

## GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		72	
GEF Agency project ID		5237	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF – 1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Gulf of Aqaba Environmental Action Plan	
Country/Countries		Jordan	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		8- Waterbody-Based Operational Program	
Executing agencies involved		Aqaba Regional Authority, supervised by the Ministry of Planning, in coordination with Jordan's General Corporation for Environmental Protection. After Feb. 2001, project execution transferred to Aqaba Special Economic Zorie Authority (ASEZA).	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Jordan Royal Ecology Diving Society (JREDS), RSCN, the Hashemite Fund, Queen Alia Foundation [collaborators]	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		5/14/96	
Effectiveness date / project start		6/27/96	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/99	
Actual date of project completion		6/30/02	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.295	0.295
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2.7	2.7
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government	9.17 (Project Doc pg. 7)	0.9 (Jordan)
	Other*		5.6 (Japan), 1.93 (EU), 0.24 (USA)
Total GEF funding		2.995	2.995
Total Co-financing		8.972 (GEF PMIS)	9.67
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		11.967	12.665
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		12/24/02	
TE submission date		5/21/04 (PMIS)	
Author of TE		World Bank (TE is an Implementation Completion Report)	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Antonio del Monaco	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Aaron Zazueta	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		6/5/14	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Dania Trespalacios	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Neeraj Negi	

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	S	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		HL	L	L
M&E Design	S	Not rated	NR	MU
M&E Implementation	S	Not rated	NR	S
Quality of Implementation	HS	S	S	S
Quality of Execution	HS	S	S	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	S	S

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

This project is part of the broader Gulf of Aqaba Environmental Action Plan (GAEAP). The primary objective of the GAEAP is to contain existing damage and prevent further environmental degradation of the Gulf of Aqaba's coast, coral reefs and marine ecosystems through the implementation of environmental management activities accompanied by required investments. (Project Document pg. 12)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of this GEF project is to increase Jordan's capacity to establish & implement a regional collaborative framework for sustainable management and protection of the Gulf of Aqaba and the conservation of its coral reefs. The project's focus on transboundary cooperation reflect hopes for mutual cooperation in addressing the needs of the Gulf of Aqaba in the aftermath of signing the peace treaty between Jordan and Israel. (TE pg. 11)

Specific project components include:

- a) Development of regulatory and institutional framework for the control and management of transboundary pollution in the Gulf of Aqaba, including establishment of collaborative mechanisms for stakeholder coordination
- b) Emergency assessment of oil pollution hazards and pollutants contained in ballast and bilge water, and measures to promote waste oil recovery and reuse
- c) Assessment of wastewater seepage effects on the quality and level of the transboundary groundwater table in Gulf of Aqaba
- d) Development of an integrated marine and land-based transboundary solid waste management strategy
- e) Establishment of the Jordanian segment of the Red Sea Marine Peace Park (Project Document pg. 13- 16)

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

There were **no changes** in the global environmental or development objectives of this project during implementation. One of the major project components- the development of an integrated marine and land-based transboundary solid waste management strategy- was transferred to the German agency GTZ, and the allocated money for this component was reallocated towards a Visitor Center for the Marine Park. Another major change during project implementation was the transformation of the Aqaba Region Authority (ARA) into the Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority (ASEZA). (TE pg. 3)

#### 4. GEF EO 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 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

This project addresses transboundary threats to the ecological viability of a globally significant water body, the Gulf of Aqaba. The project is relevant to the GEF's operational strategy 8, water body based operational programs.

The project is also consistent with the Jordanian government's priorities and with the international priorities of the Red Sea littoral nations. Jordan's Gulf of Aqaba Environmental Action Plan (GAEAP) was presented in November 1993 at the Cairo meeting of the Environmental Multilateral Working Group of the Middle East Peace Process. The project specifically responded to the transboundary environmental cooperation envisaged in the Jordan-Israel peace treaty of 1994. The project objectives address the sustainable coastal zone management needs of the country. (TE pg. 2) The ASEZA's Environmental Protection By-Law includes provisions regulating pollution from ships, enabling Jordan to meet its obligations under the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL). (TE pg. 4)

4.2 <b>Effectiveness</b>	Rating: <b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
--------------------------	------------------------------------

The project successfully accomplished its development and global environmental objectives to develop a regional collaborative framework to halt and prevent pollution of the marine environment and the transboundary aquifers in the Gulf of Aqaba. The TE reports that most of the project objectives were achieved successfully- some exceeded expectations- and thus

the project achieved the outcome of improved environmental management and transboundary cooperation.

The achievements in regulatory and institutional development and regional collaboration exceeded expectations, and 'play an essential role in ensuring project sustainability'. (TE pg. 4) The project created an Environmental Department that monitors water quality and enforces the country's only Environmental Impact Assessment system. All equipment purchased under the project is functioning and monthly reports of monitoring data are submitted to the newly created Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority (ASEZA). The Industrial Pollution prevention activity has been successfully completed and provides an exemplary model for the rest of Jordan with its zero discharge strategy. The efforts to integrate environmental data for both planning and environmental monitoring are outstanding, providing a model of integration and demonstrating the importance of GIS applications to planning and decision-making.

The main institutional features of the ASEZA's Commission for Environmental Regulation and Enforcement Affairs (CEREA) incorporate the environmental impact assessment, environmental inspection and auditing, industrial pollution prevention and standard setting functions of the project, as well as public awareness, coastal policing and enforcement, marine pollution prevention and response, and marine park management - all central elements of the project. (TE pg. 7)

The emergency assessment of oil pollution hazards was successfully completed. The Ports Authority and ASEZA signed a Memorandum of Understanding defining oil spill response and legal measures and outlining preventive measures for chemical oil spill prevention. (TE pg. 6) The Port Authority has upgraded all its facilities into environmental compliance under the new ASEZA laws. The Jordan Petroleum Refinery, together with ASEZA, has completed a system for waste oil recovery from trucks and small garages. The assessment of wastewater seepage effects on the transboundary groundwater table was completed satisfactorily, and is catalyzing larger scale efforts.

The Jordanian segment of the Red Sea Marine Peace Park was established with the Environmental Protection By-Law (articles 52-64), and implemented with an administrative committee and an annual Marine Park Management Plan. (TE pg. 6) Zoning and infrastructure of marine park facilities have been completed, and the Marine Park By-Law is enforced by public security forces and coastal policemen. The Visitor Center has also been completed, rangers have been hired and trained, the Marine Park Management Plan has been updated and adopted by ASEZA's Board, and a Public Awareness Specialist has been recruited. The TE reports that the community response to the Marine Park Beach has been very positive. (TE pg. 6)

The component to develop an integrated marine and land-based transboundary solid waste management strategy was transferred to the German government's Gessellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) agency, and thus is no longer part of this project. (TE pg. 3, 6)

The Implementation Completion Report mirrors the information in the TE regarding achievement of project components: regulatory collaboration achievements exceeded expectations, transboundary ship-based pollution is actively managed and enforced, Port Authority facilities were upgraded and comply with new ASEZA laws, data collection and

modelling exercises were completed and have catalyzed larger scale efforts. The slight discrepancy in the ICR pertains to the development and implementation of the marine park, which the ICR states was “partially achieved”, although the ICR does not explain what was partial about the achievements. The ICR concludes that the project has developed Jordan's ability to enhance the sustainability of its coastal zone management operations.

This project has successfully achieved its objectives to develop Jordan’s financial, administrative and technical capacity to sustainably manage and protect the Gulf of Aqaba. Thus this project is rated highly satisfactory.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------------

Total project costs were slightly higher than originally estimated. In addition, parallel financing was provided by Japan (\$5.60 million) and the EU (\$1.90 million) for oil pollution prevention, and by the EU (\$0.03 million) and USAID (\$0.24 million) for pollution monitoring. (TE pg. 8) The implementation of cost recovery mechanisms was successful, and the project was able to have a major influence on the new implementing agency and attract additional donor funding. (TE pg. 9) Thus it seems the project was financially efficient.

The project had two interruptions in implementation. The project was stalled for a total of 13 months, first between November 1997 to May 1998, then between August 1998 to January 1999. It seems these delays were due to the same cause: changes in ARA management and leadership. Because of these delays, the project end date was extended by 30 months, and thus the project was not as efficient as it could have been, and receives a rating of moderately satisfactory.

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: <b>Likely</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------

The likely rating for sustainability given by the TE is well supported. Overall, there is an adequate institutional and legal framework to sustain project impacts over the long term. The incorporation of the main project components into the permanent agency ASEZA ensures they will remain active beyond project completion. The TE notes that the project exceeded expectations in producing exemplary legislation supporting the institutional framework.

The TE comments that the sustainability of the marine park will depend on improved management and enforcement of regulatory mechanisms, and the pending hiring of a park manager. (TE pg. 4, 8) However, evidence presented in the TE suggests that the marine park will continue to grow as an effective and enforced institution. Active participation in the Red Sea Marine Peace Park Steering Committee meetings continues. Several NGOs and private society organizations have taken ownership of the Marine Park, and collaborate collaborating closely with ASEZA in implementing the public awareness agenda. (TE pg. 7)

As a result of project activities, a joint Jordanian and Israeli sea monitoring program is being devised under a USAID project. Regular marine water quality monitoring by the Marine Science Station (MSS) is ongoing. (TE pg. 5)

Cost recovery mechanisms put in place include marine park fees (diving fees, visitor fees, beach facility fees); issuance of permits (air emission permits, cooling water discharge permits, resource user fees, port reception facilities use fees); and fines for environmental damages, including industrial pollution and oil spills. All revenue from these fees and fines will be earmarked for the Department of Environment, Regulation and Enforcement. (TE pg. 8)

The ICR points out that an unstable regional political situation, and its consequent impact on tourism demand, present risks to the sustainability of the project outcomes. But the ICR rates the sustainability of the project as likely/highly likely.

## **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 GEF grant totaled \$2.7 million, but the total cost of the project was approximately \$12 million. Co-financing of \$7.8 million came from Japan-Oil, EU-Oil, EU-Marine Park, USAID-Marine Park and Government Industrial Pollution Control. An additional \$2.2 million in co-financing was provided by the Government of Jordan. (ICR) The TE does not discuss the importance of co-financing directly, but does mention a few successful project components that were undertaken with co-financing, for example, the solid waste management component. (TE pg. 11) There is insufficient information in the TE to determine the importance of co-financing to the achievement of GEF objectives.

**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 project implementation was interrupted a total of 13 months, and the expected completion date was extended by 30 months. Despite the very substantial project delay of 30 months, all project objectives were completed successfully, and the project achieved its expected outcomes. There was only a slight increase between the expected co-financing and the materialized co-financing.

The two project interruptions were due to changes in executive leadership of ARA, the executing agency, the first from November 1997 to May 1998, the second from August 1998 to January 1999. Both of these led to the paralysis of all activities and resignation of the project leader, and resulted in the need for extensions of the project. The first extension to December 31, 2000 was approved on December 14, 1999; a second extension to December 31, 2001 was approved on November 7, 2000; a third and final extension to June 30, 2002 was approved in December, 2001. (TE pg. 3) During this period of changes, the interim management teams did not have authority to make decisions. (TE pg. 8) Despite these substantial delays, all project objectives were achieved successfully, without additional funding.

**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:

It seems that country ownership of this project was substantial and significantly contributed to the successful achievement of project outcomes and sustainability. Despite several changes in the project senior management, the TE comments that “Government commitment to the project was very high”. (TE pg. 8) The Government contributed to related activities which were outside the project, e.g., the creation of ASEZA and additional park infrastructure. Objectives for transboundary cooperation were fully achieved despite the political circumstances in part due to the determination of project teams to prevent politics from affecting environmental cooperation. (TE pg. 4) ASEZA worked closely with stakeholder groups to address concerns. For example, after the diving community protested the lack of public access to some of the dive sites near the Royal Diving Center, ASEZA opened a new access point just north of the RDC. (TE pg. 6) The evidence in the TE suggests that both the government of Jordan and interested country stakeholders took ownership of this project and had an interest in its success.

**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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	------------------------------------------

The Attachment C in the annex lists of the TE includes a table of project implementation plan indicators and goals to be met by the end of the first, second and third years of the project, listed by project components. (Project Document pg. 35) There is also a set of performance monitoring indicators, with expected inputs and outcomes for each of the project components. The Project Document also mentions the completion of a mid-term review after two years, on or around August 1998. (Project Document pg. 15) The M&E Design at entry is inadequate, and exhibits noticeable shortcomings: no requirement to compile and examine baseline data, no specific budget for M&E activities, no specific dates for completion of activities (time frames are set for year 1, 2 or 3), and vague indicators (e.g. “completion of all activities”, “initiation of implementation”, “strategy”). It seems that the M&E plan is missing detail, particularly specific milestone dates for evaluation of progress. For these shortcomings, the M&E design is rated moderately unsatisfactory.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not include a specific section on M&E activities, nor does it rate M&E implementation, but does comment on monitoring activities throughout the report. The TE does not mention whether or not the expected mid-term evaluation was completed. The TE records that project supervision was carried out frequently - at least every six months - by a consistent team which was proactive in detecting and resolving implementation problems. The TE states that missions were well prepared with appropriate terms of reference and aide memoires and follow-up letters were well organized, focusing on key issues and solutions. The supervision team consistently provided appropriate advice to the implementing agency and agreed on action plans with the project authorities to improve implementation, but no examples of advice that improved implementation is given in the TE. The TE also states that “reporting of project implementation progress was highly satisfactory” and that “the executing agency submitted ‘meaningful’ quarterly reports on a regular basis”. (TE pg. 9) It seems that the World Bank and ASEZA sufficiently, if not explicitly, monitored the progress of activities, and were vigilant and responsive to problematic issues, although no specific examples of this are provided in the TE. .

## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates the World Bank’s quality of project implementation as Satisfactory. The Bank developed a project that was consistent with the Government of Jordan's development strategy, and thus helped contribute to country ownership and stakeholder engagement. The Bank prepared a detailed, well researched project design in close collaboration with project partners and appraised by a highly skilled team of experts, which facilitated project implementation. (TE pg. 9) Project components were appropriate for the desired objectives and incorporated lessons learned from previous international waters projects in the region. (TE pg. 3)

According to the TE, the choice of Aqaba Region Authority as the executing agency was well made, as ARA had the administrative and financial management capacity and the independence of action needed to undertake these components. (TE pg. 3) The TE states that the Bank maintained ‘harmonious relations’ with the executing agency, and that project supervision was frequent, well prepared, and proactive in detecting and resolving problems. (TE pg.9) However, the TE does not provide any specific examples of specific problems detected and solved. The TE also reports that supervision of financial management was excellent and audit reports were of high quality.



The project had was interrupted for 13 months, and extended for 30 months past its expected completion time, due to changes in executive agency management. The TE does not discuss whether or how the Bank addressed this issue and contributed to its solution. However, it seems all other aspects of project implementation were successful, thus they are rated satisfactory.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The initial executing agency, Aqaba Region Authority, became the Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority, ASEZA, throughout the life of the project. TE rates ASEZA’s quality of project implementation as Satisfactory, despite two significant interruptions in project implementation lasting 13 months in total that required three project extensions. (TE pg. 3, 9)

The TE explains that the executing agency’s commitment to the project objectives was high, and that a key element of the success of the project was the high caliber and continuity of the executing agency’s personnel, and their productive working partnership with the World Bank staff. The TE states that “ASEZA’s commitment went beyond the project to transfer project lessons and achievements into the overall implementing agency methods of working.” ASEZA’s staff and infrastructure contributions were outstandingly higher than budgeted. (TE pg. 8, 9)

ASEZA worked with community stakeholders, including NGOs and small businesses, and ASEZA's staff participate in radio shows to discuss environmental issues in Aqaba, creating wide public awareness of the GEF project. In one example highlighting ASEZA’s responsiveness to community stakeholders, when the dicing community protested the lack of public access to some of the dive sites near the Royal Diving Center, ASEZA opened a new access point just north of the RDC. ASEZA's Commission for Environmental regulation and Enforcement Affairs has an Environmental Library, which is open to all staff and the public. (TE pg. 7)

Despite the project delays and extensions, the TE rates ASEZA’s performance as satisfactory “throughout the preparation and implementation process, with strong stakeholder involvement”. (TE pg. 10) This is particularly important for the sustainability of outcomes. The apparent stellar performance in achievement of outcomes and the successful engagement of stakeholders counterbalances the 13 month delay and subsequent 30 month extension of the project. Therefore, the rating given here is also satisfactory.

## **8. Assessment of Project Impacts**

**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.

This project has resulted in reduced environmental stress, and potentially improved environmental status. A newly established marine park protects coastal eco-systems, including coral reefs. ASEZA and Ports Authority staff have been trained in state-of-the-art oil spill prevention operations and marine vessel pollution prevention procedures. New regulations that prevent pollution and provide remedial actions after pollution events are in place and enforced. The Port Authority has upgraded all its facilities into environmental compliance under the new ASEZA laws.

**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.

The TE reports ongoing and substantial collaboration between the newly created government agency ASEZA and various stakeholder groups. It also describes the efforts made by ASEZA to publicize project activities and educate the public at large. It may be said that this project has changed public education about the Gulf of Aqaba environmental issues, and the level of cooperation between stakeholder groups in the Gulf of Aqaba.

**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

This project has significantly increased country capacities, including infrastructure, environmental monitoring systems, knowledge & skills, and public awareness. The project has played an important role in developing ASEZA's capacity and hence Jordan's ability to enhance the sustainability of its CZM operations. Jordan is now equipped with financial and productive human resources to sustain sound CZM. (TE pg. 7) The TE describes the following project achievements:

- Regular marine water quality monitoring by the Marine Science Station (MSS) is ongoing. All equipment purchased under the project is functioning and monthly reports of monitoring data are submitted to ASEZA.
- The GIS Division formally assigned to the Environment Department is now supporting all the Commissions of ASEZA and is heavily involved in the planning process, e.g. land use and infrastructure development. These efforts to integrate environmental data for both planning and environmental monitoring provide a model of integration and demonstrate the role of GIS applications in planning and decision-making while ensuring environmental sustainability.
- The Port Authority has upgraded all its facilities into environmental compliance under the new ASEZA laws.

- ASEZA and Ports Authority staff have been trained in state-of-the-art oil spill prevention operations and marine vessel pollution prevention procedures. The training program was designed to help establish in depth knowledge about oil spill preparedness and response, pollution prevention, emergency cases, wastes treatment and handling from ships in legal, technical and organization contexts.
- Public awareness of the project, particularly the marine park, has been implemented in part by collaborating NGOs and the diving community.

## b) Governance

This project has significantly increased environmental governance structures that are well positioned to generate positive environmental change. The TE mentions the following new laws, administrative bodies, decision making processes that were successfully implemented during this project:

- The Environment Department was created, all staff fully trained and integrated into ASEZA.
- The Environmental Protection By-Law and the Marine Park By-Law were created and are being implemented and enforced.
- Set -up, running, and institutional mainstreaming of an exemplary Environment Commission- setting up a precedent for the country. Two directorates established within the Environment Commission are fully operational: the Directorate of Environmental Planning and the Directorate of Environmental Supervision and Enforcement.
- A legalized Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) system is enforced in the Gulf of Aqaba, the only region in Jordan where an EIA is required.
- A special coastal police was established within ASEZA's Commission on Environment, Regulation and Enforcement Affairs, in response to the limited powers of the Royal Jordanian Navy pertaining to civilian traffic under international law. A draft Memorandum of Understanding between ASEZA and the Public Security Forces (police) delegates personnel from the Public Security Forces to ASEZA to enforce marine vessel pollution prevention. (TE pg. 5)
- ASEZA's new Environmental Protection By-Law includes provisions regulating pollution from ships, and financial liability provisions pertaining to ship-based pollution include specified penalties per incident, damage recovery, and a surcharge for all assessed penalties and damages (Art. 62). The law also details procedures for environmental impact assessments (EIA). This law reflects the Kingdom's commitment to implementing its obligations under the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL).
- There is a new ASEZA Master Plan, new legal regulations, and a revised framework for CZM Guidelines. The ASEZA law outlines how audits will be carried out and, defines a pollution charge system and fining regulations for violations. The law is being implemented and fines for violations have been issued.
- A new Memorandum of Understanding between the Ports Authority and ASEZA, defines responsibilities for oil spill response and legal measures as well as outlining preventive measures for chemical oil spill prevention.
- The Jordan Petroleum Refinery, together with ASEZA, has completed a system for waste oil recovery from trucks and small garages.
- A new Marine Park was established and implemented, including an annual Marine Park Management Plan, a committee, trained rangers, and a Public Awareness Specialist.

Zoning and infrastructure of marine park facilities have been completed, including: 4 jetties, terrestrial demarcation, toilet and shower facilities, umbrellas, parking, camping grounds, ranger posts, a Visitor Center and first-aid station.

**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.

The TE does not mention any unintended impacts.

**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.

Evidence presented in the TE indicates that many of the project's components have been mainstreamed into ongoing government practices (new agencies, new laws, trained staff, etc.) and that some of the project components were scaled up or replicated elsewhere.

Active participation in the Red Sea Marine Peace Park Steering Committee meetings continues. The project has catalyzed efforts by other donors, such as the USAID MERC project, in which a joint Jordanian and Israeli sea monitoring program is being devised. ASEZA has been confirmed as Jordan's official representative to PERSGA and has already been recognized as a leader in carrying out the PERSGA agenda, having been instrumental in increasing regional cooperation and information exchange.

## 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.

The TE lists the following lessons: (TE pg. 10)

- Project preparatory work should include goals and objectives clearly defined and agreed amongst the stakeholders using a participatory approach. Consensus on a project framework greatly facilitated the implementation of a sound coastal zone management plan.
- The function of the project manager called for international expertise and experience in state-of-the-art coastal zone management to transfer knowledge to the country. The first two international managers had difficulties coping with the idle periods of decision making in ARA. The subsequent hiring of a national with top managerial experience and environmental expertise enabled adequate handling of local politics and delegation of authority to the project

- Strong stakeholder commitment and the realization that positive economic returns can flow from investment in environmentally sound projects promoted outstanding achievements.
- Demand driven interventions based on an effective CZM framework with stakeholder participation, including involvement of the general public, can bring about effective management of the environment through the active involvement of all stakeholders
- Joint collaboration by different ministries and organizations (Health, Port Corporation, private sector, NGOs, police) in training and capacity building activities can enhance the overall effectiveness of implementation. On-the-job training and motivational tools contributed to the full integration of managerial and operational project staff.
- Well-designed cost recovery mechanisms with strong enforcement can help ensure financial sustainability.
- Initiating a dialogue with polluters can bring about a consensus and lead to solutions.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE does not provide explicit recommendations. Many of the lessons learned may be taken as recommendations for future projects.

## 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 EO 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 thoroughly identifies achieved outcomes and relevant impacts, and discusses the character and extent of the achievement of objectives.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is internally consistent, and the ratings are well substantiated. Most evidence presented is complete and convincing. However the TE does not rate M&E activities, and discusses them only indirectly.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE addresses sustainability throughout the report, and in a specific section dedicated to the subject.	HS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are well supported by evidence, easily understood, and immediately applicable in other projects.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE includes actual project costs by activity. Co-financing information is provided, but not included in the annexes.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE does not discuss the initial M&E plan. It does discuss M&E activities indirectly throughout the TE, but does not rate these activities as a project component.	U
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>S</b>

$$0.3(11) + 0.1(18) = 5.1, S$$

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

- Project Document
- Implementation Completion Report