



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in tourism sector development in Jordan			
Country(ies):	Jordan	GEF Project ID: ¹	4586
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4587
Other Executing Partner(s):	Petra Development and Tourism Region Authority (PDTRA); Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority (ASEZA); Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature (RSCN); Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities (MoTA); Ministry of Municipal Affairs (MoMA)	Submission Date:	May 1, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> 	N/A	Agency Fee (\$):	270,000

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	Output 2. National and sub-national land-use plans (number) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	GEF TF	1,200,000	9,986,945
		Output 3. Certified production landscapes and seascapes (ha)			
	Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks	Output 1. Policies and regulatory frameworks (number) for production sectors	GEF TF	265,000	1,206,000
BD-1	Outcome 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management	Output 3. Sustainable financing plans (number).	GEF TF	1,100,000	10,904,398
Sub-total				2,565,000	22,097,343
Project management cost			GEF TF	135,000	613,000
Total project costs				2,700,000	22,710,343

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

Project Objective: Biodiversity Conservation Objectives are Effectively Mainstreamed and Advanced into and through tourism sector development in Jordan

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1.Regulatory and enforcement framework in place to avoid, mitigate and offset adverse impacts of tourism on biodiversity	TA	<p>Regulatory and enforcement framework in place to avoid, reduce, mitigate and offset adverse impacts of tourism on biodiversity of tourism and associated infrastructure development and tourism products and services resulting in improved security over 264,541 hectares (including 82,760 ha of protected areas)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All new tourism developments and operations apply the new biodiversity friendly EIA guidelines - At least 50% of hotels, tour operators, lodges and camp sites in ecological sensitive areas apply 	<p>1.1 A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for tourism development to inform biodiversity considerations in land-use planning - defining spatial areas where development should be avoided, where it may be permitted subject to management controls, and what mitigation and offset requirements are needed.</p> <p>1.2 A biodiversity-friendly tourism charter including a set of biodiversity standards developed, tested and adopted for the MoTA certification schemes for hotels, eco-tour operators, eco-lodges and environmental camp sites.</p> <p>1.3 An effective system of penalties for breaches of permit conditions in the tourism sector developed, adopted and publicized reflecting the new Biodiversity-friendly certification system.</p> <p>1.4 Biodiversity guidelines for the EIA Process as it applies to tourism developments and operations with particular focus on off-site and cumulative impacts.</p> <p>1.5 Economic incentives and disincentives to promote adherence by the tourism industry to the reformed policies and regulations.</p>	GEF TF	265,000	1,206,000
2.Institutional capacities for planning, monitoring and enforcement strengthened in Jerash, Petra and Wadi Rum landscapes so as to manage the impacts of tourism development on biodiversity in ecologically valuable and sensitive areas	TA	<p>Institutional capacities emplaced to manage the impacts of tourism development on biodiversity within the Petra, Jerash and Wadi Rum landscapes viz planning, monitoring and enforcement of biodiversity management measures in the tourism sector.</p> <p>No major adverse tourism development impacts on biodiversity in ecologically sensitive areas in Petra region (90,381 ha), in Jerash Governorate (40,980ha) and the Wider Wadi Rum Landscape (133,180 ha) through habitat disturbance of</p>	<p>2.1 Biodiversity Information Management System (BIMS), founded on initial ecological surveys to inform Land Use Plans, serve as a platform for decision-making, and as a source of up-to-date knowledge on biodiversity.</p> <p>2.2 Comprehensive land-use plans based on BIMS and covering Jerash Governorate, PDTRA territory, Shoubak proposed PA and its buffer zone, and Greater Wadi Rum Landscapes/Development Zones to set development limits so as to protect biodiversity.</p> <p>2.3 Biodiversity Monitoring System to update and maintain the BIMS, identify trends and ensure that any changes in biodiversity-important areas remain within acceptable limits; to include remedial measures that will be triggered by the monitoring.</p> <p>2.4 Improved enforcement of land use development constraints geared to</p>	GEF TF	1,200,000	9,986,945

		key species from tourism: Jerash Governorate: <i>Lacerta media</i> Petra: <i>Vulpes cana</i> Wadi Rum: <i>Caracal caracal</i>	protecting biodiversity. 2.5 Effective interpretation and information facilities at vantage points to inform visitors about the values and vulnerabilities of ecological resources and the consequences (ecological and legal) of not adhering to limits and regulations.			
3. Improved management effectiveness particularly in revenue generation, tourism planning and management, and community relations in Dibeen, Shoubak and Wadi Rum Protected Areas	TA	PA Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools show improvement of at least 8% in baseline scores of 57% for Dibeen Forest Reserve, 47% for Shoubak proposed PA and 67% for Wadi Rum Protected Area particular in relation to scores relating to revenue generation, tourism planning and management and relations with local communities. An increase of 50% or more in total annual revenue earned from tourism operations from a baseline of US\$ 43,000 for Dibeen Forest Reserve and US\$ 976,467 for Wadi Rum PA and at least 50% of Shoubak PA's operating costs are covered by tourism revenue by project closure.	3.1 PA Management Advisory Boards for promoting increased involvement of the private sector and local community in PA management. 3.2 Dibeen PA, Shoubak PA and Wadi Rum PA Management Plans revised to reflect the principles espoused in the new Land Use Plans and the benefits from new BIMS and Monitoring System. 3.3 Visitor management capabilities (to reduce impact on biodiversity) in Dibeen, Shoubak and Wadi Rum PAs, enhanced through improved visitor facilities, better trained rangers and eco-guides, and improved management capacities, to expand visitor attractions and improve visitor experience while reducing impact on biodiversity in sensitive areas. 3.4 Business plans for Dibeen, Shoubak and Wadi Rum PAs.	GEF TF	1,100,000	10,904,398
Subtotal					2,565,000	22,097,343
Project Management Cost (PMC) ³				GEF TF	135,000	613,000
Total project costs					2,700,000	22,710,343

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
GEF Implementing Agency	UNDP	Grant	500,000
Government	Petra Development and Tourism Region Authority (PDTRA)	Grant	9,400,000
NGO	Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature (RSCN)	Grant	800,000
Government	Ministry of Municipal Affairs (MoMA)	Grant	500,000
Government	Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities (MoTA)	Grant	175,000
Private Sector	Crowne Plaza Hotel in Petra	Grant	942,945
Private Sector	Aqaba Hotels Association	Grant	300,000

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

Government	Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority (ASEZA)	Grant	9,992,398
Private Sector	Captain's Tourist Services and Desert Camp	Grant	100,000
Total Co-financing			22,710,343

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Jordan	2,700,000	270,000	2,970,000
Total Grant Resources				2,700,000	270,000	2,970,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	40,000	0	40,000
National/Local Consultants	745,000	45,000	790,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No.

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc

N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

The project supports strategic objective 2 of the GEF biodiversity focal area (BD-2) – *Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes, and sectors.*

More specifically, the project will contribute to Outcome 2.1: *Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.* It will do this through the adoption of internationally and nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations in 194,000 hectares⁵ of ecologically sensitive areas in the tourism regions/zones and in 82,769 hectares of protected areas. The total area to benefit from the project amounts to 276,769 hectares.

The project will also contribute to Outcome 2.2: *Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks,* through the development and adoption of policies and regulations governing tourism

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

⁵ Dibeen, Wadi Rum and Shoubak PAs cover 82,769ha. Through its land-use planning activities, the project's reach will be extended to the Hizma Basin / greater Wadi Rum area (126,000ha), Shoubak District and PA buffer zone (3,000 ha estimated), the Jerash Governorate (41,000ha) as well as pockets of land between Petra and Shoubak (part of the Rift Valley Ecological Corridor) and the entire 79,641ha of land administered by the PDTRA. The total area that the project will be addressing outside PAs is about 194,000ha.

activities that integrate biodiversity conservation in the tourism regions/zones and the Protected Areas adjacent to them as well as in the ecologically important areas between them.

The project will further contribute to the realization of the first strategic objective for biodiversity—*Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems*, more specifically Outcome 1.2: *Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management*.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

UNDP-Jordan is a key player in the arena of environmental management and biodiversity conservation in Jordan and has a long history in responding to Jordan's evolving national priorities for biodiversity conservation. UNDP-Jordan will commit \$500,000 as co-financing to this project which is in line with UNDP's four strategic pillars: poverty alleviation, good governance, climate change and environment, and disaster management which are described in the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for 2008-2012 (the active programming cycle). The UNDP Country Office in Jordan will ensure rigorous supervision and project implementation of this project through the support of its programme unit successfully managing a portfolio of technical assistance and capacity building initiatives in the areas of biodiversity conservation, prevention of land degradation, and climate change in addition to the support from operations and senior management. This team is also supported by UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit.

This project will also benefit from UNDP's global efforts in the field of sustainable tourism. UNDP believes that tourism can play an important role in raising levels of human development and achieving sustainable poverty reduction outcomes. Tourism development inevitably concerns issues that extend far beyond the boundaries of the sector and reach into cross-sectoral linkages, such as in food value chains, biodiversity conservation and the cultural industry. This wider perspective is required if tourism development is to make positive impacts on poverty reduction. Properly shaped, tourism can generate opportunities for growth, poverty reduction, and incentives for environmental protection. In partnership with UN agencies and other organizations, UNDP has been implementing pro-poor interventions in support of the tourism sector under its poverty reduction, private sector and environment programmes. UNDP's Ecosystems and Biodiversity programme is currently implementing 57 projects in 48 countries that work with the tourism sector. These projects are strengthening the capacity of countries around the world to develop sustainable tourism ventures, and to manage the adverse effects that tourism may have on the environment if unregulated. Projects have made important strides in creating enabling environments for sustainable eco-tourism; developing certification standards for tourism and its related products; and partnering with the private sector, local organizations and others to create jobs for poor communities. Countries with these tourism-focused projects in the Arab region include Morocco and Egypt and will allow regional specificities to be captured by the proposed project in Jordan and to exchange lessons and good practices.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The tourism sector already poses a major threat to biodiversity in Jordan and given the planned exponential growth of the sector, this threat is expected to grow significantly. Currently, tourism is concentrated at two levels: (1) in tourism regions/zones such as Petra and Wadi Rum, both of which are ecologically sensitive areas; and (2) in wider areas between these regions/zones and the existing and planned protected areas (e.g. the area surrounding Dibein PA in Jerash Governorate, the district surrounding Shoubak Proposed PA, and the wider territory around Wadi Rum outside the PA). These Tourism regions/zones lie in high biodiversity areas and in the proximity of several protected areas. Although few of Jordan's current visitor intake are nature tourists *per se*, tourists do visit protected areas around the tourism regions/zones as part of their tour itinerary. The Government is seeking to expand the tourism marketing product—and will market Jordan as a destination for nature-based tourism—wilderness being a key attraction (hiking, camping and other activities). PA visitation is thus expected to grow over time.

Biodiversity is being threatened by mass tourism across the landscape as a whole, within each of the tourism regions/zones, and within protected areas (as well as planned new PA sites) in the Jordan Rift Valley. The tourism footprint on biodiversity is expected to grow over time. The Tourism Master Plans prepared for each of the tourism regions/zones and other areas identify current and potential impacts on biodiversity as a potentially serious issue that needs to be managed. The threat posed by tourism to biodiversity is also documented in protected area management plans. These

threats may be divided into two categories: direct threats and indirect threats. Pressures vary spatially across the landscape and while some areas are currently not heavily impacted, there is no guarantee that they will remain so in future.

The prime *direct threats* from tourism activities to biodiversity are the following:

1. Hotel and tourism infrastructure development: Development of hotels and other tourism infrastructure in ecologically sensitive areas leading to fragmentation and loss of habitat. The loss of connectivity between different habitat blocks poses a significant risk to biodiversity in Jordan as a whole, and undermines the utility of PAs as a critical storehouse of biodiversity. PAs should ideally be connected through natural and undisturbed corridors to maintain ecological processes and ensure the free passage of wildlife. There is also little or no consideration of the cumulative impact of development projects.

2. High visitor numbers: High visitor numbers in sensitive environments and protected areas leading to disturbance of the habitat. Visitors' activities have exerted extensive pressure on biodiversity from trampling, hunting, plant collection, uncontrolled trekking and climbing, etc. In Petra, which is by far the most visited tourism site in Jordan, habitat degradation has already been recorded—and tourism is believed to have an impact on wildlife populations. The disturbance from tourism activities, among others, is responsible for the absence or scarcity of avifauna.

3. Effluent discharges: Effluent discharges, litter accumulation and extensive abstraction of water. Hotels generate significant wastes, often dumped in ecologically sensitive areas. This has changed animal behavior – *e.g.* waste dumps are scavenged by species such as the Red Fox. However, this practice also results in the accumulation of toxic compounds in the ecosystem. A second problem arises as a result of the excessive extraction of ground water and surface water from wadis. The latter is a serious problem, as it threatens the biodiversity of these small, fragile but important habitats.

The *indirect threats* from tourism on biodiversity include:

4. Roads development: Roads are being developed to increase access to tourism areas. The placement of roads around tourism regions/zones is providing easy access to ecologically important areas and increasing the pressure from tourists on these areas. Unless planned to incorporate biodiversity values, this could have the inadvertent effect of increasing other threats (*e.g.* poaching).

5. Encroachment by local population: Local populations encroach on natural resources in sensitive areas and practice intensive resource use to support their livelihood needs. Local populations are using the provisioning and regulating ecosystem services to support their economies. A further increase in agriculture and pastoralist activities is expected as the local population will aim to meet increased demand for food produce from tourism establishments in the tourism regions/zones and this will cause additional pressure on biodiversity from overgrazing, loss of the vegetation cover, wood-cutting, etc. There is a need for tourism establishments to factor these impacts into supply chain management so as to mitigate the pressure on biodiversity, ecosystems and ecosystem services.

Long-term Solution, Baseline Project and Barriers

The long-term solution advanced under this project to address the identified threats is to change the course of tourism sector development, so as to reduce the negative externality on development. The solution is brought about through the 'mainstreaming' of biodiversity considerations into the process of tourism development and management.

If threats to biodiversity from tourism sector development are to be effectively curtailed, action will be needed at three levels - (1) at the national level—influencing regulations and investment strategies; (2) at the landscape level in the tourism zones—where physical development occurs and where there is a need to change the trajectory of that development to address direct and indirect threats; and (3) at the site level—in protected areas and sensitive corridors, where additional management intervention is needed to address direct pressures on ecosystems. The current baseline investments are described below at each of these levels, together with an accompanying description of the barriers impeding effective biodiversity management. The project is designed to remove these barriers.

Situation at the National (upstream) Level: Jordan's national tourism development budget for the years 2011-2013 is around US\$170 million, accounting for 26% of the total public sector investment in economic development. This outlay, which is intended to assist the MoTA to implement the National Tourism Strategy, is complemented by investments from several development partners, the most significant of which is the USAID/Jordan Tourism Development Project II⁶. MoTA is vested with the overall responsibility for developing tourism in Jordan and this includes cultivating investment in hotels and other infrastructure particularly from the private sector, catalyzing investment in tourism services (such as training); and licensing and regulating development. The Jordan Tourism Board works through a public private partnership between MoTA and tourism businesses to market Jordan as a tourism destination (11 Jordan Tourism Board Offices have been set up to support destination marketing). The baseline provides, *inter alia*, for major infrastructure development, destination marketing and diversifying the tourism product, for instance by encouraging ecotourism and nature based tourism. The JTB's annual budget is around JD4.5 million (US\$6.315 million), provided by the government and through private sector investments including private tourism services. A classification system has been developed for hotels and restaurants, providing a unified system for rating establishments (using a star rating system). The hotel classification system needs to be strengthened further and extended to eco-tour operators, eco-lodges and environmental camp sites.

Barriers at the National (upstream) Level: A comprehensive understanding of the impacts of the tourism sector on biodiversity is lacking. Although the tourism sector speaks of reducing the environmental footprint of tourism, it has focused for instance on energy and water use and rarely on biodiversity management. National land-use planning has not factored in the impact of tourism development on biodiversity. EIAs are required for specific site interventions but these do not evaluate the off-site impacts or the cumulative and synergistic effect on biodiversity of different development activities over larger areas. This is of particular concern given the fragility of ecosystems in Jordan which already suffer from a high level of fragmentation. Moreover, the national classification system for hotels and restaurants developed by MoTA which is expected to be adopted by 100% of hotels and 80% of restaurants by 2015, does not specifically address biodiversity. Specific norms and standards to regulate tourism development at the enterprise and landscape level so as to reduce and mitigate threats are also lacking. In practice, this means that biodiversity management needs are not factored into licensing decisions for development. As noted above, the Government has delegated the responsibility for issuing permits for tourism development to the new regional tourism authorities, of which, the PDTRA and the ASEZA are of interest to the project. Outside these special territories, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs is responsible for land-use planning, and the Governorates and municipalities regulate development through the implementation of the land-use plans. Of interest to the project are the Governorates of Jerash and Ma'an, the former includes Dibeen PA and the latter includes land surrounding Shoubak and Wadi Rum PAs. These authorities are also responsible for commissioning EIAs and they are accountable to MoTA and the Ministry of Environment for the discharge of this duty. However, without national biodiversity standards, a system of rewards and penalties, and a better capacity in national institutions to monitor and ensure compliance, there is a risk that biodiversity management will be sidelined. Finally, voluntary mechanisms to cultivate good corporate environmental stewardship on the part of businesses are lacking and there is a need for economic incentives and disincentives to reward those that observe environmental protection and penalize those that do not. In addition, a more formal system of penalties for breaches of permit/certification conditions is also required so as to distinguish between those companies with a solid record of stewardship, from those with a poor one.

Situation at the Landscape Level Jordan is currently implementing an ambitious regional tourism development policy – establishing development regions/zones, as financially and administratively autonomous entities. Of special interest to the project is the Petra Development and Tourism Region and the Aqaba Special Economic Zone since while Wadi Rum PA is not formally within the ASEZ, it is managed by ASEZA together with some of its surrounding territory (other territory comes under the jurisdiction of the Ma'an Governorate). These development authorities play a critical role in planning and approving physical tourism development by having a major say in the siting of infrastructure. This provides a major opportunity for ensuring that biodiversity needs are taken into account in the land use allocation

⁶ The USAID/Jordan Tourism Development Project II is a \$31.5 million, five-year project (2008-2013) that is working to improve Jordan's competitiveness as an international tourism destination. The project works in partnership with the Ministry of Tourism & Antiquities on such initiatives as developing a new national hotel classification system, improving tourism research and destination marketing, enhancing ecotourism, developing better handicrafts and upgrading vocational training in tourism.

process and that development applies the mitigation hierarchy from the outset to avoid, reduce, mitigate and offset impacts. Likewise, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs (MoMA) is in a similar position of influence since it has overall responsibility for land use planning, land use allocation and management outside the tourism and development zones. Areas of interest to the project that come under this classification (where MoMA has responsibility for land-use planning), are the Jerash Governorate and, as mentioned, parts of Ma'an Governorate in the vicinity of Wadi Rum as well as the area surrounding Shoubak⁷. The tourism and development Authorities as well as MoMA have responsibility for promoting local tourism development, directly or indirectly (in the case of MoMA) drawing on public funds and private sector investments. The Authorities and Governorates/Districts/Municipalities (Local Administrations) are also responsible for licensing development and commissioning EIAs and this makes them powerful players. The Authorities have developed Master Plans for tourism development and local employment creation while the Local Administrations, are in process of plan development (in collaboration with the MoMA). However, both the Authorities and the Local Administrations lack adequate information on the biodiversity values in their territory. They are also not strong on enforcement and monitoring. Their reliance on the Environmental Police, the Police Department, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of the Environment and RSCN leaves them without sufficient capacity because these agencies lack the institutional capacity to effectively protect the environment and their roles and mandates are currently being reviewed. Even if national biodiversity standards are developed for the tourism sector and there is a strong national level compliance auditing and management system in place, biodiversity will continue to be lost unless these authorities have a specific mandate and capability to address biodiversity management in their operations. In parallel to the impacts arising from tourism are impacts generated by recreational and livelihood activities of local residents, some of which are allied to tourism development.

Barriers at the Landscape Level: An important barrier to the mainstreaming of biodiversity in the tourism sector in Jordan is the weak vertical and horizontal coordination among the stakeholders involved in the sector. Several institutions have responsibilities at the regional level in planning, monitoring and enforcing regulations relating to tourism sector development and biodiversity conservation – MoMA, Governorates/Districts/Municipalities, RSCN, Ministry of Environment, PDTRA, ASEZA and the Police. However, the mandates for surveillance and prosecution of unlawful tourism activities and breaches of planning provisions at the level of these institutions are unclear and overlapping and need to be clarified and closely coordinated in order to ensure the integration of biodiversity conservation in the tourism development agenda. Moreover, there are weak capacities for permitting, monitoring and enforcing biodiversity-friendly development at the level of the tourism authorities/zones with respect to managing direct and indirect threats.

However, an even more fundamental barrier is the general lack of data and information on biodiversity among decision-makers and other professionals responsible for natural resource use, and even more so among the general public. This is hindering appreciation of the value of biodiversity (including to the tourism sector) and its vulnerability to various impacts. This lack of data and information is a fundamental barrier to efforts to reflect biodiversity in the planning and other initiatives on resource use – it can only be resolved through effective ecological surveys which, while not overly meticulous, must provide a robust basis for decision making.

Whereas Strategic Plans have been prepared, land-use planning is a comparatively new activity in Jordan. The MoMA has only been entrusted with land-use planning comparatively recently (in 2012) and because of the lack of data and information on biodiversity, it is difficult for planners to take biodiversity into account in their planning initiatives. Biodiversity management objectives need to be accommodated in the overarching land use plans which will guide the placement of hotel infrastructure, the siting of roads and water reticulation and waste management systems amongst other things. This needs to take an adaptive approach employing the acceptable limits of change approach, which will in turn require a sound environmental monitoring and data management system.

Allied to the lack of data and information on biodiversity, and with the exception of some work in protected areas, there is little or no monitoring of ecosystems, no assessment of the state of ecosystems and critical species, no recording of trends. Without an effective monitoring system, those responsible for the protection and management of biodiversity in Jordan cannot be aware of the dire consequences of tourism and other impacts on biodiversity, until it is too late.

⁷ It needs to be noted that while MoMA has responsibility for developing land-use plans, and is therefore in a strong position to pre-empt impacts of tourism on biodiversity, it is the Governorates, Districts and Municipalities that give effect to the plans and enforce their provisions.

The country set up the "Environmental Police" unit in 2006, an innovative system to coordinate the activities of the Police Department, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment and RSCN with a view to addressing threats to the environment. However, the unit has in practice not been able to effectively oversee enforcement in the tourism sector, partly because regulations, standards and penalties governing enforcement are wanting in the first place, but also because there is limited technical capacity to deal with the sector (because many threats occur from a conjunction of different pressures from different enterprises). The whole system of enforcement in environmental protection in Jordan is currently under review and results are expected by the time the project is under implementation and it will be able to play an active role in the follow-up to this exercise with a focus on capacity building.

While some interpretation exists in Protected Areas, there is a general and severe lack of effective interpretation and information outside formally protected areas and little, if any, communication with the public on the values and vulnerabilities of ecological resources and the consequences (ecological and legal) of not adhering to land-use plans, not observing set limits and breaking regulations.

Situation at the Protected Areas Site Level: Jordan has also allocated \$6 million of its national budget for the years 2011-2013 for the management of existing protected areas through RSCN and several development partners are also supporting RSCN in the management and development of ecotourism in the existing and planned protected areas. In addition, ASEZA manages two protected areas, namely Wadi Rum World Heritage Site and the Aqaba Marine Reserve. Among the most important initiatives, is the USAID \$8.2 million funded Eco-tourism Project which aims to create a world-class nature tourism complex in southern Jordan as a means to promote economic opportunities for poor rural communities and protect the Kingdom's finest natural landscapes. However, this support is still not able to respond to the threats that PAs face from the significant increase in tourism development in the wider Rift Valley. Dibeen PA (in Jerash Governorate) and Wadi Rum in ASEZ and Ma'an Governorate, are already well established, while Shoubak (in Ma'an Governorate and adjacent to PDTR is in the process of being established. An ambitious programme is underway in Jordan to establish additional PAs including the community managed Special Conservation Areas (SCAs). The capacity of PA sites to manage tourism is asymmetric – while the management capacity is relatively good in the Dana NR, other sites have generally weak management capacity. Moreover, they lack the financial wherewithal to increase staffing and to construct visitor infrastructure.

Barriers to effective PA management: Laudable efforts are currently made by most PA management to involve local communities. However, this does not reach all communities and even less so the private sector, and it serves as a barrier to the effective management of PAs. Partnerships are required to convey the message that PAs are a shared resources as well as a shared responsibility and this will lead to collaboration in attempting to resolve differences between factions.

To a certain extent, the PAs are managed in isolation from the surrounding lands in a situation that observes strict boundaries of jurisdiction. This is a barrier and it works against the PAs themselves. While it is not advocated to dismantle jurisdictional boundaries, recognition of mutual land use plans and management commitments on either side of the boundary should be encouraged. This will lead to a sounder basis for management in the PAs which can reflect better the provisions that might be made outside their boundaries to protect biodiversity.

There is a need to disperse tourism from heavily visited areas within Protected Areas where tourism is placing pressure on the environment. This will require the development of infrastructure in new areas (waste management systems, interpretation facilities, trails, picnic facilities, etc) as well as the institution of visitor controls. Additional resources need to be generated to staff PAs to deal with tourism pressures, as well as cover other operational expenses. The absence of ecotourism-based business plans for PAs and the lack of efficient user fees collection systems create a barrier to the ultimate ability of PAs to be self-supporting and gain financial sustainability.

The project is designed by closely complying with the objectives, outcomes, components, GEF budget and co-financing specified in the PIF. There has been no change in the GEF budget total and only one slight change in the allocation of budgets across outcomes. The co-financing targets in the PIF have been met and exceeded. The overwhelming majority of quantitative targets from the PIF have been maintained. The only minor variations are the specific project localities under Outcomes 2 and 3 as explained below –

Table 1. Changes made, compared to information provided in original Project Identification Form (PIF)

Area of change	Original PIF	Final project document	Reasons for change
Project locality	Ajloun Development Zone	Jerash Governorate	Ajloun Development Zone not fully operational yet and comprising small area. Jerash Governorate good candidate for Land Use Planning; comprises 40,980ha.
Project locality	Dead Sea Development Zone	Greater Wadi Rum	No cooperative partner for Dead Sea Development Zone. No identifiable PA directly related (Mujib is distant and disconnected). Greater Wadi Rum landscape has a World Heritage Site as focus with increasing tourism impacts inside and outside the PA boundaries. Good potential for project impact, through Land Use Planning over an area of some 133,180ha.
Project locality	Dana PA	Shoubak PA	Dana PA is well-catered for and distant and disconnected from other project localities. Shoubak is a proposed PA, arising from another GEF project. It is also contiguous with the PDTRA territory and an excellent candidate for landscape level Land Use Planning over an area of some 90,381 ha.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

In the **business-as-usual scenario**, the Tourism Regional Authorities and Local Administrations in Jordan will continue to develop and implement land-use plans at the landscape level with little or no consideration of environmental values and certainly not biodiversity; Jordan’s tourism industry will continue to expand with little or no consideration for the impacts that it is having on biodiversity inside and outside formally protected areas; protected areas will remain underfunded and inadequately managed, and vulnerable to direct or spill-over impacts from tourism, among others. Responsibility for compliance and enforcement of protective measures will remain fragmented and citizens (including the tourism industry) will remain unclear as to their responsibility and accountability. Locals will continue to be forced by necessity to encroach on to protected areas for grazing; they will continue to cut trees for firewood for home heating and recreational barbecues as well as for tourist campsites; guided tourist vehicles will continue to drive off-track increasing the footprint of tourist activities on the fragile desert ecosystem.

Globally significant biodiversity in and around tourist hotspots and protected areas will continue to suffer impacts and species will continue to decline.

Government will continue to express concerns about these impacts but being caught in a dilemma it will continue to aim for higher tourist numbers as an increasingly valuable component of the economy. The Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities will continue to promote archaeological sites such as Petra, solely for their historical and cultural values; and the Jordan Tourism Board website will continue to respond to “biodiversity” as a search keyword with a single link to the Mujib Nature Reserve. The market potential of sustainable biodiversity for tourism in Jordan will remain underutilized.

The increment of the **GEF alternative** will comprise the mainstreaming of biodiversity considerations into tourism development. It will do this through a series of complementary activities to develop institutional tools upstream at national level which will provide the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities and related agencies such as the Ministry of

Environment, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, the Jerash Governorate, the Petra Development and Tourism Region Authority, the Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority and the Ma'an Governorate with the know-how, means and mechanisms for promoting biodiversity protection as in the best interest of the tourism industry. In its turn, the industry will recognize the value of Jordanian biodiversity and strive to protect it and promote it as a tourist attraction in its own right. Land-use plans at the landscape level will benefit from the project through the identification of biodiversity values and how they can be protected, and an effective monitoring system to maintain all data up to date and discover any worrying trends before they become irreversible. At site-specific level, protected areas that are currently weakly managed and poorly funded will benefit from comprehensive land use plans, visitor facilities that will provide information and education as well as recreation, and financial security.

The implementation of the proposed project will have an immediate global environmental benefit through the increased management efficiency of declared Protected Areas and the expansion of the area under agreed protection through land use plans, and buffer zones, albeit at a lesser level. This will lead to the restoration and conservation of the habitats of a number of threatened species and valuable ecosystems and will secure migratory pathways in the long term. As a result, globally significant biodiversity will be conserved and valuable ecosystem services will be safeguarded.

As a result of the significant effort that the project will make on institutional capacity building and the mainstreaming of biodiversity considerations into tourism sector development, these benefits will be sustainable.

Jordan is investing significant resources into the tourism sector estimated to be worth some \$170 million for the years 2011-2013 (26% of the total public sector investment). It is also investing at a more modest level in biodiversity conservation, estimated at some \$14-20 million. The global gains to be obtained through the GEF alternative project are estimated to cost \$25.5 million - this is the incremental cost of the incremental global benefits and GEF will contribute \$2.7 million towards it.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

The project strategy is based on the **assumption** that *mainstreaming* will lead to a long term solution to the impact of tourism on biodiversity in Jordan, and for it to happen, mainstreaming requires the following ingredients –

- Effective policy and procedural framework
- Capacity to implement and manage the process
- Awareness, sensitivity, understanding

In addition, stronger, more effectively managed and financially sustainable protected areas will be in a better position to deter/overcome any impacts of tourism on biodiversity which may arise. Furthermore, it can be assumed that increased tourism, if properly managed, can contribute to the sustainable financing of PAs.

These assumptions have given rise to the project design which sets about putting in place the principal elements for mainstreaming biodiversity into tourism sector development. The risk that these basic assumptions will fail is very low. However, there are other less fundamental risks, some of which were identified in the PIF and these are considered as follows:

RISK	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	MITIGATION
That political support for the adoption and implementation of environmental regulations and guidelines for tourism development, will waiver, and changes to legal provisions and procedures may take long to adopt thus reducing the effectiveness of the project	Medium to Low	Low	Jordan has set ambitious tourism growth targets which can only be met if the tourism sector remains competitive, which in turn requires greater sustainability. This is also applicable for the tourism development regions/zones. The project will mitigate the risk of insufficient political support through the promotion of a policy dialogue which will allow all concerned partners, including policy makers, community-members, and the private sector to capture in a technical and hands-on approach the benefits of balanced economic development and biodiversity conservation. The best defence against this risk is to bring on board the tourism industry and the project will do this through endless opportunities for participation.

upstream tools			
That the political context in Jordan will be indecisive and unable to confirm, endorse, adopt or otherwise accept project products such as new legal processes and requirements, the declaration of Shoubak as a PA, etc	High to Medium	Medium	The political situation in Jordan is fluid with frequent changes of government and changing parliament composition. There is a risk that amendments to laws & bylaws as proposed by the project will not be passed by parliament, given that this will not be a priority for the state. The adoption of policy and the passing of laws is a government responsibility and the project will lobby at the right places and facilitate decisions by government and parliament. However, an even stronger mitigation mechanism is the emphasis that the project is giving to working directly with local authorities, the private sector, NGOs and communities. Even without formal government decisions, project products can even be applied on a voluntary basis if necessary, and this will depend to a great extent on the rapport and buy-in that the project will strive to achieve from its implementation partners and other stakeholders.
That political unrest in the region will negatively affect tourism development in Jordan	Medium	High	Jordan has embarked on a tourism strategy building upon its national heritage and diversity and disconnecting its tourist packages from the regional tourism market. Moreover, the stable political situation in Jordan will allow mobilization of regional tourists (a growing segment of the market) who would have otherwise visited other countries in the region. As an example, in 2011, and despite regional unrest, Petra has still emerged as one of the top 25 worldwide destinations, with its designation as a UNESCO World heritage Site and one of the New Seven Wonders of the World. In effect, this is a threat to the industry, but not to the project.
That the private sector may not be willing to invest in biodiversity- friendly tourism services and products	High to Medium	Low	Project design guards against this risk through the mixture of mandatory measures, attractive incentives, participatory approach, etc. Should the risk materialize, the project will need to assist the tourism private sector, in collaboration with the Jordan Tourism Board, to upscale the marketing of Jordanian biodiversity and ecosystems as a unique attraction.
That long-term changes in climate will exacerbate or present additional and unforeseen challenges for biodiversity conservation in Jordan as a whole	Low	Low	This is not a risk to project implementation, although it could be a risk to the sustainability of project benefits. The objective of the project is to support biodiversity conservation efforts and alleviate current and future threats and pressure, including those presented by climate change. There is already evidence of the negative impact of sustained drought in Jordan on biodiversity, and this project will directly contribute to alleviate climate change impact, as the activities under the project are climate resilient and the project complements related initiatives addressing climate change impacts.
The MoTA is highly committed to the reduction of the impact of tourism on biodiversity, however, policy changes brought about by changes in government, could affect this commitment	Low	Low	As noted above, by working in a positive climate with the industry, the project and its benefits could ride out this weaker commitment until the project results will become proof of the benefits to Jordan of reducing the impact of tourism on biodiversity.
Social acceptability in Jordan and in the tourist market for biodiversity as an added attraction for visitors, may turn out to be weaker than expected	Low	Low	The project will strive to bring biodiversity as a product to the forefront of tourism planning and investment in Jordan. However, as noted above, the project design may need re-focussing in response to such a lukewarm reaction so as to assist the Jordan Tourism Board in its marketing efforts
Project Management Risks - in a project of this nature, with activities at four different localities spread throughout the country, there is always a risk of complications	Low	Low	The recruitment of a committed and competent Project Coordinator is crucial. In addition, the project will continue to nurture its understandings and relationships with its implementing and co-financing partners, building on the excellent rapport that has been established during the PPG Phase

Further consideration of risks will be carried out by the project, based on the UNDP ATLAS Risk Assessment template during the Inception Phase.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

An outline of how the project will coordinate with other related initiatives in the region is presented below.

Collaborations with other related initiatives

INITIATIVES / INTERVENTIONS	HOW COLLABORATION WITH THE PROJECT WILL BE ENSURED
<p><i>World Bank-GEF “Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Jordan Rift Valley”</i></p> <p>The project’s goal is to secure the ecological integrity of the Jordan Rift Valley as a globally important corridor. The project development objective is to mainstream integrated ecosystem management practices in the Jordan Rift Valley pilot areas. Total GEF funding is \$ 6.15 million</p>	<p>The project’s objectives are complementary to the project proposed as it addresses land-use planning and Integrated Ecosystem Management for biodiversity conservation. The proposed project will draw upon lessons and good practices already identified to inform policy and legal processes for mainstreaming biodiversity in the tourism sector more specifically, targeting the Tourism authorities</p>
<p><i>UNDP/GEF “Mainstreaming marine biodiversity conservation into coastal zone management in Aqaba Special Economic Zone (ASEZ)”</i></p> <p>This project aims to conserve the unique marine biodiversity in Jordan and ensure the long-term survival of the coral reefs of the Gulf of Aqaba as well as promote equitable sharing of the benefits of the ecosystem services they provide. This will be achieved by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the planning process of ASEZ, and its economic sectors, notably tourism. GEF funding is \$1million</p>	<p>Given that the ASEZ Authority has been established long before the other authorities of the tourism regions/zones, many lessons and good practices can be drawn from the ASEZ experience, despite differences in their activities. The proposed project will ensure close coordination and exchange of information with the ASEZ project, which can be easily facilitated since UNDP is the GEF agency for both projects, specifically with regards to policy and regulatory process for ecotourism and NBT</p>
<p><i>UNDP/GEF “Mainstreaming conservation of Migratory Soaring Birds (MSB) into key productive sectors along the Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway”</i></p> <p>The aim of this regional project is to mainstream BD considerations into the production sectors along the flyway that pose the greatest risk to the safe migration of these birds-principally hunting, energy, agriculture and waste management-while promoting activities in sectors which could benefit from these birds, such as ecotourism in Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, Palestinian Authority, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Yemen. Total GEF funding is \$ 6.7 million.</p>	<p>Jordan has selected hunting as the sector which poses the greatest threat on MSB and will therefore address hunting under the fly way project. This threat is accordingly not addressed under the tourism BD mainstreaming project</p>
<p><i>IFAD/GEF Project on “Mainstreaming Biodiversity in the Sylvo-pastoral and Rangeland Landscapes in Pockets of Poverty in Jordan.”</i></p> <p>The project aims to mainstream biodiversity conservation in silvo-pastoral and rangelands in the pockets of poverty of Jordan through the promotion of an enabling environment (policies, capacity, knowledge, and market incentives) that will be beneficial to local livelihoods and yield global environmental benefits. The project seeks also to promote innovative pilots for PES and investment support to biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>The Tourism/Biodiversity project will explore areas of potential collaboration with this project, in particular its activities in the Payment for Ecosystem Services</p>
<p><i>World Bank/GEF “Badia Ecosystem and Livelihoods Project (BELP).”</i></p> <p>The BELP will contribute to restoring the Badia through a dual approach of adapted rangeland management and promotion of alternative income-generating activities for target communities in Ar Ruwaished sub-district (a poverty pocket in the northern Badia) and Al Husseinieh and Al Jafr sub-districts (poverty pockets in the southern Badia). In order to support the livelihoods of local communities, the project will promote a people-centered sustainable natural resource base development approach. The BELP also carries an innovative value in terms of approaches and specific activities, which if proven successful would pave the way to replication and scaling-up in other parts of the Badia. This integrated approach would allow Badia communities to improve their livelihoods while reinforcing their capacity to manage and sustainably use the ecosystem services that are available to them.</p>	<p>Although not working in the same general areas, the Tourism/Biodiversity project will be able to contribute to the Badia Project particularly to the latter’s activities in community-centered ecotourism</p>

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

STAKEHOLDER AGENCY	INVOLVEMENT	REFERENCE TO PROJECT
Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities (MoTA, Amman)	The Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities is the lead government agency for tourism development and management. Where it does not have a direct operational role (as in the Special Development Zones, it still functions in an advisory capacity). It is an Implementing Partner for a number of project activities (primarily under Outcome 1), and a collaborating/advisory partner essential to ensure that the project's products and services are of practical and applicable value and sustainable beyond the life of the project.	Output 1.1 – SEA Output 1.2 – Charter Output 1.3 – Penalties Output 1.4 – EIA Process Output 1.5 – Incentives Output 2.5 - Interpretation
Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature (RSCN, Amman)	The RSCN is entrusted with the establishment and management of Protected Areas in Jordan, with minor exceptions. It is also the acknowledged source of expertise and advice on biodiversity. RSCN is a Key Implementing Partner for the project through its responsibility for Dibeen and Shoubak Protected Areas (specifically under Outcome 3). It will also serve as a collaborating/advisory partner for the project with those Activities requiring its expertise.	Output 1.1 – SEA Output 1.2 – Charter Output 1.3 – Penalties Output 1.4 – EIA Process Output 2.1 – Survey, BIMS Output 2.2 – Land Use Plans Output 2.3 – Monitoring Output 2.4 – Enforcement Output 2.5 - Interpretation
Ministry of Municipal Affairs (MoMA)	The Ministry has recently been assigned responsibility for land use planning in Jordan and will therefore be a crucial partner for the project's LUP activities (mainly under Outcome 2) in the Jerash Governorate, and the buffer zones around Shoubak proposed PA and the Wadi Rum buffer zone.	Output 1.1 – SEA Output 2.1 – Survey, BIMS Output 2.2 – Land Use Plans Output 2.3 – Monitoring Output 2.4 – Enforcement
Petra Development and Tourism Region Authority (PDTRA, Wadi Musa), the Environment Department	The PDTRA is a Key Implementing Partner and Petra is the locality with the greatest influx of tourists in Jordan and as such it has the highest potential impact on biodiversity. Although the aim of the World Heritage Site Protected Area is its archaeological value, its biodiversity values are acknowledged and responsibility for their protection and management lies with the PDTRA Environment Department. The Department's needs were assessed through the Capacity Assessment Questionnaire administered by the project. The project will work with the Environment Department in its activities in the greater Petra locality which is a critical part of the ecological corridor between Dana and Wadi Rum. The work will be carried out primarily under Outcome 2.	Output 2.1 – Survey, BIMS Output 2.2 – Land Use Plans Output 2.3 – Monitoring Output 2.4 – Enforcement Output 2.5 – Interpretation Output 3.3 – Visitor Facilities
Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority (ASEZA, Aqaba)	The ASEZA is responsible for two major PAs outside the RSCN area of responsibility, namely, Wadi Rum PA and the Aqaba Marine Park. Of interest to the project is the Wadi Rum PA which is discussed below, and because of this, ASEZA is considered as one of the Key Implementing Partners for the project primarily under Outcome 2.	Output 2.1 – Survey, BIMS Output 2.2 – Land Use Plans Output 2.3 – Monitoring Output 2.4 – Enforcement Output 2.5 – Interpretation
Dibeen Forest Reserve Protected Area	The Dibeen Protected Area comprises the focus of an implementation locality for the project and as such, the Dibeen PA Management is considered as one of the project's Implementing Partners with RSCN as the responsible organization for activities which will be carried out within the PA under Outcome 3. Activities to be carried out in Dibeen reflect the needs as identified through both the METT and the Capacity Assessment Questionnaire.	Output 2.3 – Monitoring Output 2.4 – Enforcement Output 3.1 – PA Boards Output 3.2 – Mangmnt Plans Output 3.3 – Visitor Facilities Output 3.4 – Business Plan
Shoubak proposed Protected Area	The Shoubak Protected Area has not yet been formally declared. It has been identified by the GEF/World Bank Project on Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Jordan Rift Valley and this project will complement what has been carried out by the GEF/World Bank project. As such, Shoubak PA Management will be an Implementing Partner for activities under Outcome 3, under the aegis of RSCN. Specific activities to be carried out in Shoubak reflect the needs as identified through both the METT and the Capacity Assessment Questionnaire.	Output 2.3 – Monitoring Output 2.4 – Enforcement Output 3.1 – PA Boards Output 3.2 – Mangmnt Plans Output 3.3 – Visitor Facilities Output 3.4 – Business Plan
Wadi Rum Protected Area	The Wadi Rum Protected Area is also a UNESCO World Heritage Site recognizing its natural as well as its cultural values and their close interaction. The PA Management has welcomed the assistance of the project in addressing some of the threats arising from tourism	Output 2.3 – Monitoring Output 2.4 – Enforcement Output 3.1 – PA Boards Output 3.2 – Mangmnt Plans

	and as such it is considered as a Key Implementing Partner for the project which, while focussing its activities on the PA itself (Outcome 3), will also extend beyond the boundaries to the wider buffer zone which has intrinsic biodiversity values and from where some of the threats arise (Outcome 2). A METT and a Capacity Assessment Questionnaire have been obtained.	Output 3.3 – Visitor Facilities Output 3.4 – Business Plan
Ministry of Environment	The Ministry of Environment is the agency of government responsible for environmental protection in Jordan. It is the focal point for the CBD in Jordan and the agency responsible for managing the EIA Process. As such it is seen as one of the Implementing/collaborating Partners for the project particularly under Outcome 1.	Output 1.1 – SEA Output 1.3 – Penalties Output 1.4 – EIA Process
Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MoPIC)	MoPIC is the National Operational Focal Point for the GEF in Jordan and has been involved in the project since the pre-formulation phase. The land-use planning activities of the project (Outcome 2) are of direct interest to MoPIC.	Involved in Project Governance, more specifically as Government Focal Point for the Project and as chair of the Project Executive Board
Various exponents of the tourism private sector	As and where appropriate (and possibly on request), exponents of the private sector, representing various tourism activities, will be invited to join working groups, react to draft proposals, provide comments, and provide advice to the project.	Output 1.2 – Charter Output 1.3 – Penalties Output 1.4 – EIA Process Output 1.5 – Incentives Output 2.2 – Land Use Plans
Ministry of Finance	The Min Finance will provide advice and guidance to the project in its design of an economic incentives and disincentives scheme	Output 1.5 – Incentives
Jerash Governorate	The Governorate surrounds Dibeen PA and as such has a key role to play in its protection. It will be collaborating with the project, primarily on land use planning activities, under the aegis of the MoMA.	Output 2.1 – Survey, BIMS Output 2.2 – Land Use Plans Output 2.3 – Monitoring
Shoubak District	The District surrounds the proposed Shoubak PA and as such has a key role to play in its protection. It will be collaborating with the project, primarily on land use planning activities, under the aegis of the MoMA.	Output 2.1 – Survey, BIMS Output 2.2 – Land Use Plans Output 2.3 – Monitoring
Ministry of Justice	The project will seek the advice and guidance of the Ministry of Justice in designing a system of penalties for breaches of the biodiversity protective elements in land use planning, etc. Likewise, the Ministry will be asked for advice in the project's setting up of the enforcement system.	Output 1.3 – Penalties Output 2.4 – Enforcement
Various communities, especially those in the vicinity of one of the target PAs	Apart from being involved in project activities in their role as tourism SMEs and as part of the tourism industry, communities will also be involved in PA activities	Output 2.2 – Land Use Plans Output 3.1 – PA Boards Output 3.2 – Mangmnt Plans

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The project is about biodiversity and about tourism. In addition to the benefits to globally significant biodiversity, the project will strive to make Jordan's biodiversity an intrinsic part of the tourism product that the country has to offer – biodiversity will become an attractant in its own right alongside the cultural and historical attractions of Jordan. By reducing the impact of tourism on biodiversity the project will also ensure that the benefits are sustainable for the long term.

The tourism industry supports livelihood and economic activities and offers opportunities for public recreation and tourism. By strengthening the management of PAs, and putting in place measures to manage the adverse impacts of tourism, the project will make an important contribution to safeguarding future use options in Jordan. It is estimated that some 221,390 persons live in and around Jerash/Dibeen, in Shoubak/Petra and in greater Wadi Rum and they can be expected to benefit directly or indirectly from the sustainable use mechanisms that the project will develop. Local residents will also benefit from a sense of empowerment that comes from fuller participation in PA co-management and benefit sharing arrangements.

Women in the local communities are not at the forefront of the tourism industry, however, while constrained by cultural and traditional norms, they participate through cooperatives they have formed which produce/manufacture and market

handicrafts and other cottage industry products. Improvements in the tourism sector, as envisaged by the project, will lead to an improvement for women.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

Three scenarios can be analyzed from the perspective of cost-effectiveness of maximizing biodiversity mainstreaming in tourism development in Jordan. The first is the business-as-usual scenario in which minimal considerations are given to biodiversity. Ecosystem degradation outside and inside protected areas will continue and the approach will be to focus on the elimination of consequences after a threat materializes. The cost-effectiveness of this approach is extremely low. For example, rehabilitation of a forest after a fire costs approximately US\$40,000/1,000 ha, while installing an optimal hydrological regime to prevent a fire costs US\$15,000/ 1,000 ha. By 2016, the amount needed to be invested in severely degraded ecosystems and the opportunity cost through lost tourism dollars will substantially outweigh the proposed investment now. The second scenario is that proposed under the project that is based on policy-making and real-life promotion of best mainstreaming practices in the tourism sector. The third possible scenario is the expansion of biodiversity protection outside the protected area network to cover all the globally significant populations and habitats that are currently unprotected from tourism impact. Calculations indicate that the most cost-effective intervention is the project approach for it is too expensive to establish protected areas in the landscapes targeted for intervention. The income foregone by the tourism industry is insurmountable for the local and national economy. The financial and social value these lands generate is too high for them to be withdrawn from the economic cycle and put under protection (even if it is IUCN management category IV, V or VI).

The cost effectiveness of this project will be further ensured by the following elements that have been included in project design.

- Combination of upstream, landscape (regional) and site specific actions: The project design includes the development of tools at the central upstream level complemented by on-the-ground activities that will help test and develop the tools in areas where the impact of tourism on biodiversity is being felt within protected areas as well as in the rural landscape outside protected areas. These experiences will inform the changes at the systemic level in terms of improved policies, procedures, manuals and guidelines, in turn facilitating the replication of site-level experiences.
- The project approach which involves the development or refinement of policies, legal mechanisms, approaches, processes and other tools at the upstream level in a participatory approach and their testing at the local level before they are adopted nationwide. In this way, wholesale adoption of these tools will only take place after they have been tried and tested and are therefore both more reliable and more acceptable.
- Selection of project localities that exhibit a range of biogeographical and socio-economic characteristics: This will make the site-level experiences relevant to a greater number of districts for further replication.
- The project will focus its interventions on localities selected because their biodiversity value is being threatened by tourism activities. This will maximize the visible impacts and allow the beneficiary locations to act as models for effective protection of biodiversity throughout the country. The project will implement on-the-ground interventions in cohesive and contained localities, rather than in geographically dispersed areas, and this will reduce operational costs significantly.
- The project will place equal emphasis on assisting compliance as well as enforcement which will require less intense and less costly levels of monitoring and prosecution. This will allow the project to work effectively with local communities and stakeholders to share management responsibilities and costs, as well as to develop sustainable economic activities that can benefit these partners and generate revenue streams for protected areas. This is more cost effective than an exclusionary strategy aimed solely at biodiversity conservation, which is likely to be costly to enforce and unlikely to be sustainable.
- Close coordination with on-going projects such as those funded by USAID in the tourism sector and the GEF/World Bank biodiversity project in the Rift Valley. These projects have been under implementation for some time and have accumulated practical experiences with mainstreaming biodiversity which are going to be invaluable for this project. While the juxtaposition of tourism and biodiversity is unique to this project, many of the experiences and models developed by these other projects are still relevant.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the standard M&E activities and allowances have been made for this in the M&E budget as in the table below.

The Inception Phase

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first two months of project start with the participation of those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, the UNDP country office and, where appropriate/feasible, regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop will serve to confirm the LogFrame, build ownership for the project results and plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues including:

- a. Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff *vis à vis* the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- b. Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- c. Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget will be agreed and scheduled.
- d. Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- e. Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures will be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting will be held within the first 12 months following the Inception Workshop.

The Inception Workshop Report will serve as a key reference document and will be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Monitoring and Reporting Responsibilities and Events

On a quarterly basis –

- Progress made will be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log will be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. As this is a UNDP GEF project, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as the proposed microfinance scheme for AIGs, are automatically considered as critical on the basis of its innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
- Based on the information recorded in ATLAS, a Project Progress Report (PPR) will be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs will be used to monitor issues, lessons learned, etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

On an annual basis –

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report will monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) for the Biodiversity focal area.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits –

UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the PEB may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and PEB members.

Project Terminal Report

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results. The Project Terminal Report will be available, at least in draft, for the Terminal Evaluation.

Learning and knowledge sharing

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects.

Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communications and visibility requirements

Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The [GEF logo](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo) can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The [UNDP logo](http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml) can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Full compliance is required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf. Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

Independent Evaluations and Audits

Mid-term of project cycle – The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the second half of the project’s term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of Project – An independent Terminal Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final PEB meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project’s results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

M&E Workplan and Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Timeframe
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NPC ▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF 	Indicative cost: 10,000	Within first two months of project start up
Setting of Baselines and end of project Targets together with Means of Verification of project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP GEF RTA/NPC will oversee the hiring of specific surveys, studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop (estimated 50,000).	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by NPC ▪ Project team 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan’s preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NPC and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RTA ▪ UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NPC and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NPC and team 	Indicative cost: 30,000	At the mid-point of project

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Timeframe
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 		implementation.
Terminal Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NPC and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost : 30,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NPC and team ▪ UNDP CO 	None	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ NPC and team 	Indicative cost per year: 3,000 (12,000)	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 132,000	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S) :
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Saleh Al-Kharabsheh	GEF Operational Focal Point/Secretary General	Ministry of planning and international cooperation	09/14/2011

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator	Signature	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		May 1, 2013	Johan Robinson, Regional Technical Advisor for Biodiversity, UNDP	+421 259337299	johan.robinson @undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:					
Government and national institutions have operationalized mechanisms and improved capacities to develop and implement strategies and plans for targeted key environmental and disaster risk reduction issues facing Jordan and support a transition to a Green Economy					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: 1) % change of protected areas covered by funded management plans (baseline, target). 2) Strategies and plans developed and implemented for agreed key environment and DRR issues and relevant laws reviewed and updated, Policy relevant and implementation capacities of staff in targeted institutions improved, Communities are more resilient as a result of effective efforts from government and relevant actors					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area : 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: BD2 and BD1					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: <u>Outcome 2.1:</u> Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation; <u>Outcome 2.2:</u> Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks; Outcome 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicator 2.1: Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool. Indicator 2.2: Policies and regulations governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation as recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score. Indicator 1.2: Funding gap for management of protected area systems as recorded by protected area financing scorecards					
	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Project Objective⁸ : Biodiversity Conservation Objectives are Effectively Mainstreamed and Advanced into and through tourism sector development in Jordan	Consideration of biodiversity in plans and policies for tourism development by government, planning authorities and the private sector	No explicit reflection of biodiversity priorities	At least 80% of known and available plans and policies for tourism development incorporate biodiversity priorities	Review of available documents	Assumptions: Awareness and sensitivity to the values of biodiversity to the tourism industry in Jordan, and the potential impact of tourism on biodiversity, are key ingredients of “mainstreaming”. When awareness and sensitivity reach an effective critical level among government officials, tourism operators and others in the private sector, the reduction of impact on biodiversity will be evident. Risks: The risk is that the project timescale is too short for mainstreaming to occur and the project will mitigate against this by putting in place a robust sustainability strategy for its products, services and benefits. The selected Indicators will serve to confirm whether a good enough foundation has been laid.
	Percentage allocation for biodiversity conservation in tourism development proposals	While energy and water feature in environmental considerations at present, biodiversity does not	100% of proposals for tourism development consider biodiversity conservation seriously	Review of EIAs and other documentation	
	Hectares of landscape where impacts on biodiversity are avoided, mitigated or offset	No planning provisions for the protection of biodiversity outside formal PAs	Some 180,000 hectares covered by biodiversity-friendly land-use plans effectively preventing impact on biodiversity	Published land-use plans and annual reports of planning authorities	
	Total annual revenue earned from tourism operations in targeted PAs	Dibeen Forest Reserve: US\$ 43,000 Wadi Rum PA: US\$ 976,467 Shoubak Proposed PA	An increase of 50% or more to the following levels – Dibeen Forest Reserve: US\$64,500 Wadi Rum PA: US\$1,464,700 Shoubak Proposed PA: at least 50% of	PA Annual Financial Reports	

⁸ Objective (Atlas Output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

		not yet established	its operating costs at least in the beginning		
Outcome 1⁹: Regulatory and enforcement framework in place to avoid, reduce, mitigate and offset adverse impacts of tourism on biodiversity	The place of biodiversity in the legal and procedural framework for tourism planning, development and operations	Biodiversity considerations are currently absent from the framework.	An obvious and meaningful biodiversity element/s in the legal and procedural framework for tourism planning, development and operations	Review of legal and procedural framework	Assumptions: The Outcome seeks results - “ <i>avoidance, reduction, mitigation and offsetting</i> ” and it is assumed that a regulatory and enforcement framework will achieve this. Risks: The risk that the framework may not lead to the desired results is low and the likelihood is reduced further through the economic incentives and disincentives that will be developed by the project and the fact that the framework will be developed with the full participation of the private sector.
	Application of the new Biodiversity-friendly guidelines for the EIA Process	No such guidelines exist	All new developments / hotels / roads/ etc apply new Biodiversity-friendly guidelines for the EIA Process	EIA Reports and Annual Report of the MoENV	
	Percentage of tourism establishments in project localities that are biodiversity-friendly according to the MoTA Certification Scheme	0%	At least 50%	Review of MoTA certification approval data	
	Outputs: 1.1 A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for tourism development to inform biodiversity considerations in land-use planning - defining spatial areas where development should be avoided; where it may be permitted subject to management controls, and what mitigation and offset requirements are needed. 1.2 A biodiversity-friendly tourism charter including a set of standards developed tested and adopted for the MoTA certification schemes for hotels, eco-tour operators, eco- lodges and environmental camp sites. 1.3 An effective system of penalties for breaches of permit conditions in the tourism sector developed, adopted and publicized reflecting the new Biodiversity-friendly certification system. 1.4 Biodiversity guidelines for the EIA Process as it applies to tourism developments and operations with particular focus on off-site and cumulative impacts. 1.5 Economic incentives and disincentives to promote adherence by tourism industry to the reformed policies and regulation.				
Outcome 2: Institutional capacities for planning, monitoring and enforcement strengthened in Jerash, Petra and Wadi Rum landscapes/development zones, so as to manage the impacts of tourism development on biodiversity within	Extent of land area for which integrated land-use plans that deliver biodiversity benefits outside PAs are developed and under implementation	Current land area covered by biodiversity-sensitive LUPs is nil	180,000 hectares covered by integrated land-use plans	New or reviewed land-use plans	Assumptions: The Outcome assumes that “ <i>management of the impacts of tourism</i> ” can be obtained through stronger capacities for planning, monitoring and enforcement. Risks: If capacity development by the project is well-targeted and effective there is no risk that this will not be the case. In focussing on particular ecosystem types and particular species, care will be taken to attribute any changes to the correct influences.
	Capacity development indicator score for mainstreaming biodiversity in Jordan ¹⁰	Overall score: 43%	Overall score: > 60%	Project review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	
	Increase in land area where threats to ecologically sensitive areas from tourism activities are controlled	0 ha	Jerash Governorate: Aleppo Pine (<i>Pinus halepensis</i>) Forests 6,200 ha Petra Region: Hisheh Forest (<i>Quercus</i>	Ecological surveys that will be carried out at the beginning of the project and updated at	

⁹ All outcomes (Atlas Activity) monitored annually in the APR/PIR

¹⁰ See Annex 4.

ecologically valuable and sensitive areas			<i>coccifera</i>) 300 ha Wadi Rum Landscape: Sand Dune vegetation (<i>Haloxylon persicum</i>) type – 8,900 ha ¹¹	least twice in the life of the project	
	Populations of the following indicator species across the landscape (inside and outside PAs) remain stable: Jerash Governorate: <i>Lacerta media</i> Petra: <i>Vulpes cana</i> Wadi Rum: <i>Caracal caracal</i>	Baseline populations ¹²	No decrease over baseline values	Ecological surveys that will be carried out at the beginning of the project and updated at least twice in the life of the project	
	Level of credibility of licensing and permitting authorities who sanction and regulate tourism developments	Survey to confirm and document credibility level in the eyes of stakeholders (primarily the tourism sector)	Enhanced credibility of licensing and permitting authorities as a result of an improved basis for decision-making arising from sound data and information and effective monitoring system	Repeat survey	
	Outputs: 2.1 Biodiversity Information Management System (BIMS), founded on initial ecological surveys to inform Land-Use Plans, serve as a platform for decision-making, and as a source of up to date knowledge on biodiversity. 2.2 Comprehensive land-use plans based on BIMS and covering Jerash Governorate, PDTRA territory, the Shoubak proposed PA and its buffer zone, and the Greater Wadi Rum Landscapes/Development Zones to set development limits so as to protect biodiversity. 2.3 Biodiversity Monitoring System to update and maintain the BIMS, identify trends and ensure that any changes in biodiversity-important areas remain within acceptable limits; to include remedial measures that will be triggered by the monitoring. Include the use of indicator species as appropriate. 2.4 Improved enforcement of land use development constraints geared to protecting biodiversity. 2.5 Effective interpretation and information facilities at vantage points to inform visitors about the values and vulnerabilities of ecological resources and the consequences (ecological and legal) of not adhering to limits and regulations.				
Outcome 3: Improved management effectiveness particularly in revenue generation, tourism planning and management, and community relations in Dibeen, Shoubak and Wadi Rum Protected Areas	METT scores in each of Dibeen, Shoubak and Wadi Rum PAs	Scores obtained during PPG are: Dibeen 58% Shoubak 48% Wadi Rum 67%	Improvements expected in effectiveness in revenue generation, tourism planning and management and community relations, leading to an improvement in METT scores of around 8-10%.	Repeat METT prior to Terminal Evaluation	Assumptions : The Outcome assumes that improved revenue generation, better tourism planning and management, and better community relations, equate to an improvement in management effectiveness at each of Dibeen, Shoubak and Wadi Rum PAs Risks: If the planned outputs are indeed obtained through the project there is very little or no risk that the outcome will not be
	Financial security and sustainability of PAs	The three PAs (less so with Wadi Rum) currently rely almost entirely on government grants and/or development aid as sources of finance	Increase the level of financial resources that are generated on site (and not reliant on government budget or development aid) to 50%	PA Annual Report and FSC scores	

¹¹ The above targets for the land area where tourism practices will be controlled are only indicative at this stage. By the end of year 1, once detailed biodiversity inventories are collected and ecologically sensitive areas are mapped against tourism impact information, a clearer picture will emerge of the areas in the three localities where conflicts are present and practices need to be modified. The targets will therefore be modified once this information is available.

¹² Baseline populations figures will be provided once the biodiversity inventories are completed in the three localities by year 2 of the project.

					achieved.
	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>3.1 PA Management Advisory Boards for promoting increased involvement of the private sector and local community in PA management.</p> <p>3.2 Dibeen PA, Shoubak PA and Wadi Rum PA Management Plans revised to reflect the principles espoused in the new Land Use plans and the benefits from new BIMS and Monitoring System.</p> <p>3.3 Visitor management capabilities (to reduce impact on biodiversity) in Dibeen, Shoubak and Wadi Rum PAs, enhanced through improved visitor facilities, better trained rangers and eco-guides, and improved management capacities, to expand visitor attractions and improve visitor experience while reducing impact on biodiversity in sensitive areas.</p> <p>3.4 Business plans for Dibeen, Shoubak and Wadi Rum PAs.</p>				

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project
STAP Scientific and Technical Screening of the PIF <i>Minor revision required</i>		
<p>Serious attention paid to exploring a properly targeted PES programme, so that local stakeholders might more directly benefit from the Tourism development. As it stands, the PIF assumes that all local livelihoods are tourism driven, and in fact subsistence needs are not well considered.</p>	<p>A PES programme for the project has been considered but was decided against taking into consideration the guidance of the document "Payments for Environmental services and the GEF" (STAP, 2010). The current community subsistence livelihoods will be minimal impacted by the project, as the emphasis in the wider landscape protection will be on sustainable use rather than exclusion. The project will not set up additional protected areas but only reduce, mitigation and offset mostly tourism impacts in areas of biodiversity importance. With the anticipated growth in tourism, the emphasis of the project will be about prevention – prevention of biodiversity loss accompanying future development ('pre-emptive conservation'). It aims to put in place mechanisms that will ensure that the long-term tourism development on the ecological valuable areas is sympathetic and sustainable and does not lead to loss of its biodiversity. However, it is acknowledged that the local communities might lose some minimal opportunities in regards to their tourism-related livelihoods once areas are set aside for the conservation of biodiversity through reducing/mitigating impacts of certain land which in time will lead to the benefit of tourism as the country develops its ecotourism and nature-based tourism product. However, currently both the buyer and seller in a PES scheme are not well organized which could lead to the failure of such a scheme. The potential buyers of the ecosystem service could be Government, the international community or the tourism sector. The only buyer that could be considered at this stage as a viable buyer would be the international community through GEF. However, STAP advises against GEF being the principle buyer in the set-up of PES programmes. Further, the sellers, the local communities, are not well organized and the property regime in Jordan does not allow for a PES system to reach the targeted individual land users. The threat of adverse self-selection in such cases is high, in that community elites benefit and not the landusers targeted. Most of the areas that the project will target are in open access property regime meaning that if at all possible to set up a PES scheme, it will be targeted at community level resulting that the community benefits and not the individual land users that the PES scheme would want to target to cover the lost opportunity costs. Many of the Protected Areas targeted by the project has already been proclaimed, and has a stricter legal protection already in place, "which in principle renders the PES obsolete" (STAP, 2010). It was therefore decided not to pursue a PES system within the context of the project. Further, local stakeholders are already</p>	<p>Most Outputs (Section 2.2.3) bring in representatives of local communities as appropriate and this will provide an opportunity to reflect their needs to the extent possible. See in particular Activities under Outcome 2 and 3</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project
	<p>benefiting from tourism development and the project has been designed to increase these benefits while reducing the impact on biodiversity.</p> <p>The project is targeting the protection of biodiversity in general from the impacts of tourism and among the benefits arising from this will be: recognition and utilization of the tourism potential of biodiversity; sustainability of biodiversity and other ecological resources; safeguarding of ecosystem services that arise from biodiversity. The project will also explore the marketable products and services from Protected Areas when developing Business Plans for each PA.</p>	
<p>Related to this, if the needs of local communities are not directly taken into consideration in project design, the future viability of these PAs (and therefore the majority of expected project outcomes) may be threatened.</p> <p>The project speaks of the intent to "transform the investment practices of private sector investors. Collectively, the planned interventions will ensure that tourism development is avoided in the most biodiversity sensitive areas, and that impacts are reduced, mitigated and offset as necessary elsewhere, thus reducing pressures on biodiversity."</p> <p>However, without careful consideration of biodiversity pressures at local levels OUTSIDE of tourism, then the impact of investment, PA integrity, and indeed any tourism product, is also threatened.</p>	<p>The project is designed to change the trajectory of unsustainable tourism development with current and future adverse impact on the biodiversity within the target landscapes to one where tourism is sustainable and recognizing and profiting from the rich biodiversity in the landscapes. The needs of local communities are part of project design while project activities reduce the impact of tourism and recreation on biodiversity. The project will lead to the sustainability of biodiversity resources and this will be to the benefit of local communities directly and indirectly. The project will develop tools that mitigate against impacts and will influence private sector investors through its arguments that the protection of biodiversity is in the interest of the tourism sector since it adds an extra draw card for the industry. However, in the development of the land use plans for the three localities (output 2.2), the project will not solely look at the impact of tourism, but also at the impacts of other land uses on biodiversity in order that biodiversity can be conserved but also to ensure that full economic potential of the natural areas can be realized through tourism. As part of the project preparation process, a number of stakeholder consultations including focus group discussions and interviews were held in the three target landscapes. The consultations revealed that local communities are amenable to biodiversity conservation because it is part of their traditional value system. However, the local communities have not always benefitted from the rich biodiversity that are under their stewardship. To enhance long-term benefits to the local community and sustainability of the biodiversity in the target areas, the project, therefore, adopted a participatory approach with direct involvement of communities at all levels and ensure the maximizing of benefits from biodiversity related enterprises as possible. Elements of the strategy include:</p> <p><i>1) Greater engagement of Communities in PA/BD Management</i> Under Outcome 3 "Improved management effectiveness particularly in revenue generation, tourism planning and management, and community</p>	<p>Representatives of local communities are involved in many of the project activities. See especially activities under Outcomes 2 and 3 (especially outputs 2.2 and 3.1)</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project
	<p>relations in Dibeen, Shoubak and Wadi Rum Protected Areas” the project will establish PA Management Advisory Boards in all three targeted PAs. The existing PA Management Board membership will be reviewed in order to ensure the participation of communities and other relevant stakeholders. The function, roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders in the management of the PA and its buffer zones will be clarified. This will increase the rights and sense of ownership of the local communities towards the PAs and ensure that the management of the PA is relevant to the needs of the PA and in harmony with the aspirations of the local community. The project will undertake capacity development of the PA management Advisory Boards as is deemed necessary to ensure that all stakeholders’ views are heard and incorporated into the management of the PAs. The influence of the PA Management Advisory Boards will not only be for the PAs, but will extent past the PA boundaries into the buffer zones of the PA, making the local communities an important component of the overall PA management.</p> <p>2) <i>A framework for collaboration between communities and local government to manage BD outside PA</i></p> <p>By design, the project will develop an inter-sectoral natural resources management coordination mechanism between planning authorities, local authorities, the private sector and local communities. The project will improve the relations and engagement between authorities and local communities in these landscapes through collaborative management planning and a focus on increasing economic benefits derived from biodiversity, for example increasing the viability of livelihoods based on tourism. Direct engagement of the communities will be on two levels (a) through provision of user rights in certain parts of landscape (both inside and outside of PAs) and (b) collaborative management approaches in the wider landscape. This will include working together with communities on a land use plan delineating areas for wildlife dispersal and sustainable use of biodiversity. Also included will be training and sensitisation on sustainable use thresholds.</p>	
Comments by Germany on Work Program (dated 24 November, 2011)		
<p>A large portion of the suggested project approach seems to depend on co-financing agreements. It should be made clearer to what extent of certainty these agreements will materialize and which components of the proposal would be prioritized in case the budget target will not be met.</p>	<p>The project has obtained formal pledges in writing which exceed the figures targeted in the PIF and this is in spite of the current financial climate worldwide. The proposed portfolio of Outputs in the ProDoc has been designed to reflect the available cash financial resources (GEF + cash co-fin) together with the generous non-cash grants made available by co-financing partners.</p>	<p>See Section 4 – Total Budget and Workplan; and Section 2.2.3 – Project Outputs and Activities.</p>
<p>The project title suggests “mainstreaming” biodiversity conservation is the main goal of the project, implying</p>	<p>The project sets about developing the “tools” for mainstreaming biodiversity into tourism considerations at the “upstream” level – this will be led by</p>	<p>See for example, Section 2.2.2 – Project Outcomes</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p>that it specifically targets the country as a whole. However, there are only few references in the proposal that refer to activities relating to mainstreaming in the sense of evaluating lessons learned and distributing knowledge gained by project activities across Jordan. We strongly suggest that the project approach include a significant (and budgeted) component on the distribution of knowledge gained from the project, ideally not only within Jordan itself but also in exchange with other conservation and protected area projects facing similar challenges across the world.</p>	<p>MoTA and available to be applied nationwide. However, before this is proposed, the project will test the tools at the “downstream” level at the three project localities, before making them available for adoption nationwide.</p> <p>The project has integrated knowledge distribution on most of the outputs and budgeted for it. In particular the following outputs have an important national knowledge sharing mechanisms built into it: Output 1.1: A Strategic Environmental Assessment for tourism development to inform biodiversity considerations in land-use planning [<i>a national workshop will be held and a final report will be distributed widely through hard copy and DVD</i>], Output 1.2: A BD-friendly tourism charter including a set of BD standards developed, tested and adopted for the MoTA certification schemes for hotels, eco-tour operators, eco-lodges and environmental camp sites [<i>a number of national workshop meetings will be held and the final agreed charter will be launched by MoTA through a public information campaign designed to raise awareness of BD values among the tourism industry</i>], Output 1.3: An effective system of penalties for breaches of permit conditions in the tourism sector developed, adopted and publicised reflecting the new BD-friendly certification system [<i>an handbook will be produced and a national public information campaign launched</i>], Output 1.4: Biodiversity guidelines for the EIA Process as it applies to tourism developments and operations with particular focus on off-site and cumulative impacts [<i>the project will assist Ministry of Environment with a public awareness campaign and the training of environmental consultants and industry components on how to apply the guidelines</i>], Output 1.5: Economic incentives and disincentives to promote adherence of industry to the reformed policies and regulation [<i>Discussion workshops will be held and the project will assist Ministry of Finance in printing (and DVD) of adopted guidelines and with necessary publicity to reach the tourism industry</i>]. Also the Biodiversity Information Management System to be developed under Output 2.1 will be available for access (albeit in a managed and within certain limits) by the wider public, thereby contributing to knowledge sharing. Further, through the meaningful involvement of the tourism sector at various levels (from Ministry to private sector and communities) the project will instigate the replication of its tested tools throughout Jordan. Opportunities will also be taken to broadcast the project’s achievement through appropriate GEF, UNDP, regional and other forums.</p>	<p>which indicates the relationship between the Outcomes</p> <p>Section 2.2.3 – Project Outputs and Activities, illustrates the participatory approach that the project is adopting</p>
<p>Coordination with other related initiatives: Reference to page 10 (global environmental benefits): “<i>By promoting environmentally-friendly regulations and guidelines in the tourism sector the project will also contribute to the</i></p>	<p>Within its limited resources, the project cannot address waste management and water use, and the expectations by the PIF will only accrue incidentally, in the long term, once consideration of biodiversity has been mainstreamed. However, in fostering a more biodiversity-friendly approach to tourism</p>	<p>These tools will result from activities under Outcome 1</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p><i>reduction of solid wastes and wastewater discharges and will reduce extensive abstraction of water ...</i>". In this regard, it is recommended to consider the lessons learned by a Public-Private-Partnership between GIZ and the Hans Grohe AG in grey water recycling at the "Dead Sea Spa Hotel".</p>	<p>developments and operations, the project will contribute to better management of wastes and more prudent use of water. It will do this through its ecotourism charter, the hotels classification system, the improved EIA System, the more efficient enforcement and compliance systems, and other tools. During the development of these tools all lessons learned in Jordan and internationally (where relevant to the Jordan context) regarding best practice in the tourism sector will be incorporated including the lessons learned from grey water recycling at the "Dead Sea Spa Hotel".</p>	
<p><i>Comments by France on Work Program</i></p>		
<p>FFEM is funding a project supported by Royal Botanical Garden that aims at identifying mains endangered ecosystems and protecting them. This project could be linked with this GEF project.</p>	<p>In the set-up of the Biodiversity Information Management System all available information on the selected localities will be incorporated as the starting point. The information collected by the Royal Botanical Garden will form part of the BIMS, where relevant. The project will also learn from the FFEM project being implemented by the Royal Botanical Garden. In particular it will benefit from the identification of endangered ecosystems and the mechanisms that have been developed to protect them.</p>	<p>See Output 2.1 and Section 2.6 for collaborative projects that have been identified</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹³

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

The project structure is complex with implementation taking place in three localities through collaboration with five implementing partners including exponents of the Central Government, Local Government, and an NGO. Some of the activities are focussed on a PA that is still in the process of establishment and while this provides an interesting challenge for the project it also represents a risk. This and other risks have been identified and analyzed and mitigation measures have been drawn up to manage and alleviate the risks.

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$100,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Activity 1-- Project Preparation*	100,000	68,573	31,427
Total	100,000	68,573	31,427

*Note: Project Preparation covers the following activities as per the PPG request: (1) Baseline studies, (2) Assessment of Institutional Capacity to support co-management and implementation of project activities, (3) Project strategy and budget.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

¹³ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.