



**GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\***  
**THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS**

GEF ID:	<b>4586</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Jordan</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Tourism Sector Development in Jordan</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4587 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>Project Mana; BD-2; BD-2; BD-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,700,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$22,710,343</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$25,510,343</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>September 16, 2011</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 09, 2011</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jaime Cavalier</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Johan Robinson,</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	8-29-11 Yes. Jordan is eligible for funding. Cleared	5-20-13 Cleared
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	8-29-11 NA	5-20-13 NA
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	8-29-11 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$3.08 million dated August 9, 2011 Cleared	
	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	8-29-11 Cleared	5-20-13 Cleared
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	8-29-11 UNDP is bringing \$1million in co-financing. Cleared	5-20-13 UNDP decreased its co-financing from \$1m to \$0.5M. Cleared
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff	8-29-11 Yes	5-20-13 Cleared

Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	8-29-11 Jordan is in the "Flexible" category and is requesting \$2,970,000 for this project. Please indicate how much from each of the Focal Areas is being requested for this project (BD is only \$1.7 million and not enough for the project). Please address in PIF.  9-13-11 Issue properly addressed in revised PIF. Cleared	5-20-13 Biodiversity = \$1,363,636 Land Degradation = \$1,336,364 Cleared
	• the focal area allocation?	8-29-11 Same as above.  9-13-11 Issue properly addressed in revised PIF. Cleared	5-20-13 Biodiversity = \$1,363,636 Land Degradation = \$1,336,364 Cleared
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	8-29-11 Yes. BD-2 Cleared  Corrigendum (5-20-13): The PIF actually included activities under BD-2 and BD-1.	5-20-13 BD-2 + BD-1. Cleared
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	8-29-11 Yes. Cleared	5-20-13 BD-2 + BD-1. Cleared
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	8-29-11 Yes. Page 5. Cleared	5-20-13 Cleared
	11. Does the proposal clearly	8-29-11	5-20-13

	<p>developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>going to implement the results of this project understanding that they are mostly in the form of plans and studies? Is there an explicit commitment and funding available in these institutions to turn the outputs of technical assistance into something tangible on the ground? Please provide answer and address in PIF. Thanks.</p> <p>9-13-11 The Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities, Regional Authorities, and the Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature, have confirmed their commitment and the availability of funding, to sustain the new management measures that will be operationalised under the project (see response to GEFSEC comments in revised PIF). Cleared</p>	
Project Design	<p>12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>8-29-11 Although there is a significant number of Tourism initiatives and projects taken place in Jordan, the "baseline scenario" (directly related to the GEF project) is difficult to visualize, for the project as a whole and for the three tourism zones. The Table on p.7 could be modified to include a column stating the baseline scenario for each of the regions. Please address in PIF. Thanks.</p> <p>9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	<p>5-20-13 Cleared</p>
	<p>13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>		<p>5-24-13 Yes. Cleared</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>8-30-11  Component 1. i) If the c0-financing becomes effective, the budget for this</p>	<p>5-20-13 Cleared</p>

considering that three outputs are all assessments, plans, and reports (standards, guidelines). ii) It is not clear how the project aims at making the 20 eco-tour operators adopt the BD friendly standards, iii) Not clear the relationship -if any, between the BD standards and certification schemes to be developed by the project, with the existing international schemes readily available.

Component 2. i) The price tag for the proposed outputs and outcomes ((\$6,000,000) is very high and should be seriously reconsidered. ii) Not clear what "institutional capacities" will be developed to manage the impact of tourism development. Part of the problem may be with the description of the baseline situation. iii) Outputs and outcomes related to PAs finances (including "visitor management capabilities", site financing systems, and METTS), would fit better under BD-1 in Focal Area Strategy Framework. A third components on PA financing should be considered, iii) what are the bases to suggest that Nature Based Tourism will double as a result of this project?

Please address in PIF.

9-13-11

Baseline information: Please provide information on the baseline situation in the PAs themselves.

Private Sector: If the private sector (Hotels and Lodges) is going to play a key role in the development and implementation of this project adopting BD standards, there should be a formal engagement and commitment in the form of co-financing. Please ID and raise co-financing from these stakeholders.

		9-15-11 Issue addressed in the revised version 9-15-11. Cleared.	
	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	8-29-11 No. Since the baseline scenario is not clear, the incremental reasoning is hard to build. Please consider extracting from the baseline scenario documentation, the elements on which the GEF investments are building on. That could be done by Project Component or Tourism Zone. Please address in PIF. Thanks.  9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	5-20-13 Cleared
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	8-30-11 The way the project is structured makes difficult to buy the argument that with GEF support, BD conservation will be adequately included in policies, laws and regulations governing tourism development. A more systematic approach is needed to build the incremental reasoning. Please address in PIF.  9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	5-20-13 Cleared
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		5-20-13 Yes Cleared
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	8-30-11 Yes. Cleared	5-20-13 Yes Cleared

	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	8-30-11 Yes. Cleared	5-20-13 Yes Cleared
	20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	8-30-11 Please address the risks associated with the implementation of the project on the ground, behind the preparation of the plans and reports. Risks associated with the private sector not opting for the propositions in this project should be considered. Please address in PIF.  9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	5-20-13 Yes Cleared
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?		5-20-13 Yes Cleared
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?		5-20-13 Yes. the stakeholders and respective roles are listed on pages 14-15. Cleared
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	8-30-11 Same issue as discussed on incremental reasoning.  9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	5-20-13 Yes Cleared
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	8-30-11 Cleared	5-20-13 Yes Cleared
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		5-20-13 Yes. The project pilot sites, Ajloun Development Zone, Dead Sea Development Zone and Dana PA, were changed for the Jerash Governorate (40,980 ha), the Greater Wadi Rum Landscape (Wadi Rum PA and buffer zone - 133, 180 ha), and the Shoubak Proposed PA (7,740 ha) and its buffer zone (3,000 ha). Justifications were

			Cleared
			Cleared
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	8-29-11 It is 5% of the GEF funding. Cleared	5-20-13 It is 5.2%. Cleared
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	8-30-11 Please reconsider co-financing allocation in light of the proposed outputs and outcomes associated with PAs.  9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	5-20-13 Yes Cleared
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	8-29-11 See above.  9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	5-20-13 Co-financing increased from \$8.7M to \$22.7M. Letters of co-financing were provided. Cleared
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		5-20-13 Yes. Assuming the co-financing (mostly in-kind) becomes effective during project implementation. Cleared
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		5-20-13 Yes. Cleared
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors		5-20-13 Yes

	indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>9-1-11 No. Please consider outstanding issues under items 6,10,11,13,14,15,18,19,24, and 25. Thanks.</p> <p>9-13-11 No. Please provide clarification to issues raised under item 14. Thanks.</p> <p>9-15-11 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		5-24-13 Yes. This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 01, 2011	May 24, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 13, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 15, 2011	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.



## REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	<p>11-03-11 Yes. The PPG includes the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Baseline Studies</li> <li>2. Assessment of Institutional Capacity to support co-management and implementation of project activities.</li> <li>3. Project Strategy and Budget</li> </ol> <p>The activities under these outputs are all appropriate.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>11-03-11</p> <p>Consultants: Including co-financing, local consultants are paid at \$6,000/week and the international consultant at \$12,000/week. That is way too much. Please adjust.</p> <p>Travel: There is no justification for 76,000 in travel (\$19,000 from GEF). What is the cost of the airfare for the International consultant and domestic travel? Please provide clarification and/or adjust.</p> <p>11-21-11 Properly addressed in the revised PPG dated November 4, 2011.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>11-3-11 No. Please address issues under 3. Thanks.</p> <p>11-21-11 Yes. This PPG is recommended for approval.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	November 03, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 21, 2011

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.