

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3932	
GEF Agency project ID		GEF-MSP_025-JO	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Silvo-Pastoral and Rangeland Landscapes in the Pockets of Poverty of Jordan	
Country/Countries		Jordan	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD-SP4; BD-SP5	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Planning; Ministry of Agriculture	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		As partners in project execution IUCN & RSCN	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		March 2, 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 2013	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 2016	
Actual date of project completion		December 31th, 2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.8	0.8
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1.0	1.0
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	3.0	3.0
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	0.3	0.3
Total GEF funding		1.8	1.8
Total Co-financing		3.3	3.3
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		5.1	5.1
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		May 26 th , 2017	
Author of TE		Not given	
TER completion date		April 30th, 2018	
TER prepared by		Molly Sohn	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	MS	-	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	-	ML
M&E Design		S	-	S
M&E Implementation		MU	-	MU
Quality of Implementation		S	-	S
Quality of Execution		NR	-	U
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's goal is to "increase biodiversity conservation in productive landscapes in Pockets of Poverty in Southern Jordan" (Project Document p.30).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective is to "improve economic productivity of land and enhance gender empowerment of communities affected by land degradation and unsustainable use of natural resources." (project document) More specifically, the project sought "to mainstream biodiversity conservation in sylvo-pastoral and rangeland management activities, particularly in buffer zones associated with existing (and proposed) Nature reserves and to produce local economic benefits and poverty alleviation in a sustainable and replicable manner." (Project Document p.31) The project was designed to achieve this in three Ministry of Agriculture Reserves, intended to protect portions of the rangeland and sylvo-pastoral landscapes within the Agricultural Directorate for Developing the Sharah region.

The project was designed to produce the following three outcomes:

- 1)Enhanced capacity building and awareness raising for biodiversity mainstreaming in local communities and government agencies.
- 2)An enabling environment which allows rangeland and sylvo-pastoral landscape users to understand and benefit from the conservation of biodiversity
- 3)Innovative pilot measures and introduction of payment for environmental services

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes in the project's global environmental, or development objectives.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The project is relevant to GEF 4 biodiversity strategic programs 4, strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity, and 5, fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services.

project is relevant to key national policies and strategies. It supports the country's agenda 21 by addressing issues highlighted in the policy on sustainable agricultural and range land management, biodiversity conservation and desertification prevention. The project's focus on sustainable land management practices supports the National Strategy for Agricultural Development's call for adoption and application of national legislation and international agreements for protection of agricultural resources. Finally, the project contributes to the country's implementation of its National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates project effectiveness as moderately satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. Although data was not available to assess all planned indicators, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the project was largely effective in achieving its objective to mainstream biodiversity conservation in sylvo-pastoral and rangeland management activities in the project area. Working through project partners the project piloted payment for environmental services activities in Jordan for the first time, with positive impact of these activities documented, and built capacity and awareness for biodiversity mainstreaming in local communities and government agencies.

Achievement of the project's three main outcomes is detailed below:

The project's first outcome was enhanced capacity building and awareness raising for biodiversity mainstreaming in local communities and government agencies. To achieve this outcome, the project delivered training courses concerning the value of biodiversity and its potential local and regional economic benefit, created a tool-kit for mainstreaming biodiversity in sylvo-pastoral/rangelands, established new knowledge management and information sharing systems within the ministry of agriculture, and organized three regional study tours to areas with biodiversity mainstreaming techniques already in place. Nearly all targets were met or exceeded, with the exceptions being the number of study tours organized (3 versus a target of 4), and the percentage of land owners/users engaged in supporting biodiversity mainstreaming as a result of the toolkit, which it was not possible to assess. The TE notes that the toolkit, which was designed and completed with the assistance of IUCN

and stakeholder involvement, was still in its promotion phase at project end. The knowledge materials produced included one documentary, the toolkit already noted, a mainstreaming biodiversity kit, and a best practice and lesson learned document, as well as several brochures on specific project themes.

The project's second intended outcome was to create an enabling environment which allows rangeland and sylvo-pastoral landscape users to understand and benefit from the conservation of biodiversity. The terminal evaluation reports that the project met its target to support at least 20% of local communities to strengthen participatory relations with the Ministry of Agriculture and other stakeholders, and that there were measurable improvements in overall community support and involvement. The project met targets for all indicators where such targets had been specified. In some instances, where targets had not been specified, the project appears to have underperformed. IUCN carried out an assessment on environmental and agricultural knowledge and practices in each of the project areas, and prioritized needs in each region in order to ensure that project activities were in line with the strategic plan and vision of each region. In order to establish the traditional "Hima" (a traditional form of sustainable land management, which the project sought to reintroduce in the region) mechanisms for stakeholder involvement in biodiversity conservation, the Ministry of Agriculture established a joint team along with project partners the Hashemite Fund for the Development of Jordan Badia (HFDJB) and IUCN to hold meetings with local community stakeholders, and workshops were conducted to establish the system. The TE reports that the Hima approach was established on a pilot basis in 2 sites, covering 500has. Although the project planned to achieve the implementation of the legal and institutional framework for co-management and biodiversity conservation with the project area, no new legal mechanisms were drafted or introduced. Project partner RSCN developed ecological baselines for the project areas, and plans for potential expansion, co-management and biodiversity mainstreaming were developed in each project area. A planned output to put in a place a conflict resolution system was not done, although the project staff and partners claim that the project itself, and the reestablishment of the Hima approach is itself a conflict resolution system. Finally, partners ensured documentation of project lessons learned, which are available on their websites.

The project's final intended outcome was to implement innovative pilot measures and introduce a "Payment for Environmental Services" model. This outcome was fully achieved with Jordan's first payment for ecological services pilot activities established at the Fujaij Rangeland Reserve and at the Hisheh Sylvo-pastoral reserve. Payment for environmental services activities included small business development, including beekeeping and food processing for local groups and solar heaters, and water harvesting reservoirs for poor households. Additional achievements under this outcome include a Payment for Environmental Services manual developed for the project by IUCN, a toolkit for biodiversity management and a webpage and economic evaluation of payment for environmental services relevance in biodiversity management. The terminal evaluation was not able to verify whether an implementation plan of cooperative activities between the Ministry of Agriculture and the RSCN was established and functional by the end of the project, and the project only partially successful in establishing a formal mechanism for dialogue with other initiatives, as communities involved were not willing to be involved with the Dana Reserve and its management.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	--

The TE rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. Despite delays of roughly 2 years, the project executed within the allocated budget, and all promised co-financing materialized and was accounted for. Expenditures were roughly in line with the project document. Executing activities through local organizations proved an efficient strategy, as it ensured “an optimal ratio between costs and benefits of the projects.” (TE p.12)

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	----------------------------------

The terminal evaluation rates overall likelihood of project sustainability as moderately likely, noting in particular the strength of the project in creating a solid and effective partnership with stakeholders and securing participation with support to those that are more vulnerable or more dependent on local ecosystem services to sustain their livelihoods. This TER agrees that sustainability of project benefits is moderately likely.

Financial Risks to Sustainability: The equipment procured and technologies introduced do not have additional maintenance or operational costs, and beneficiaries have been trained on regular maintenance. The livelihood activities funded by the project will maximize and optimize use of available financial, human and natural resources of beneficiaries. The TE does note that public financing of payment for environmental services activities has not yet been established, and that future policies and strategies will need to consider how to support communities engaged in natural resource management.

Socio-political Risks to Sustainability. The TE rates socio-political sustainability as moderately likely, as the project put in place a bottom up strategy which effectively engaged stakeholders, including beneficiary communities who perceive ownership of biodiversity as a development opportunity.

Institutional Framework and Governance Risk to Sustainability: The TE rates institutional framework and governance sustainability as moderately likely, with risks stemming from the large number of institutional actors involved in natural resource management in Jordan, which may reduce effectiveness of governance and permeability of innovative practices introduced by the project, as well as high turnover in administrative staff.

Environmental Risk to Sustainability: The TE rates environmental sustainability as likely, as the project has taken into consideration climate change and worked with communities to ensure foresight in managing local natural resources. Project activities increase communities’ resilience and reduce their adaptation gap.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The terminal evaluation reports that co-financing commitments were met, and that actual co-financing was as expected, with 3 million USD in co-financing coming from the government, and 300,000 USD of in kind co-financing coming from the non-profit Royal Society for Nature Conservation (RSCN) in the form of studies and technical support during design and implementation.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The main executing partner (Ministry of Agriculture) was slow in recruiting a project management team that led to start up delays. Consequently, the project completion date had to be extended by 2 years. The project management team was able to effectively deliver project outcomes, but according to the TE the project's M&E system was "probably the component that paid most the toll of delays an management turnover" as the system was "weak and fragile." (TE p.11)

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Project execution was carried out by local NGOs which were known in the country and had offices in target areas to promote greater community mobilization and ownership. This has contributed to country ownership. Although the lead executing agency was the government, their capacity to execute the project was lower than expected, which led to delays in implementation. Low ownership on the part of the government may affect project sustainability, as the TE assessed that the institutional impacts of the project were only moderately successful "due to low participation of the Ministry of Agriculture [the executing agency] in follow up of the established procedures." (TE p.6)

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	----------------------

The TE rates M&E Design as satisfactory and this TER agrees with that rating. The project design includes an indicative project evaluation work plan and corresponding budget of 13,000\$ (excluding staff time) which includes provisions for an inception workshop and report, annual project implementation reports, steering committee meetings, and a mid-term and final evaluation. The results framework includes relevant indicators to measure achievement of all project outcomes and outputs, with sources of verification, as well as risks and assumptions identified.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE rates M&E implementation as moderately unsatisfactory and this TER agrees with that rating. The TE notes that project M&E paid most the toll of delays and management turnover, and that project M&E was weak. However, it also notes that the project's partnership strategy was helpful in that at project completion partners were in the process of updating Ministry of Agriculture files in the project's area, as well as briefing newly appointed senior management in the region. Though the project M&E design provisioned for a mid-term evaluation, it was not carried out.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	----------------------

IFAD served as the project's implementing agency, and the TE rated their performance as satisfactory, noting that IFAD coordinated a participatory project design process that ensured "a solid theory of change and a smooth implementation strategy". This TER agrees with that rating. Since the project start up IFAD undertook seven field missions to support the Ministry of Agriculture in planning and implementing the project, and supported the project team in work planning procurement, monitoring and engaging partners. A design flaw noted in the TE was that the capacity of the government to execute the project was overestimated, however this was mitigated by a design that relied on execution of activities through project partners such as IUCN and others.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unsatisfactory
---	------------------------

The TE rates quality of the government's performance in execution as unsatisfactory. This TER rates quality of project execution as unsatisfactory. The Ministry of Agriculture was the lead project executing agency, with activities coordinated through the Ministry of Agriculture's Department of Projects. A project Management Unit was set up within the Ministry of Environment's Agriculture Directorate for

Developing the Sharah Region (AADDSR). The TE notes that the project design had overestimated the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture to execute a project of such political relevance, resulting in delays especially in the project's early stages, in setting up a project management unit. There was also frequent turnover in project managers, with three changes during execution. The TE finds that the Ministry of Agriculture did not manage to staff the project management unit adequately, and that the delays and turnover caused problems with project momentum reduced capacity of the project management unit to secure key processes including procurement and M&E.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE notes that it was “not possible for the mission to assess objectively” impacts of the project on natural resources/environment, although expected impacts on local biodiversity are relevant and foreseeable. In terms of climate change adaptation impacts, the project distributed 76 solar heaters to poor families residing in proximity of forests, thus reducing impacts on scarce forest resources and reducing dependency from natural resources.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

Although the TE mission was only able to report on community perception and visual observation, interviewed beneficiaries rated unanimously that the project's payment for ecosystem services activities had a “great impact on their lives thanks to financial and economic saving granted by simple practices and technologies such as the rain water reservoirs and solar heaters, or by the economic activity support provided by the project (beekeeping, food/herbs processing.)” TE p.12 Communities are expecting returns from potential increase in grazing areas that the project allowed. TE p.12 Expected impacts on household assets forecast in the TE as major are additional grazing opportunity, utilization of medicinal plants, and bee keeping. Afforestation, access to garden plots for domestic or commercial use, are assessed to have a medium impact on household assets, while utilization of nontimber forest products is forecast to have a low impact on household assets. (TE p.15)

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

Household and community groups have been involved in 19 training programs on 27 different topics related to the value of biodiversity and its potential local and regional economic benefit. The project also generated a Toolkit for Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Jordan, as well as a manual on Payment for Environmental Services activities.

b) Governance

There have been no impacts on governance as of yet.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts are reported.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE reports that new projects have been designed to expand and replicate the proposed theory of change of the project, and that UNEP and IUCN are replicating the methodology in other countries and contexts. (TE p.26)

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

Lessons learned documented in the terminal evaluation are as follows:

1. When working with protection and enhancement of natural resources through livelihood training and Payment for Environmental Services, partnership with local and international organizations is proven worth the investment.
2. Participation and support to communities through livelihood training and Payment for Environmental Services facilitate management of biodiversity and ensure ownership of project's activities. In these regards, the project demonstrated that simple activities that are not expensive and that are easily replicable can secure major change. (TE p.25)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE's recommendations are included below:

- To project partners IUCN and RSCN: Although Dana reserve was excluded by the communities for the reasons expressed above, stakeholders analyze the main problems of Dana's communities and include them in the project exit strategy to demonstrate achievements and recreate an environment of trust.
- Organize an informal workshop to gather state institutions as well as project's partners (including GEF focal point) to analyze project's bottlenecks in order to complete remaining activities related and set up a sustainable system for continuation of benefits.
- Although partners are present in project areas with their community development centers, secure dedicated follow up on communities and on biodiversity management on a regular basis to ensure continuation of project benefits.
- Involve national academia in monitoring impact on Himas and in general on local biodiversity so as to capitalize and maximize the investment done via RSCN to prepare the biodiversity baseline.

(TE p.27)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE provides a detailed assessment of achievement of outcomes and impacts.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and evidence is complete and convincing. Some indicator levels are unclear (a percentage is given but it is unclear how it was calculated) otherwise findings are well substantiated.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	A thorough discussion of project sustainability and risks to sustainability is provided.	S

To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The report provides only a very brief discussion of lessons learned.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides total and per activity costs as well as information on materialized co-financing.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The reports evaluation of the M&E System is complete and satisfactory.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).