08 August 2011					
Start of Implementation	14 December 2011					
Date of Inception Workshop	14 December 2011					
Date of first disbursement	17 August 2011					
Total disbursement as of 30 June 2023	USD\$ 699,231.61					
Total expenditure as of 30 June 2023	USD\$652,614.88					
Expected Mid-Term Review Date	N/A					
Completion Date	<i>Planned</i>	30 August 2014				
	<i>Revised</i>	31 December 2023				

Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	30 June 2024
Expected Financial Closure Date	31 December 2024

## 1.2. Project description

The Overall Goal of the project is to have a workable and transparent national biosafety framework, in line with Jordan's national development priorities and international obligations. The specific objectives are:

- Integrate and incorporate Biosafety and the safe use of biotechnology into national sectoral action plans and strategies in conformity with the Jordan NBSAP
- Establish a sound and effective legal regime with participation of all relevant authorities, and in line with national legislation, national needs and priorities, and the requirements of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety
- To have a fully functional system for handling requests, performing risk assessment, decision-making, performing administrative tasks, handling, storing and exchanging information.
- Establish a workable and effective national system for follow-up: monitoring of environmental effects, inspections of LMO releases, and enforcement of Biosafety laws and regulations.
- Establish a workable and effective national system for public awareness, education, participation, and access to information on LMOs

Project components and expected results are summarized in the table below:

<b>Component A</b>	To assist Jordan to integrate and incorporate Biosafety and the safe use of biotechnology into national sectoral action plans and strategies in conformity with the Jordan NBSAP.
<b>Expected results</b>	A.1. Government recognizes the importance of Biosafety by integrating Biosafety issues into national policies, plans A.2. Development programs and political and community support for the implementation of the Biosafety policy.
<b>Component B</b>	To assist Jordan to establish a sound and effective legal regime with participation of all relevant authorities, and in line with national legislation, national needs and priorities, and the requirements of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.
<b>Expected results</b>	B.1. An applicable law and applicable, effective and transparent regulatory system that are consistent with other national laws, the Cartagena Protocol, and other international treaties in place for handling of applications for LMOs B.2. Increased national competence on regulatory issues is available and equipped with tools for related additional capacity building
<b>Component C</b>	To assist Jordan to have a fully functional system for handling requests, performing risk assessment, decision-making, performing administrative tasks, handling, storing and exchanging information.

<b>Expected results</b>	C.1. Administrative processing, risk assessment and decision-making of LMOs are set and operational including clear definitions of institutional roles and responsibilities  C.2. Increased national competence on handling of request is available and equipped with tools for related additional capacity building
<b>Component D</b>	To assist Jordan to establish a workable and effective national system for follow-up: monitoring of environmental effects, inspections of LMO releases, and enforcement of Biosafety laws and regulations.
<b>Expected results</b>	D.1. Increased national competence on monitoring, Follow-up, inspection and handling emergency cases is available and equipped with tools for additional capacity building
<b>Component E</b>	To assist Jordan to establish a workable and effective national system for public awareness, education, participation, and access to information on LMOs.
<b>Expected results</b>	E.1. Effective and workable mechanisms in place for access to, and sharing of information and for public participation in decision making on LMOs  E.2. Increased public awareness and education on Biosafety and the safe use of biotechnology in place and utilized effectively.

### 1.3. Project Contacts

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division
Name of co-implementing Agency	N/A
Executing Agency(ies)	Ministry of Environment
Names of Other Project Partners	Royal Scientific Society, Ministry of Agriculture
UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Ersin Esen
UNEP Task Manager(s)	Alex Owusu-Biney
UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Paul Vrontamitis
UNEP Support/Assistants	Evelyn Machasio/Solomon Kinuthia
EA Manager/Representative	Belal Qteshat
EA Project Manager	Khalid al Majali
EA Finance Manager	Abeer Abu Zaid, Mohamad Abass
EA Communications Lead, if relevant	Khalid Zaid al-Majali

## 2. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

### 2.1 UNEP PoW and UN

UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)	Nature action . Foundational: Environmental Governance.
PoW Indicator(s)	Nature Action: Outcome 2A/ Output 2.9/ indicator (i); Environmental Governance indicator ii
UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)	Healthy and Productive Ecosystems & Environmental Governance
UNSDCF / UNDAF linkages	Strategic Priority 1- Strengthened institutions under Outcome 1 on Institutions in Jordan at national and local levels are more responsive, inclusive, accountable, Transparent and resilient – with activities contributing to policies and laws in line with UN/International Standards and conventions
Link to relevant SDG Goal(s)	Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture
Link to relevant SDG Target(s)	Target: 2.5 - By 2020, maintain the genetic diversity of seeds, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild species, including through soundly managed and diversified seed and plant banks at the national, regional and international levels [BIOSAFETY], and promote access to and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, as internationally agreed

### 2.2. GEF Core Indicators (for all GEF 6 and later projects): N/A

GEF Core Indicators	Indicative expected Results	
<i>Discuss GEF core indicators targeted by the project, as well as expected results. (maximum one paragraph)</i>		
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Expected values at</i>	
	<i>Mid-term</i>	<i>End-of-project</i>

### 2.3. Implementation status and risk

*[complete the fiscal year and select: 1st PIR; 2nd PIR; .... Final PIR; select HS; S; MS; MU; U; HU; unknown; not rated to rate the progress towards outcomes and outputs in third and fourth lines; select H; S; M; L; to rate risks for the fiscal year you are reporting in the fifth line. Add more columns if needed]*

	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
PIR #	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>	6 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup>	8	9
Rating towards <b>outcomes</b> (section 3.1)	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	S
Rating towards <b>outputs</b> (section 3.2)	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	S
<b>Risk rating</b> (section 3.3)	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	L

**Rating towards outcomes: Satisfactory**

The project outcomes rated as satisfactory as since the recommencement of the project in Oct. 2019, the project was reorganized and submitted the draft law to ministry of environment to go in procedures to issue it, also planning to draft a by-law regarding unintended release of GMOs into the environment, a steering committee was formed and six meetings were held, working on implementing an awareness plan, where a workshop was held for all media sectors, Issuing a periodic newsletter (3 newsletters) of the project as well as a brochure to introduce the project and the protocol. The tender to purchase of laboratory equipment and consumables has been done and the two chosen labs (National Agriculture Research Center, and Royal Scientific Society) received the desired equipment. Four national consultancies successfully implemented (administrative system, inspection and monitoring, emergency measures, and decision making on LMOs) and submitted. The next activities will focus on the consultancies related to risk assessment, assessing the safety of LMOs for feed and food and the International training activity which planned to be done on August 2023 in addition to many training and discussion workshops have been done.

**Rating towards outputs: Satisfactory**

The progress of project is rated as satisfactory regarding the formulation of steering committee and active contribution from their side and the appointment of new project coordinator has just been appointed to restart pending activities. Starting of Oct. 2019, reorganized the project work, submit the draft law to ministry of environment to go in procedures to issue it, working on implementing an awareness plan, where a workshop was held for all media sectors, and three regional workshops covering all governorates of Jordan has been conducted. Issuing periodic newsletters of the project as well as a brochure to introduce the project and the protocol, newsletter. *The qualified labs to receive the fund finalized and received the equipment, and four national consultancies implemented and discussed with all relevant stakeholders. And the remaining activities will be implemented ontime.*

**Overall risk rating: Low**

The main risk facing the project is the routine process for getting approval to conduct the planned activities and complications of conducting the international activities (contracting and paying the fees), Another key risk is the lack of public and institutional support for biosafety, while the project

team and NEA will hardly try to fill these gaps with the help of UNEP team and the continuous meetings with stakeholders and the awareness plans and activities.

[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]

#### 2.4. Co-financing

<p><b>Planned Co-finance</b></p> <p><b>Total: \$905,000</b></p> <p><b>Actual to date:</b> \$650,000 and 72% as at 30 June 2023</p>	<p>The planned co-finance is in kind. Due to the intermittent breaks and delays, the project has been able to leverage 80% of the planned co-finance.</p>
--	---

#### 2.5. Stakeholder engagement

<p><b>Date of project steering committee meeting</b></p>	<p><i>Steering Committee Meeting was held in June 2022 and the next was planned for June/July 2023</i></p>
<p><b>Stakeholder engagement</b></p>	<p>Strong Stakeholder interest including support from the Royal Jordanian Society of Science. However, the Ministry needs to provide a strong coordination and leadership role. Whilst the scientific community, partner ministry, agencies and civil society are keen to support project execution, the Ministry's internal processes on procurement and related services in addition to COVID-19 restrictions impacted negatively on stakeholder engagements.</p> <p>The engagement of stakeholders was taken into consideration during the formulation of the project steering committee as the committee composed of 22 members representing most of the related stakeholders and they now have satisfied understanding about the biosafety, and they are participating in all project decisions and activities.</p> <p>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</p>

#### 2.6. Gender

<p>Does the project have a gender action plan?</p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p><b>Gender mainstreaming</b></p>	<p>Sufficient number of the project steering committee are from women and 40% of the workshops attendees are women also. Ongoing efforts are being made to address this issue.</p> <p>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</p>

#### 2.7. Environmental and social safeguards management

<p><b>Moderate/High risk projects (in terms of Environmental and social safeguards)</b></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p><b>New social and/or environmental risks</b></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>

<p><b>Complaints and grievances related to social and/or environmental impacts (to be filled in by TM and EA)</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Environmental and social safeguards management</b></p>	<p>The draft law and the supporting regulatory instruments have measures to ensure environmental and social safeguards. The approval of the Policy and the law will lay a good platform for implementation of measures to ensure safeguards in the implementation of the Law.</p> <p>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</p>

**2.8. Knowledge management**

<p><b>Knowledge activities and products</b></p>	<p>Biosafety Outreach brochures; Situational Analysis of Biotechnology Laboratories; Policy Paper on Biotechnology and Biosafety; a draft Biosafety Law, Media workshop, Biosafety newsletters (3 editions) regional awareness workshops (three workshops for the north, south and middle regions of Jordan)</p> <p>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</p>
---	--

**2.9. Stories to be shared**

<p><b>Stories to be shared</b></p>	<p>Currently we notice the difference of thinking from all our partners as the project awareness, discussion and training workshops increased the public awareness about the LMOs, GMOs and biosafety in general and believe this is a big achievement.</p> <p>[section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication]</p>
------------------------------------	--

### 3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**<sup>1</sup> will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:

- (i) Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1
- (ii) Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

#### 3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

*[copy and paste the CEO Endorsement (or latest formal Revision) approved Results Framework, adding/deleting outcome rows, as appropriate]*

---

<sup>1</sup> For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator (One indicator per row)	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2023	Progress rating <sup>2</sup>
<b>Objective<sup>3</sup></b> <b>To have workable and transparent National Biosafety Framework (NBF), in line with its national development priorities and international obligations</b>	National Biosafety Framework translated into operational instruments supported by approved Policy, Regulatory, technical and Administrative frameworks to support Biosafety Decision-making.	No policy or draft Biosafety Law in place	Draft Biosafety Policy and Draft Law with supportive measures for handling Biosafety decision making prepared	Biosafety policy, Biosafety law with supportive technical and administrative guidelines and a functional LMO Detection Laboratory in place to support Biosafety Decision Making	Draft Biosafety Policy and Law prepared and submitted to Government	S
	<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Government recognizes the importance of Biosafety by integrating Biosafety issues into national policies, plans	Biosafety policy, strategy and action plan is drafted.	No unified governmentally approved biosafety policy exists.	The implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is supported by the consolidation of a unified governmentally approved Biosafety policy, strategy and action plan.	The policy and Biosafety law are drafted and submitted to the ministry.	
	<b>Outcome 1.2:</b> Developing programs and political and community support for the implementation of the Biosafety policy.	Agreed set of measures for sustainability of the biosafety system agreed upon by all involved governmental institutions		Before the end of the project (based on the extended period) the Biosafety policy will be governmentally approved and published.	Roles and responsibilities of all involved governmental institutions with regards to Biosafety clearly identified	

<sup>2</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

<sup>3</sup> Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators.

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator (One indicator per row)	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2023	Progress rating <sup>2</sup>
	Biosafety considered as an integral part of the country's sustainable management of biodiversity	the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, and Environmental Law no.6 for the year of 2017 touches upon the issue of Biosafety	Outreach Materials on the Biosafety policy prepared and made available. Penalties are available within the Env. Law	Increased national competence on Biosafety policy issues.	There is common understanding about the issue of Biosafety by the related Stakeholders	S
	Biosafety adopted in National Policies, Plans and Development Programs	<i>Biosafety never mentioned in any policies or National Plans</i>	Communicating with all stakeholders to take the biosafety into their consideration while preparing the national policies and plans	Biosafety mainstreamed into national policies and plans by end of project	Efforts are hardly made to mainstream the biosafety and planned workshop for the parliament and decision makers members will be conducted soon.	S
<b>Outcome 2:</b> 2. 1 An applicable law and applicable, effective and transparent regulatory system that are consistent with other national laws, the Cartagena Protocol, and other international treaties in place for handling of applications for LMOs	Draft Biosafety Law and Executive Directive Regulations on LMOs and their products drafted, finalized, adopted and in place	No specific Biosafety law exists.	By the end of the project finalized draft biosafety law will be available.	The implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is supported by the consolidation of a workable and operational Biosafety regulatory regime	The first draft law discussed with all relevant stakeholders reviewed and enhanced and final version submitted to the EA for perusal.	S

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of output

Outputs/Activities <sup>4</sup>	Start Date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Expected completion date <sup>5</sup> (dd/mm/yyyy)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%)	Progress rating justification <sup>6</sup> , description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress rating <sup>7</sup>
<b>COMPONENT 1:</b>						
<b>Output 1:</b> a. Media briefings on process of biosafety policy development b. Outreach materials on the project goals and activities prepared and made available c. Biosafety issues reflected within Jordan national strategies of agriculture and health	<i>Continuous throughout the project</i>			95%	The outreach processes still ongoing. Reflecting the biosafety issues within the national policies and strategies still under process	S
<b>Output 2:</b> Form a steering committee for the project, six meeting held. <b>And forming the technical committee.</b>	01/12/2020	Done	80%	100%	Completed	S
<b>Output 3:</b> Consultancy to review Biosafety related sectoral legislation and ministerial decrees to identify needs for amendments and harmonization with the Biosafety Law and to prepare legal texts.	01/01/2023	28/02/2023	3%	100%	The final Biosafety related sectoral legislation document finished and submitted	S
<b>Output 4:</b> Supporting the reference laboratories with the required equipment and materials	01/12/2020	31/12/2021	90%	100%	The Equipment tendering process is finished and equipment delivered.	S
<b>Output 5: Support for attendance to international training on 1. risk assessment and management and related issues 2. Detection of LMOs and their products on procedures for analysis and detection.</b>	01/01/2023	31/01/2023	6%	100%	The international training has been done.	S

<sup>4</sup> Outputs and activities (or deliverables) as described in the project logframe (and workplan) or in any updated project revision.

<sup>5</sup> The completion dates should be as per latest workplan (latest project revision).

<sup>6</sup> As much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc.

<sup>7</sup> To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

#### 4. Risk Rating

##### 4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

Please refer to the **Risk Help Sheet** for more details on rating.

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1. Management structure – Roles and responsibilities	L	M
2. Governance structure – Oversight	L	M
3. Implementation schedule	L	L
4. Budget	L	L
5. Financial Management	L	L
6. Reporting	L	L
7. Capacity to deliver	L	L

##### 4.2 Table A. Risk-log

Risk	Risk affecting:	Risk Rating							Variation respect to last rating	
	Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	MTR	PIR 7	PIR 8	PIR 9	Δ	Justification
Risk 1: the routine long procedures for implementing the Project activities internally and externally for the international activities – Management Structure/Governance oversight	Most Outcomes and outputs					H		M	↓	- The need to get approval from the ministry to implement any activity of the project action plan, hinders the implementation according to the planned schedule within action plan.
Risk 2: Inadequate capacity in handling issues related to LMOS in Jordan	Outcome 3	M	M	M	M	M		L	↓	- Despite the fact that there are capacity challenges on management of LMOs, with the current efforts this risk has been effectively managed.
Risk 3: Lack of public and institutional support for Biosafety	Most Outcomes and outputs	M	M	M	M	L	L	L	=	- Still limited lack of public awareness of the decision makers regarding the handling of LMOs.
Consolidated project risk		n.a	M	M	M	M	H	L	↓	
							L			

**Table B.** Outstanding medium & high risks

*List here only risks from Table A above that have a risk rating of M or worse in the current PIR*

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR <sub>t-1</sub> , MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
Risk 1: the routine long procedures for implementing the Project activities internally and externally for the international activities	n/a	Communicating with the decision makers within the ministry to figure a procedure to expedite the process of actions. And communicating with UNEP to find a suitable way to implement the international activities	Stronger communication channels with UNEP. Dedicated technical support by UNEP to the team and the reorganization of the roles and tasks of the project team	ongoing	UNEP, Project Team and Task manager

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.  
**Significant Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.  
**Medium Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.  
**Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

**Project Minor Amendments**

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines.

Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate.

**5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment**

- Results framework
- Components and cost
- Institutional and implementation arrangements
- Financial management

- Implementation schedule
- Executing Entity
- Executing Entity Category
- Minor project objective change
- Safeguards
- Risk analysis
- Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%
- Co-financing
- Location of project activity
- Other

[\[Annex document linked to reported minor amendment\]](#)

<b>Minor amendments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The project implementation schedule extended up to the end.</i></li> <li>- <i>One of the risks for implementation now is the long process of receiving the next cash advance and routine procedure for taking approval for actions.</i></li> </ul>
-------------------------	--

## 5.2. History of project revisions

Version	Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Rev0 (CEO ED)	-	
Rev1 (Implementation)	04/03/2015	Revised budget and workplan due to institutional challenges in project management
Rev2 (Implementation)	06/06/2018	Delayed processes for procurement leading to delays in delivery – workplan revision
Rev3 (Implementation)	15/02/2021	Revised workplans due to delays in delivery caused by COVID-19 restrictions
Rev4 (implementation)	27/02/2022	Revised workplans due to delays in delivery caused by COVID-19 restrictions and procurement challenges in accessing international training and consultancies

**GEO Location Information:**

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](https://openstreetmap.org/) or [GeoNames](https://www.geonames.org/) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name Required field	Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field <u>if</u> the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
Amman	31.963158	35.930359			

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate. \*  
 [Annex any linked geospatial file]

*[Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate]*

<https://www.google.com/maps/place/Amman,+Jordan/@31.8354533,35.6674224,10z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m5!3m4!1s0x151b5fb85d7981af:0x631c30c0f8dc65e8!8m2!3d31.9539494!4d35.910635>