



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

GEF ID:	5026		
Country/Region:	Jordan		
Project Title:	Badia Ecosystem and Livelihoods Project (BELP)		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	127861 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; LD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,330,555
Co-financing:	\$11,349,025	Total Project Cost:	\$14,679,580
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Song Li

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?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>Yes Jordan is eligible, and the proposed project is part of the MENA-DELP program.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>Yes, the OFP endorsement is on file.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>Yes, the World Bank has clearly described its comparative advantage in terms of existing and planned commitments to support the Government.</p>

			Cleared
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		July 9, 2012 No Cleared
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		July 9, 2012 Yes. The Agency will harness both technical and administrative support from regional offices and HQ, through a PMU that will be established in the country. Cleared
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		July 9, 2012 Yes, Jordan is utilizing \$3,597,000 from its allocation, which was committed at time of MENA-DELP approval by Council. Cleared
	• the focal area allocation?		July 9, 2012 Yes. Jordan exercised its eligibility as a flexible country to utilize BD, LD, and CC allocation for a total of \$3,597,000 (including Agency fees). The project, however, contributes to only BD and LD focal areas.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>No focal area set-aside is being requested for this project.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>Yes, the project is aligned with BD and LD focal area strategies.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>BD: The link between the BD project objective and the narrative part needs to be strengthened. Table A, the project aims to contribute to BD-2, but lack specific details on how the linked activities are reflected (sub-national land-use and ecosystem service valuation). In the narrative part, a direct contribution to biodiversity conservation across 6,500 ha is mentioned for channeling funds toward the management of a future PA. But these expected outputs contribute to BD-1. Therefore please update Table A accordingly and provide further information on the activities leading to these outputs.</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p>

			<p>emphasise focus on mainstreaming through the ecotourism development plan, which will build on opportunities presented by the PAs.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>The consistency is adequately described for Conventions (i.e. NBSAP and NAP), but not for national strategies including those associated with poverty reduction. Please highlight specific national strategies and plans for which this project demonstrates consistency.</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p> <p>This has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>Since the project will target beneficiaries for most of the activities in the southern Badia, sustainability of project outcomes will be greatly enhanced. However for component 1 focusing on BD, preliminary information is only given for education programs for tourists and school children visiting the area, on a website, and on the RSCN "Ajloun Ecotourism and Ranger training Academy". Please provide further information on the targeted public, and the institution in charge of the activities development.</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p>

			<p>The potential for sustainability through engagement of targeted communities has been clarified.</p> <p>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>July 9, 2012</p> <p>The baseline reflects two spatially distinct realities in the southern and northern Badia, as basis for justifying separate BD and LD interventions. While the approach is justified for the LD, it raises questions for the BD focal area specifically, such as detail on the status of biodiversity and threats, and the on-going actions on biodiversity conservation in the overall Badia ecosystem (number of protected areas, level of management effectiveness...). Please provide specific details to justify use of the focal area resources in the northern Badia (component 1).</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p> <p>The context for BD has been further elaborated to justify contribution to the GEF focal area.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<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?</p>		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>No. The separation of interventions between the northern and southern Badia is justified on the basis of social, economic and ecological realities. However, it is not clear how this single project approach will be different from designing two separate projects. Please provide a clear explanation for why</p>

			<p>best addressed through a single project under the MENA-DELP.</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p> <p>Cost-effectiveness is now sufficiently demonstrated on the basis of contribution to MENA-DELP objectives and efficiency gains from a single project approach covering the two separate areas within the Badia.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>The CEO document is very weak in clearly demonstrating the GEF value-added. The section B.2 needs to include specific statements about how the GEF financing builds on the baseline to deliver GEBs and development benefits. The details should also be consistent the project framework (Table B), including breakdown of the GEF grants.</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p> <p>The GEF value-added has been clarified on the basis of incremental reasoning, including use of BD and LD focal area resources.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>No, the project framework needs to be refined for greater clarity based on the following:</p>

			<p>the PAD (page 15-16 of CEO doc) does not distinguish between outcomes, outputs, results and indicators. A more consistent presentation will be helpful in showing how the BERP will advance the DELP vision, especially in light of ecosystem services being targeted by the former. For the proposed new income from ecotourism (numbers slightly different between PAD and CEO doc), over what time frame will the amount be generated?</p> <p>2. BD focal area contribution is not adequately reflected in project design. While BD2 is targeted, there is no evidence of the project delivering "land use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation". To ensure consistency with the focal area strategy framework (Table A), please specify exactly how mainstreaming will be demonstrated in the BERP. Will the project help to mainstream BD in the tourism sector? If so, how will this be reflected at national Level?</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p> <p>The alignment with MENA-DELP and contribution to BD are now clarified to reflect a sound and sufficiently clear project framework.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>No, the incremental benefits are not clear especially as they relate to GEBs</p>

			<p>the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GEBs - for component 1, increased awareness and sustained livelihoods (page 10 of CEO doc) are not GEBs. In terms of areas targeted for BD benefits, please specify what the nature of those benefits are. Is it expansion of PA, management effectiveness of existing PA, or formal designation of a planned PA? Based on this confirmation, the BD objective will need to change to BD1, and consistency with the TT will be needed. Please provide further details on how the GEBs will be monitored. 2. For the same Component 1 on development of tourism activities, please give details on the national and the RSCN experiences in ecotourism development and PA management (such as number of sites developed, number of ecotourist per year, if any) 3. The project mentions the development of a revenue sharing mechanism with communities, please provide further information on it (type of envisaged mechanism, which governance...). <p>July 20, 2012</p> <p>The GEBs and approach to ecotourism development have been clarified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<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</p>		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>Yes, the project highlights specific socio-economic benefits including</p>

	achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		beneficiaries. Engagement of these beneficiaries in the project is an appropriate way of ensuring the delivery of benefits. Cleared
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		July 9, 2012 Yes, CSO participation is fully assured in the project design. Cleared
	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)		July 9, 2012 Overall approach to mitigating risks associated with stakeholders should be reflected in project design. However, it is not certain why there is a risk of "targeted southern Badia communities" showing reluctance to participate in planned activities, or roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders being unclear . Please clarify these risks and explain why they are not inherently addressed as part of the project design. For BD: The project expects to develop tourism activity, therefore the security situation in the region should be mentionned in Table B4. July 20, 2012 The risks have been clarified as an integral part of the project design. Cleared
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related		July 9, 2012

	region?		<p>target a several efforts targeted at human development, rangeland management, and biodiversity conservation. Please provide a description of such efforts and how this project will leverage lessons and experiences from them.</p> <p>For the BD focal area, the project should build/ exchange experiences with the additional following on-going GEF projects: ID 355 (on Al Azraq PA), ID 3932 (Mainstreaming biodiversity in silvo-pastoral and rangeland landscapes) and ID 4596 (Mainstream biodiversity conservation in Tourism sector).</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p> <p>These have been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>NCARE as the project Implementing Agency raises some important question about the implementation arrangements. Component 1 as presented will be executed by RSCN, an independent non-profit NGO devoted to the conservation of Jordan's natural resources; which is relevant. RSCN has developed and managed a number of ecotourism facilities. It has strong technical capacity, a clear mandate (through a by-law, 1966) and proven experience in ecotourism development. Given the emphasis on ecotourism, how will NCARE provide oversight of RSCN activities to ensure</p>

			<p>standards for the sector? Please provide a clear explanation on how the technical oversight will be managed by these entities under WB guidance. An illustrative diagram will be helpful to show the decision-making and accountability for project outcomes.</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p> <p>This has been adequately addressed, and the proposed institutional arrangements justified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>The project is part of the MENA-DELP Program and therefore did not include a PIF stage.</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>Yes, the project management cost is about 5% of the GEF grant.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>Yes, the breakdown amounts are adequate as proposed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>Co-financing letters are included to confirm proposed amounts. but there is</p>

			<p>in the letter and those presented in the CEO document. Please review the MOPIC endowment letter and adjust the amounts accordingly. Also, please provide letter of endorsement for the cash grant of \$140,000 proposed by the Government.</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p> <p>The cofinancing numbers are now consistent with amounts in the letters provided.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>The Agency has not provided any co-financing, but highlighted its continued commitment to supporting the Government.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>BD: Excel sheet of the METT have been provided, but may need to be updated accordingly based on early comments on the BD objectives (under #8).</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p> <p>This has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors		<p>July 9, 2012</p>

	and targets?		with proposed needs for TTs and based on project indicators. Please clarify how the total co-financing of \$1,170,000 in the last sentence under section H was determined. July 20, 2012 This has been addressed. Cleared
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STAP? 		July 9, 2012 Comments at the PFD stage have been addressed. Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convention Secretariat? 		July 9, 2012 No comments on file.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council comments? 		July 9, 2012 No comments on file.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other GEF Agencies? 		July 9, 2012 No comments on file.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	July 9, 2012 Please address major concerns related to focal area objectives (BD), incremental reasoning, GEBs, and implementation arrangements.	

		All concerns have now been addressed in the re-submission. Cleared	
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?		n/a
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>July 9, 2012</p> <p>No, CEO Endorsement is not yet recommended. Please address comments in #8-15, 18-20, 25, 27, and 28.</p> <p>July 20, 2012</p> <p>Yes, CEO Endorsement is now recommended.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*		July 09, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)		July 20, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	

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.