

# Supporting the Operation and Effective Performance Management of the Aqaba Marine Reserve, Jordan

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10905

**Countries**

Jordan

**Project Name**

Supporting the Operation and Effective Performance Management of the Aqaba Marine Reserve, Jordan

**Agencies**

IUCN

**Date received by PM**

2/2/2023

**Review completed by PM**

4/17/2023

**Program Manager**

Mark Zimsky

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

MSP

**PIF**   
**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

NA.

Agency Response  
**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Please fix the cofinancing table which is not aligned with the cofinancing letter. The Letter notes that all cofinance is in-kind and for recurrent expenditures and all from the Government.

In addition, the letter is from the "Recipient Country Government", Government of Jordan and not the UNDP. Please correct the field below to reflect on the correct source of co-financing as "government of Jordan" if this is the case, otherwise please provide a separate letter of evidence from UNDP if the source is the GEF agency.

4/13/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response  
11th April 2023

This is noted and the changes have been made in the portal.

**GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
Project Preparation Grant

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Provide a METT score for the marine MPA.

Indicator 5 is listed as zero for CEO endorsement. Is this correct? If there will be no hectare indicator please do not complete and do not enter zero.

Embed the GEF core indicators in the project results framework as well.

4/13/2023

We note that the footnote states: " **staff do complete a separate World Bank annual MPA performance ?scorecard? tool on an annual basis. This Score Card is designed to ?Assess Progress in Achieving Management Effectiveness Goals for Marine Protected Areas? (2004).**

Please use the score that you score as the baseline score as it is equivalent to the METT and will serve as a baseline measure for evaluation of the project going forward. Enter it into the portal and then in the portal explanation under the core indicators note the footnote above.

4/17/2023

Yes, cleared.

## Agency Response

14 April 2023

This is well noted and updates have been made in the portal to include the World Bank scorecard score with associated explanation.

11th April 2023

1. Clarification text is offered in the Prodoc (p27) and the CEO Endorsement form (p?) regarding the fact that no METT score exists for the Aqaba Marine Park. The reason for the new project is to complete such a score in participatory manner. Reference is made in a footnote to the 2004 World Bank MPA Effectiveness Tool that AMR do use.

2. please note that the Indicator 5 has not been filled out in the portal on the agency preparer side, this must be something generated in the GEF portal. We hope this is no longer an issue.

3. Annex A now has GEF core indicators (listed also in Annex F) embedded into the project results framework (word for word), namely:

2.2. Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness

4.1. Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares)

11. Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

## Part II ? Project Justification

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2/15/2023

Please eliminate all references to potential GEF-8 projects in the Table under the project description and anywhere else it is presented in the text.

4/13/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

11th April 2023

All reference to GEF8 projects are deleted from the Project Document and the CEO Endorsement Form accordingly.

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
Child Project

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

The project's gender action plan specifies among its objectives: ?Increase the access to and control over diversified and important role of women in developing marine biodiversity by supporting improved access, use, and opportunity of

women in the Aqaba Marine Reserve?. As such, Agency is requested to select ?Yes? to the item in the portal submission: "Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources."

4/13/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

11th April 2023,

This is noted and has been adjusted in the GEF portal entry for submission.

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

In the budget it allocates \$10,000 for Midterm evaluation, but in the text it says there will not be a midterm evaluation since the project is only two years long. In the budget it also notes the total cost for evaluation will be \$29,000 but the written text in the budget allocates \$10,000 for Midterm and \$20,000 for final evaluation. Please revise and allocate resources for a final evaluation only and with a correct amount.

A Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) is being charged across components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion (and the co-financing portion) allocated to PMC. This item alone represents 36% of the overall project budget. When the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds), the project's staff could be charged to the project's components with clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). Please charge this item to the PMC (both GEF resources and co-financing) or provide clear ToRs showing outputs to the components.

4/13/2023

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

11th April 2023

Text updated to delete reference to the need for a MTR. (see p55 of the Project Document).

Budgets are also updated (US\$29,000 for the TE plus US\$1000 for any document translation totalling US\$30k. Wording in Annex K to align to this change.

Regarding the CTA issue, separate ToRs for the CTA and other supporting consultants have been produced and included as a new Annex Q.

#### **Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Please embed the GEF core indicators in the project results framework.

4/13/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response  
11th April 2023

Annex A and the Prodoc are updated to embrace the 2 relevant GEF Core Indicators  
**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

NA.

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

NA.

Agency Response  
**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

NA.

Agency Response  
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

NA.

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

NA.

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

NA.

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

NA

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

NA

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/15/2023

NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2023

No. Please revise per above and resubmit.

4/14/2023

No. Please address the issue related to the MPA assessment noted above, make the revisions, and resubmit.

4/17/2023

Yes, cleared.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	3/7/2023	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	4/13/2023	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	4/17/2023	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**