



Restoring Forest Ecosystem Functions Through Community-Based Management in the Royal Botanic Garden of Jordan

Review PPG Request and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11616

Countries

Jordan

Project Name

Restoring Forest Ecosystem Functions Through Community-Based Management in the Royal Botanic Garden of Jordan

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/6/2024

Review completed by PM

5/7/2024

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

GBFF

GEF-8 Project Preparation Grant request Review Sheet

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GBFF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments JS 5/6/2024 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments

II. Indicative Project Overview

- a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?
- b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective?

Secretariat's Comments JS 5/6/2024 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments

- c) Are the components adequately funded?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional (only for Multi-trust Funds PPGs with BD from the GEF Trust Fund)?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for projects of more than \$2 million or 10% for projects of less than \$2 million? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments JS 5/6/2024 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments

III. Project Rationale

a. Does the project adequately describe the: (i) current situation/baseline conditions within the project geographic area or project thematic area; (ii) problem(s) that the project will address; (iii) goal and objectives of the project; and (iv) justification for the project intervention; and (v) expected results including the Global Environmental Benefits and an estimate of the project's contributions to the relevant biodiversity core indicators.

Secretariat's Comments JS 5/6/2024 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments

IV. Project Description

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the project components and activities identified in the theory of change adequately described.

c) Is a list of stakeholders that will be involved in the project and their roles in the design and implementation of the project provided?

d) Are the Specific Action Area(s) that the project is aligned with identified and an explanation provided on and how the project will support the achievement of the specific Action Area objective(s).

Secretariat's Comments JS 5/6/2024 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments

V. Does the proposal adequately describe how the project meets the following criteria:

a) Potential to generate global environmental benefits (GEBs) (include a description of the GEBs the project will generate per the GEF-8 Core Indicators for biodiversity);

b) Alignment with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and/or National Biodiversity Finance Plans or similar instruments to identify national and/or regional priorities;

c) The level of policy coherence and coordination across multiple ministries, agencies, the private sector, and civil society that the project aims to support;

**d) Whether the project will mobilize the resources of the private sector and philanthropies';
and**

e) Whether and how the project will engage with and provide support to IPLCs.

Secretariat's Comments JS 5/6/2024 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments

VI. Project results indicators

Is the table correctly populated and consistent with the Project Description?

Secretariat's Comments JS 5/6/2024 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments

VII. Project Financing Tables

a) Are all the tables correctly populated?

b) Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines (only for projects with GEF TF components)?

Secretariat's Comments JS 5/6/2024 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments

VIII. Project Endorsement

a) Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) OFP and has the OFP at the time of PPG request submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments JS 5/6/2024 - Cleared.

Agency's Comments

IX. GEFSEC Decision

a. Is the PPG recommended for technical clearance?

b. Additional comments to be considered by the Agency during project preparation

Secretariat's Comments

JS 5/6/2024 - This PPG request has been recommended for technical clearance.

During PPG, please:

- Strengthen the justification of the benefits for biodiversity of global significance to be delivered by the project. We notably understand that the project is to entirely take place within a section of the Dibbin Key Biodiversity Area (<https://www.keybiodiversityareas.org/site/factsheet/46664>), which is only very partially covered by protected areas. Please notably ensure the CEO endorsement requests explains how any GBFF-supported restoration activities have been designed to specifically generate benefits for biodiversity of globally significance.

- As ex-situ conservation, and thus botanic gardens, are not eligible for support by the GEF, please:

a. Revise the title to better reflect the objective and content of the project. For instance, "Restoring Forest Ecosystem Functions Through Community-Based Management".

b. Remove all support, including restoration, to any area or activity related to ex-situ conservation.

- Please revise and consolidate the targets on GEF core indicators.

a. As the high cost per hectare and high potential benefits for biodiversity of global significance of the proposed restoration activities is not justified in proposal, the project targets (a total impact over 340 ha) are currently not commensurate with the GBFF funding request (\$744,521 of project financing, i.e. close to \$2,200 per hectare). Please consider concentrating financial resources on fewer activities to expand their geographic scale and likely impact for biodiversity, focusing on support to in-situ conservation and restoration where it has potential to provide cost-effective benefits for biodiversity of global significance.

b. As the Dibben Forest Reserve is registered as a 849 ha PA in the WDPA (WDPA ID 30697), support to its management should thus be reported under core indicator 1, with an associated target for increase on management effectiveness as measured by the METT. We also note that the adjacent Al Khayouf Special Conservation Area (WDPA ID

555577563, 2,221 ha) is not included in the scope of the project, when it is managed by local communities and thus seems entirely in line with the project objectives and target landscape. Please consider adding Al Khayouf and restoration to enhance functional connectivity between the two conservation areas, as relevant, in the scope of the project.

- confirm the amount of GBFF project financing dedicated to support actions by IPLC for the conservation, restoration, sustainable use and management of biodiversity. Please make sure that the CEO endorsement request document includes a justification with cross-reference to relevant project components and/or outputs that clarifies who will benefit and describes their role in the project.

- Please better justify alignment with Action Areas 3 and 6, or remove and shift the corresponding programming of fund to the relevant Action Areas.

- Ensure the M&E budget is in line with recommended threshold of 5% project financing for projects of similar size, or justify any specific M&E needs.

- Round financial numbers to nearest dollar in GEF Financing table and FA elements table.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PPG Request Review	Agency Response
First Review	5/7/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		