



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

GEF ID:	4586		
Country/Region:	Jordan		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Tourism Sector Development in Jordan		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4587 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	Project Mana; BD-2; BD-2; BD-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,700,000
Co-financing:	\$8,710,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,410,000
PIF Approval:	September 16, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Mirey Atallah,

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	
	2. 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	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	8-29-11 Cleared	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	8-29-11 NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	8-29-11 Yes Cleared	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Resource Availability			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	<p>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.</p> <p>9-13-11 Issue properly addressed in revised PIF. Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>8-29-11 Same as above.</p> <p>9-13-11 Issue properly addressed in revised PIF. Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	8-29-11 Yes. BD-2 Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	8-29-11 Yes. Cleared	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	8-29-11 Yes. Page 5. Cleared	

	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>8-29-11 No. What Government Institutions are 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>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, 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>	

	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>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.</p> <p>9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>8-30-11</p> <p>Component 1. i) If the c0-financing becomes effective, the budget for this component is very high (\$2,545,000), 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.</p> <p>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</p>	

		<p>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?</p> <p>Please address in PIF.</p> <p>9-13-11</p> <p>Baseline information: Please provide information on the baseline situation in the PAs themselves.</p> <p>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 enagement and commitment in the form of co-financing. Please ID and raise co-financing from these stakeholders.</p> <p>9-15-11 Issue addressed in the revised version 9-15-11. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>8-30-11</p> <p>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</p>	

		<p>approach is needed to build the incremental reasoning. Please address in PIF.</p> <p>9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	<p>8-30-11 Yes. Cleared</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>8-30-11 Yes. Cleared</p>	
	18. 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)	<p>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.</p> <p>9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>8-30-11 Same issue as discussed on incremental reasoning.</p> <p>9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/execution arrangement adequate?	<p>8-30-11 Cleared</p>	

	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	8-29-11 It is 5% of the GEF funding. Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	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	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	8-29-11 See above. 9-13-11 Properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	
	26. 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	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

	adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. 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>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 01, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 13, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 15, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

*** 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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* 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.