

**SECOND BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT
REVIEWERS OF
THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN**

Prepared by:

Dr. Mahfouz Abu-Zanat

Dr. Ahmad Mousa Disi

Mr. Ayman Al-Asmar

Submitted to UNCC

By

Engicon

March 2010

Table of Contents

- I Executive Summary
- II Clarifications
- III Report
- IV Annexes

I. Executive Summary

1. This report represents the second regular, biannual report of the Independent Reviewers (IRs) of Jordan to the United Nations Compensation Council (UNCC) under UNCC Governing Council decision 258 (2005). It is recalled that Jordan has one project under decision 258: award 5000304 for a total of USD\$ 160,582,073 for rangeland restoration; development of a cooperative rangeland management program; and a captive breeding program at the Shaumari Wildlife Reserve (USD\$ 246,873).
2. On the 25th of February 2010, the IRs received from the Jordan National Focal Point (JNFP) a report covering the period from July 2009 to December 2009. The IRs were asked to review the report and it was decided that three members of the IRs' team would take part in this review: the range management, the wildlife, and the financial experts. The Task Orders were received by the IRs on the 25th of February 2010.
3. The JNFP 2nd Biannual Report covered several issues including: Technical Progress of the Baseline Study, Monitoring and Reporting Guidelines for the Baseline Study, Progress Report of Shaumari Project, Proposal of Forage Crop Production in Jordan Badia, Amendment of the Phasing Plan Document, Database and Information Unit, Financial reporting on the BRP, and the proposed six-month Work plan for the BRP.

Baseline Study

4. The PMU-BRP and IRs viewed the Baseline Study sub-phase as the benchmark for future monitoring, an informative source to help identify entry points to the community, and a reliable source of quantified and geo-referenced data that enables the stakeholders to select sound technical and non-technical interventions to serve the objectives of the BRP. Therefore, a detailed TOR of the Baseline Study was prepared to guide the selection and characterization of the Demonstration Sites, and the characterization of the targeted communities.
5. The IRs believe that the technical progress that has been accomplished so far in the Baseline Study is satisfactory. All the required pre-sampling activities (e.g. preparation and validation of questionnaires for the socioeconomic characterization of the targeted community, selection and characterization of the Demonstrations Sites, Range Sites and Key Areas...etc) and some small-scale sampling activities (e.g. collection of soil samples, and description of soil profile) will be concluded on time and the findings will be discussed in the 1st progress report of the Baseline Study that will be submitted by March 2010.

Monitoring and Reporting Guidelines for the Baseline Study

6. The development of a consolidated monitoring program is essential to monitor the activities and the expected outputs of the Baseline Study. The developed document "Monitoring and Reporting Guidelines for the Baseline Study" in particular the log-frame for the Baseline Study is a "mixed" planning for the management of the BRP (self-monitoring) and the Baseline Study. The PMU-BRP is working on the monitoring program document to refine it from all the issues beyond the scope of the Study. The document has to be finalized by April 2010.

Progress Report of the Shaumari Project

7. The progress that has been achieved in the Shaumari Project is Satisfactory. However, the RSCN should fulfill two main objectives as soon as possible: (i) the introduction of new blood of Oryx to Shaumari and (ii) replacing the damaged fence around the perimeter of the Reserve.

8. In the previous IRs Review Report, the IRs believe that the allocation of USD\$ 80,000 to purchase the Safari vehicles is reasonable and will lead to the purpose of the F4 Panel award (improving Oryx and Sand Gazelle captive breeding program). Ecotourism is the major source of income for the Shaumari Reserve and the intended Safari vehicles are safer and convenient for the visitors than the commonly used pickups; consequently more visitors are encouraged to tour the Reserve.

Proposal of Forage Crop Production in Jordan Badia

9. The fodder crop production project has been introduced into the cooperative rangeland management element of 5000304 by JNFP.
10. Before any input from the IRs side on the Forage Project, the following requirements have to be accomplished: (a) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and (b) Economic Feasibility (EF) studies of the project.
11. After the EIA and EF studies, the IRs can help the PMU-BRP in the overall evaluation of the proposed Forage Project.

Phasing Plan Document

12. The developed Phasing Plan Document is satisfactory and it is in line with the objectives of the BRP. The PMU-BRP considered the minor changes that were raised by the IRs. The changes are meant to inform all the stakeholders about the annual amount of money to be released for the restoration projects and for the Administration of the BRP.
13. The UNCC and IRs raised the issue that the cumulative interest on the deposited money in the Special Account for BRP in the Central Bank of Jordan should be addressed in the Phasing Plan. The JNFP and the UNCC will handle this issue.

Database and Information Unit (DBIU)

14. The issues related to the DBIU were addressed in the JNFP 1st Biannual Progress Report covering the period from July 2008 to June 2009. However, the IRs believe that the two documents "Proposal Framework for the Establishment of Database and Information Unit" and "Terms of Reference for the Database Unit Staff" related to the DBIU that were included in this progress report (JNFP 2nd Biannual Progress Report) in Annexes 8 and 9 serve the objectives of the BRP. The JNFP 3rd Biannual Progress Report (January-June 2010) shall contain a briefing on the progress in relation to the Staffing of DBIU and the expenditures for the establishment of the Unit.
15. The outputs of the DBIU are expected to be the benchmark for the Full Implementing Phase of the BRP and necessary to develop a comprehensive master plan for Jordan Badia taking into consideration the status of natural resources and community needs.

Financial Reporting

16. The expenditures totaled to US\$1,133,679 until June 2009 which was reported in the JNFP 1st Biannual Progress Report. From the 1st of July to 31 December 2009 the expenditures were US\$355,449. Total expenditures until the 31 December 2009 were US\$1,489,128 which is equivalent to less than one percent of the award.
17. The IRs recommended recruiting a Financial/Accounting member to handle the financial issues as well as the financial reporting. The PMU-BRP is in the process to recruit an external auditor.

Proposed Six-month Work Plan (January-June 2010)

18. The proposed work plan by the PMU-BRP included three important issues that have an impact on the BRP: recruiting additional staff for the PMU-BRP, the development of TOR

for the development of Community Action Plan Document, and the forage crop production project.

19. Recruiting additional staff for the PMU-BRP. The IRs encourage the PMU-BRP to develop the TOR for the needed experts as soon as possible in order to have enough time for the advertising, selection, and contacting.
20. Development of TOR for the preparation of the Community Action Plan (CAP). It is recalled that the development of Community Action Plan (CAP) Document for the Demonstration Site is the cornerstone for the BRP. The development of the CAP document for each Demonstration Site is expected to be concluded by the end of 2010. A pre-requisite for the development of the CAP document is the articulation of precise, concise, and detailed TOR to ensure sound interventions and incentives which are the pillars for sustainable use of the Demonstration Sites after restoration. The TOR should consider the inherent variations in the selected Demonstration Sites, and the social and financial issues of the beneficiaries. The TOR for the development of CAP document should be approved by November 2010.
21. Conducting the feasibility study for the proposed forage crop production project. The PMU-BRP is expected to develop the TOR for the consultant for the intended studies (Environmental Impact Assessment and Economic Feasibility) followed by the UNCC approval of the TOR before contracting.

II. Clarifications

1. The IRs reviewed the JNFP Report and asked the PMU-BRP for several clarifications which were sent to the JNFP on the 11th of March 2010. The clarifications were portrayed in the template that was suggested by the UNCC (**Annex A**). The main inquired clarifications included the following:

Baseline Study

2. Justification for changing the composition of some technical teams of the institutions implementing the Baseline Study.
3. The reluctance of NCARE to recruit the needed expertise as stated in the TOR of the Baseline Study, and the role of PMU-BRP to resolve this issue.
4. Reiterating that the recruited project managers (PMs) of the Baseline Study are full-time employees and are not allowed to be engaged in other activities regardless of the circumstances. The PMs are fully responsible for carrying out all the activities of the Baseline Study according to the planned schedule and for ensuring the quality of data to be collected.
5. The importance that all the activities that were articulated under items 2.2.2 to 2.2.4 of the Baseline Study must be concluded by March 2010. The adherence of implementers to this date is a pre-requisite for a proper execution of the large scale sampling of the biophysics of the Demonstration Sites and the characterization of targeted communities which expected to be commenced by mid-March 2010 and may last till August 2010.
6. The importance of working more closely with the targeted communities to resolve the concerns (e.g. fencing, incentives, employment...etc) that are raised by the communities during the meetings. The implementers of the Baseline Study should exert more effort to mobilize the community around the objectives of the BRP.

Phasing Plan Document

7. It is understood that the Phasing Plan is a dynamic plan and requires minor amendments through time. However, the amendments should be in line with the restoration activities that surely fulfill the objectives of the BRP. The expenses of the administration of the PMU-BRP and those of the projects should be added for each year to give all stakeholders a clear idea about the total amounts of money to be released during each quarter of the year.
8. According to the UNCC guidelines, the upper ceiling for the administration expenses is 3%, which is equivalent to US\$ 4,817,462. JNFP and UNCC will handle this issue and the JNFP will include it in the budget of up-scaling phase.
9. How much is the cumulative interest of the Special Account in the Central Bank of Jordan and where it will be allocated in the Phasing Plan.

Forage Crop Production Project

10. It is premature to ask the IRs to evaluate the Forage Project Proposal without the availability of two vital documents: Environmental Impact Assessment Study, and Economic Feasibility Study. After the approval of the Forage Production Project by UNCC, the needed budget for the project will be included in the Phasing Plan.

Monitoring and Reporting Guidelines for the Baseline Study

11. Refining the developed log-frame for the baseline Study and deletion of any issue beyond the scope of the baseline Study.

Ecological Monitoring and Evaluation Program

12. Justification for not developing neither the “Ecological Monitoring and Evaluation Program” for the BRP as recommended by UNCC nor the log-frame for the Demonstration Phase knowing that this issue was voiced in JNFP 1st Biannual Report (July 2008-June 2009).
13. The PMU-BRP has a vision to contract a consultant to develop a “Monitoring and Evaluation Program” for all the phases and sub-phases of the BRP. The IRs recommend that the recruitment process have to be through bidding.

Responses of JNFP on the Clarifications of the IRs

14. The Staff of PMU-BRP, IRs, and Engicon-coordinator for the BRP held a meeting in the BRP Office on the 17th of March 2010 to discuss the responses of PMU-BRP on the clarifications that were raised by the IRs on the 11th of March 2010.
15. In the meeting, the PMU-BRP provided the IRs with a copy of responses on the IRs clarifications (**Annex A**). The meeting was positive and both parties collaborated to resolve the raised issues in a satisfactory manner.

III. Report

The administration achievements were addressed in depth in the previous IRs Review Report. This part of the report focused only on the Technical Achievements regarding the BRP.

1. Technical Project Progress

1.1. Baseline Study

1. It is recalled that in accordance with the UNCC guidelines; the BRP was phased into a Demonstration Phase (5-7 years) and a Full-Implementation Phase (10 years). The Demonstration Phase was further subdivided into four sub-phases: Baseline Study, Development of Community Action Plan (CAP) for each demonstration site, implementation of the CAP, and Community-based management of the sites after restoration.

1.1.1. TOR of the Baseline Study

2. The PMU-BRP with collaboration of IRs developed the TOR for the Baseline Study to ensure quality data. The TOR were approved by the UNCC and then discussed with the potential implementers on the 7th of April 2009 at the National Center for Agricultural Research and Extension (NCARE).

1.1.2. Contracting the implementers of the Baseline Study

3. The JNFP signed the contracts with the implementers of the Baseline Study on 26 June 2009. The actual work on the Baseline study started after August 2009 for two main reasons: (i) the inquiry of PMU-BRP for an inception report from the implementers of the Baseline study and (ii) the engagement of all technical teams in the training workshop on "Methodology Standardization on the Collection and Analysis of Data of the Baseline Study" which was conducted during July 2009.

1.1.3. Logical framework of the Baseline Study

4. The log-frame is an important monitoring tool which enables the PMU-BRP to monitor and guide all the intended activities of the Baseline Study. Each implementer of the Baseline Study submitted an inception report with a log-frame to guide the types and timing of activities and deliveries of the Study.
5. The PMU-BRP developed a log-frame for the Baseline Study which requires refining and to be focused only on the issues related to the Baseline Study.

1.1.4. Capacity building of the technical teams of the Baseline Study

6. The PMU-BRP with collaboration of national experts designed and implemented a training workshop on "Methodology Standardization of Collection and Analysis of Data of the Baseline Study". The training workshop emphasized the importance of using scientific techniques for the characterization of targeted communities (e.g. socioeconomics) and the selected demonstration sites (e.g. biophysics) for quality data and validation purposes.

7. At the conclusion of the training workshop, the PMU-BRP outlined the timeframe for carrying out the needed activities of the Baseline Study and due dates for submitting the progress reports. The timeframe is important to ensure that the implementers are in compliance with the articulated TOR of the baseline study, and to make sure that the intended achievements will be delivered on time.
8. A fruitful outcome of the training workshop was the creation of Several Thematic Groups (Socioeconomic, Wildlife, Livestock, Soil and Water, and Range Management) which had the opportunity to discuss the main issues related to the Baseline Study.

1.1.5. Selection of ecosystems and Demonstration Sites

9. Out of the five ecosystems that were targeted in the "Roadmap of BRP", the implementers of the Baseline Study selected only three: Runoff Hammada, Wadi bed (Marab), and Gravel Hammada. The Sandy Hammada and the Steppe ecosystems were not targeted.
10. The implementers of the Baseline Study and the Staff of the PMU-BRP conducted several reconnaissance visits to select potential locations within the affected ecosystems to serve as Demonstration Sites for the BRP. The implementers of the Baseline Study and the Staff of PMU-BRP visited the targeted communities and discussed the objectives and phases of the BRP. It is worth to mention that the PMU-BRP Staff were collaborative with the technical teams of the implementing institutions.
11. All the implementers indicated that the selection of the demonstration sites was performed with participation of the local communities. It is understood that participation with communities is a continuous process. The outcomes of the scheduled meetings between the implementers and community members are expected to be delivered to the concerned stakeholders immediately. Informing the stakeholders about the community issues in time helps in understanding their actual concerns and avoids actions that undermine the growing relationship.
12. The IRs cannot evaluate the soundness of the adopted participatory approach for selecting the Demonstration Sites without being informed about the details of this process. However, it is expected that detailed information pertaining to the "Participatory Approach" that was adopted for sites selection will be provided in the JNFP 3rd Biannual Progress Report (1st January to 30 June 2010).

1.1.6. General characterization of the Demonstration Sites

13. All the implementers carried out several visits to the Demonstration Sites to develop a comprehensive idea about the edaphic and biotic characteristics of the selected sites. The boundaries of the main watersheds and the Demonstration Sites were delineated and mapped.
14. The implementers of the Baseline Study are expected to tackle the following issues regarding the Demonstration Site: total area of the site, the potential for scaling-up, location within the watershed, general physiography, dominant plant communities, land use, risks and constraints.
15. The IRs visits (20-25 January 2010) to the Demonstration Sites revealed that all implementers had selected and delineated the Demonstration Sites.

1.1.7. Identification of range sites and selection of key- and reference areas

16. The PMU-BRP and the IRs hoped that the identification and mapping of range sites, collection and analysis of soil samples, description of soil profiles, selection of key areas, and marking of permanent transects within the key areas for sampling will be accomplished by March 2010. These activities will be reported in details in the 1st progress report of the Baseline Study.

In summary, the activities that had been carried out by the implementers of the Baseline Study are in line with the TOR of the Baseline Study. The outcomes of the implemented activities will be evaluated after receiving the 1st progress report of the Baseline Study.

1.2. Shaumari Wildlife Project

1.2.1. Progress report

17. In the vision of the IRs, the progress that had been accomplished in Shaumari Project is satisfactory. The main achievements were: introduction of sand gazelle, contracting experts to establish the genetic profile for the Oryx, determination of grazing capacity for the Shaumari reserve, surveillance of the perimeter fence, and estimation of the replacement costs.

18. It is worth noting that two objectives were not accomplished (i) the introduction of new blood of Oryx to the Reserve, and (ii) the replacement of the damaged fence.

19. The RSCN justified these issues as follows:

- For the introduction of new blood of Oryx, the genetic profile should be known for the animals at the Reserve and for those to be imported. The RSCN contracted a national expert to establish the genetic profile of the Oryx at the Reserve.
- For fence replacement, the estimated cost was around US\$350,000 which is more than the budget (US\$250,000) that was allocated to the Shaumari Project. The RSCN decided to replace the most damaged parts of the fence and waiting for extra funds to be able to replace the entire fence.

1.2.2. Proposed work plan

20. The two activities that are lagging behind (introduction of new blood of Oryx and the replacement of the perimeter fence of Shaumari Reserve) were included in the Shaumari Project work plan for the next six-month period.

1.3. Phasing Plan

21. The PMU-BRP has been working on the Phasing Plan for almost one year. It is understood that the Phasing Plan is a dynamic issue as far it serves the objectives of the BRP. Introduction of new activities or deviations from the mainstream of the BRP requires reasonable justification to be considered for technical evaluation.

22. The amended Phasing Plan is satisfactory and serves the purpose of the BRP (**Annex B**).

1.4. Database and Information Unit

23. The "Proposal Framework for the Establishment of Database and Information Unit" and "Terms of Reference for Database Unit Staff" documents were addressed in the JNFP 1st Biannual Progress Report. Moreover, the technical, the financial, and the contractual issues of the two documents were approved by the UNCC.
24. In the vision of the IRs, the two documents represent the roadmap for the intended Unit. Close monitoring of the Unit is needed to ensure its functionality and sustainability in serving the objectives of the BRP.

1.5. Forage Crop Production Project

25. The PMU-BRP claimed that the forage crop production project is a strategic project and serves the overall goal of the BRP. The IRs believe that Environmental Impact Assessment Study (EIA) and Economic Feasibility Study (EF) are vital for this project.
26. The PMU-BRP developed a vision for contracting a consultant to carry out the EIA and the EF studies. When the results of the technical evaluation, EIA and EF studies are available, the IRs will help in the overall evaluation of the Forage Project.

2. Proposed work plan

27. The proposed BRP work plan for the next six-month period (January to June 2010) is in line with the objectives of the BRP.

3. Financial Reporting

28. The expenditures totaled to US\$1,133,679 until June 2009 which was reported in the JNFP 1st Biannual Progress Report. From the 1st of July to 31 December 2009 the expenditures were US\$355,449. Total expenditures until the 31 December 2009 were US\$1,489,128 which is equivalent to less than one percent of the award. The detailed expenditures are presented in **Annex C**.
29. The process of obtaining information on the financial issues is time consuming. The PMU-BRP has to recruit a consultant to handle all the financial affairs of the BRP.

4. Overall Recommendation

4.1. Capacity Building of the BRP

30. The BRP is a challenging project that will last for 20 years. It deals with degraded ecosystems in arid areas upon which substantial number of pastoral and rural communities used to derive some goods and services. For Jordan, this strategic project is expected to restore the damaged ecosystems and consequently enhancing the livelihoods of local communities. Therefore, in the vision of the IRs it is very important to recruit outstanding experts in policy and planning, small ruminant production, and range management to achieve the goal of the BRP.
31. In the previous IRs Review Report, the capacity building of the PMU-BRP was addressed to enhance the efficiency of handling the technical issues of the BRP and not becoming dependent on IRs.

32. In the vision of the IRs, the recruitment of the needed experts for the PMU-BRP is a top priority and should be accomplished by the end of April 2010 to enable the PMU-BRP to evaluate the submitted 1st progress reports of the Baseline Study.
33. Experts in Policy and Planning, Small Ruminant Production, and Range Management are highly needed to empower the acting PMU-BRP:

4.2. Development of Logical Framework for the Demonstration Phase

34. A logical framework for the entire Demonstration Phase and sub-phases is essential to guide the intended activities and expected outcomes.
35. This tool is necessary to avoid any deviation from the specific objectives of each sub-phase which enables the PMU-PRP from achieving the articulated objectives of the Demonstration Phase.

4.3. Ecological Monitoring and Evaluation Program for the BRP

36. The UNCC required JNFP to develop a comprehensive Ecological Monitoring and Evaluation (EM&E) Program. This issue was raised in the JNFP 1st Biannual Report that covered the period from July 2008 to June 2009. To this date, very limited achievement has been accomplished regarding this issue. The main objective of the EM&E is to track the functional and structural changes of the targeted ecosystems after concluding technical and non-technical intervention.
37. Contracting an outstanding expert in this field can help the PMU-BRP in drafting the EM&E program.

IV. Annexes

Annex A
IRs Clarifications on JNFP 2nd Biannual Report, JNFP Responses, and Final IRs
Observations

Annex A

IRs Clarifications on JNFP 2nd Biannual Report, JNFP Responses, and Final IRs Observations

| Initial IR (Questions/Concerns/Comments) | NFP Responses/ Clarification | Final IR Observation |
|--|--|--|
| <p>1. Technical teams</p> <p>1.1. The inception reports that were submitted by the implementers of the Baseline Study to the BRP-PMU indicated slight changes in the composition of the original technical team compare to that which was indicated in the Baseline Study proposal. This change is not expected to result in a negative impact on the performance of the planned activities of the Baseline Study.</p> <p>1.2. The exception is NCARE which failed to recruit three experts (wildlife ecologist, plant ecologist, and data coordinator) who are highly needed for proper implementation of the Baseline Study. NCARE did not provide any written justification to the PMU-BRP regarding this issue. Therefore, there are concerns that both the quality and timing of the planned activities of the Baseline Study implemented by NCARE will be affected.</p> <p>1.3. The PMU of the BRP should take the necessary measures to</p> | <p>1. Technical teams</p> <p>1.1. Slight changes in the composition of the staff were due to the retirement of the former Project Manager at MoA and the replacement of the former Project Manager at JSSD. It worth noting that the qualifications of new project managers are in line with the TOR of the baseline study document in terms of qualifications and experience (please see their CVs).</p> <p>1.2. This point was resolved; as NCARE recruited three experts to fit the gap in the mentioned field. The experts who joined NCARE team are Eng. Khalid Abu Layla, plant ecologist, and Eng. Motasim Amboshi, Data Coordinator (the PMU still negotiate with NCARE to appoint another Data Coordinator with relevant experience), and NCARE negotiates Dr. Zuhair Amr, wildlife ecologist (or another wildlife ecologist will be recruited as soon as possible).</p> | <p>1. Technical teams</p> <p>1.1. Replacement of PMs of MOA and JSSD is justified.</p> <p>1.2. The PMU-BRP informed the IRs that NCARE responded positively to the issues that were raised by IRs. The commitment of NCARE was verbal and not through an official letter. NCARE contacted Dr. Zuhair Amr, wildlife expert, to serve the Baseline Project. The TOR of the Baseline Study stated that principal experts are not allowed to serve more than two projects. The Director of the PMU-BRP indicated that NCARE can contract Dr. Amr because experts in this specialty are limited. For the benefit of the BRP, the IRs believe that this issue should be passed.</p> |

| Initial IR (Questions/Concerns/Comments) | NFP Responses/ Clarification | Final IR Observation |
|--|---|---|
| <p>force NCARE to recruit the needed expertise.</p> | <p>1.3. The PMU of BRP raised this issue with the project Managers (PMs) during the official meetings. Moreover, an official letter was sent to His Excellency the Minister of Agriculture concerning this issue. The feedback from the concerning institution was positive and gaps were filled by recruiting the required expertise. As a result, the project manager at NCARE expressed his commitment to the TOR. Subsequently, NCARE will implement all the activities of the baseline study according to schedule. All activities will be documented and included in the first progress report which will be submitted on time (March, 2010). The PMU of BRP is waiting for an official letter from NCARE regarding the above mentioned issues.</p> | <p>1.3. The PMU-BRP took the necessary measures to ensure that NCARE is in compliance with the TOR of the Baseline Study.</p> |
| <p>2. Technical Progress</p> <p>2.1. The IRs visits to the Baseline Study sites that were conducted 20-25 January 2010 revealed that the technical progress of some of the implementers of the Baseline Study were behind the planned schedule. It is expected that by March 2010, all the pre-sampling activities that should be included in the 1st Progress Report will be concluded.</p> | <p>2. Technical Progress</p> <p>2.1. After signing the contract with the baseline implementers (in August, 2009) and during the preparation stage for site selection, the technical team of baseline study conducted several field visits to the selected target sites and met many times with livestock owners and targeted communities. The outcomes of these visits and meetings are the selection of the demonstration sites. Consequently, before the IRs visit to the demo sites, all the implementers selected and mapping the boundary of the demo sites with</p> | <p>2. Technical Progress</p> <p>2.1. The IRs understood that the 1st progress report to be submitted by 15 March 2010 shall include all the articulated activities under items 2.2.2 to 2.2.4 of the TOR of the Baseline Study. During the visits (from 20-25 January 2010) to the Demonstration Site, the IRs realized that the implementers of the Baseline Study spent 5 months (from August 2009 to January 2010) to accomplish two main activities: selection of the Demonstration Site and delineation of the selected site on a map. The PMU-BRP ensured the IRs that the implementers of the Baseline Study will not be excused for any delay or not performing</p> |

| Initial IR (Questions/Concerns/Comments) | NFP Responses/ Clarification | Final IR Observation |
|--|---|---|
| <p>2.2. It is understood that the recruited project managers (PM) of the Baseline Study are full-time employees. The engagement of two PMs in other projects being implemented by their institutions/ organizations delayed the progress in the Baseline Study. The recruited PMs are paid from the allocated budget of the Baseline Study; therefore, there is no excuse for the PMs to refrain from attending meetings called by the BRP-PMU or carrying out field visits as required by the PMU Staff of the BRP or by the IRS.</p> | <p>the participation of targeted communities and by 15 March, 2010 all the planned activities will be accomplished and included in the 1st progress report.</p> <p>2.2. The PMU of BRP raised this issue several times during the official meetings with the PMs and the technical team. JNFP (His Excellency the Minister of Environment) send an official letter to the Director Generals of the implementing institutions concerning this issue. The concerned institutions committed to have full-time project managers, who will be fully dedicated to the project's activities and implementation.</p> | <p>any single activity as articulated in the TOR of the Study.</p> <p>2.2. The PMU-BRP handled the issue of the PMs of the Baseline Study properly.</p> |
| <p>3. Targeted Communities The targeted communities have the following concerns:</p> <p>3.1. The communities are against any fencing of their grazing domain. Fencing was neither included in the TOR of the Baseline Study nor in the work plan of the implementers of the study. Only a small area of 500m² will be fenced to serve as a reference area for future monitoring.</p> | <p>3. Targeted Communities</p> <p>3.1. The PMU of BRP has a vast experience in dealing with the local communities and it is well-known that fencing is neither accepted by these communities nor by the PMU of BRP. Therefore, this option of protection was not explicitly mentioned in the TOR of baseline study. Oppositely, the PMU of BRP clearly asked all the PMs to recruit rangers (guards) from the targeted communities to protect the selected sites and to avoid the option of fencing. Moreover, the PMU of BRP clearly asked the PMs and the technical team to fence</p> | <p>3. Targeted Communities</p> <p>3.1. The IRs meant that the implementers of the Baseline Study should exert more effort and seize any opportunity to increase the community awareness about the objectives and approaches of the BRP. The concerns should be discussed in a direct and transparent way with the community.</p> |

| Initial IR (Questions/Concerns/Comments) | NFP Responses/ Clarification | Final IR Observation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>3.2. The communities expect immediate and substantial incentives as a compensation for closing their traditional grazing domain.</p> | <p>the reference area (almost 0.1% of the demo site) after the consultation and coordination with targeted communities. Moreover, the PMU of BRP encouraged the PMs and the technical team of the baseline study to be more involved to enhance the public awareness about the BRP objectives and approaches.</p> <p>3.2. The vision of PMU-BRP regarding the incentives as follows: During the baseline study, the Baseline implementers appointed rangers (guards) and community facilitator from the targeted communities as initial incentives for the local communities. Later on, during the upcoming sub-phases of the Demonstration phase, the structured incentives will be included in Community Action Plan (CAP). The structured incentives will be part of the final report of the Baseline study after conducting and concluding the Baseline study and prior to Community Action Plan (CAP) implementation. Following the baseline study, the most appropriate and structured incentives measures shall be selected, justified, and provided to the community during the implementation of the CAP.</p> <p>3.3. The PMU of BRP realized the importance</p> | <p>3.2. The implementers of the Baseline Study are expected to recruit 2 to 3 guards and a community facilitator from the targeted community. This is the only incentive thought during the Baseline Study subphase.</p> |

| Initial IR (Questions/Concerns/Comments) | NFP Responses/ Clarification | Final IR Observation |
|--|---|---|
| <p>3.3. The communities are in need for a readily available source of forage/grain for feeding their animals. They are reluctant to wait for many years before getting substantial benefits from the targeted ecosystems/demonstration sites after restoration.</p> <p>3.4. The implementers of the Baseline Study and the PMU Staff of the BRP should work more closely with the communities to</p> | <p>of this issue and, therefore, proposed an urgent project to produce forage crops in the Northeastern Badia. The project "Production of Irrigated Forage Crops in the Northeastern Badia", prepared by a national team from different institutions, shall serve this objectives.</p> <p>- The Baseline study implementers and the PMU of BRP are working on developing a sustainable collaboration and coordination with the targeted communities and the evidence for this are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. involvement of the local communities in the selection of the demo site(s), 2. the recruited rangers for protecting the selected sites were from the local community, and 3. the appointed community facilitators were from local community <p>The enthusiasm of the local community(ies) provides evidence on the degree of their collaboration and participation in the BRP activities. However, the PMU of BRP and the implementers are looking for more fruitful and more collaboration with the targeted communities.</p> | <p>3.3. The PMU-BRP informed the IRs that a consultant will be contracted to handle all the technical aspects of the proposed fodder production project including carrying out the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and the Economic Feasibility (EF). The IRs recommend that this task, if approved by the UNCC, to be accomplished through bidding.</p> <p>3.4. The PMU-BRP agreed that the implementers of the Baseline Study should work more closely with the targeted communities to mobilize these communities</p> |

| Initial IR (Questions/Concerns/Comments) | NFP Responses/ Clarification | Final IR Observation |
|--|--|---|
| <p>resolve the above concerns. This is a critical issue for a sustainable collaboration between communities and the PMU-BRP</p> | | <p>around the objectives of the BRP.</p> |
| <p>4. Phasing Plan</p> <p>4.1. The expenses on project implementation and on the administration should be listed separately in the same table to calculate the grand total for each year. This informs all stakeholders about the amount of money needed to be released in each quarter for a given year.</p> <p>4.2. The allowance of US \$ 300,000 for administration budget needs to be allocated.</p> | <p>4. Phasing Plan</p> <p>4.1. The Phasing plan aims to manage the release of award fund from UNCC to the Government of Jordan and from the Ministry of Environment upon the completion of measurable and agreed milestone.</p> <p>4.2. The JNFP Phasing plan represents a forecast of expenditures for the upcoming activities and phases of BRP. Therefore, it was prepared for the year 2010 up to year 2026. According to the guidelines of the UNCC, a sealing of 3% of the UNCC award is permissible for paying the staff and covering the operational cost of the PMU of BRP throughout the BRP life. The PMU of BRP will phase the spending of the 3% of the award at a rate of 300,000 US\$ from 2009 to 2015 with an incremental increase of 5% annually from 2016 to 2026. The PMU of BRP has considered these issues in staffing and allocating expenses of operational and management. After taking into account the valuable comments of IRs, the PMU of BRP amended the "Phasing Plan of the Badia Restoration Program" as shown in Annex 1.</p> | <p>4. Phasing Plan</p> <p>4.1. The PMU-BRP amended the Phasing Plan in accordance to UNCC guidelines and the IRs clarifications.</p> <p>4.2. The PMU-BRP agreed to include the administration expenses in Table No. 4 of the Phasing Plan Document.</p> |

| Initial IR (Questions/Concerns/Comments) | NFP Responses/ Clarification | Final IR Observation |
|--|--|---|
| <p>4.3. The proposed fodder production using harvested surface runoff and ground water in Jordan Badia is important for the targeted communities. An expert in the production of forage crops under irrigation in arid areas (desert ecosystem) should be consulted for proper technical evaluation of the proposed project.</p> <p>4.4. The IRs believe that the outcomes: of the technical evaluation of the proposed project, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and Economic Feasibility (EF) studies are essential elements shall furnish ample of information for proper evaluation of the sustainability and viability of the proposed project.</p> | <p>4.3. The proposal of "Production of Irrigated Forage Crops in the Northeastern Badia" was already prepared by a national team and experts in the field of forage crop production, water harvesting, water irrigation management and modeling, socioeconomic, GIS and Remote Sensing,.... . Therefore, the PMU believes that the input from the required expertise was included in the proposal. Also, the PMU of BRP recognizes the importance of this project to the local communities and the urgent need for implementing such crucial project. Therefore, the PMU of BRP insists that the opinion of IRs and their input to this proposal is highly needed to have a further step towards implementation.</p> <p>4.4. The PMU of BRP agrees with the IRs opinion which was also included in the proposal's work plan which stated that the first activity of the project will be the conduction of EIA an EF after the approval of IRs and UNCC on the proposal. Therefore, H.E Prime Minister and the Steering Comity (SC) headed by H.E the Minister of Environment are looking forward for the Governing Council approval to carry out this strategic project.</p> | <p>4.3. The intended fodder production project was introduced by the JNFP to the range management element of the BRP. The IR recommend conducting EIA and EF.</p> <p>4.4. After conclusion of the EIA and EF studies, the IRs will collaborate with PMU-BRP in the overall evaluation of the project.</p> |

| Initial IR (Questions/Concerns/Comments) | NFP Responses/ Clarification | Final IR Observation |
|---|---|---|
| <p>5. Monitoring and Evaluation System (MES)</p> <p>5.1. The MES Document discussed the objectives of monitoring but overlooked the tools and the mechanism(s) to achieve these objectives. -The Logical Frame of the Demonstration Phase (5-7 years) was expected to be prepared as a tool to achieve the monitoring purposes. A clear vision and an overview of the BRP, in particular for the Demonstration Phase, results in a consolidated Logical Frame.</p> <p>5.2. The Proposed MES document was intended for the Baseline Study as indicated in the title, but in the text it tackled all the sub-phases of the Demonstration Phase.</p> <p>5.3. Therefore, it is highly recommended to develop a Logical Frame at two levels: for the entire Demonstration Phase, and a detailed one for the Baseline Study.</p> | <p>5. Monitoring and Evaluation System (MES)</p> <p>5.1. The MES included in the 2nd JNFP Biannual report is for the Baseline study sub-phase of the demonstration phase of BRP. The PMU of BRP will develop the Monitoring and Evaluation Program and the Logical Frame for the demonstration phase of BRP after the preparation of the TOR for the Community Action Plan.</p> | <p>5. Monitoring and Evaluation System (MES)</p> <p>5.1. The PMU-BRP agreed to develop a comprehensive MES for the Demonstration Phase of BRP. This takes time and will be included in JNFP 3rd Biannual Report. It is worth noting that the IRs voiced the issue of MES in the JNFP 1st Biannual Report.</p> <p>5.2. This issue was handled in item 5.1.</p> <p>5.3. The PMU-BRP agreed to refine the prepared MES document for the Baseline Study as recommended by the IRs. The PMU-BRP agreed to develop a logical framework for the entire Demonstration Phase, and refine the prepared MES for the Baseline Study.</p> |

| Initial IR (Questions/Concerns/Comments) | NFP Responses/ Clarification | Final IR Observation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>6. Proposed Work-plan</p> <p>6.1. The issue of contracting new IRs should be added to the suggested work-plan.</p> <p>6.2. The duties of the present IRs will be ended in May 2010 after the conclusion of the review of the JNFP 2nd Biannual Report (1 July to 31 December 2009).</p> | <p>6. Proposed Work-plan</p> <p>6.1 and 6.2. The PMU agrees with this point, however, we would like to draw the IRs attention that the present contract with Engicon and IRs commenced will be ended in May, 2010. The PMU of BRP is intending to contract with new individual IRs after announcing and bidding through the official channels and according to specified TOR. This will be carried out in April, 2010.</p> | <p>6. Proposed Work-plan</p> <p>6.1. The PMU-BRP agreed that the issue of recruiting new IRs will be included in the proposed work plan.</p> |
| <p>7. Shaumari Project</p> <p>7.1. The Progress Report (January-December 2009) on the Shaumari Project “Maintaining a Viable Population of the Arabian Oryx and Sand Gazelle in the Shaumari Nature Reserve” is roughly composed of three parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) An overview of the approved work-plan and the achievements during the period January-December 2009. b) The technical report on “Determination of Grazing Capacity for Shaumari Nature Reserve” c) A master plan for the Shaumari Nature Reserve that was prepared with collaboration of US Forest Service. <p>7.2. Comments:</p> <p>a) The progress that was achieved against the proposed outcomes and activities is satisfactory except for the following</p> | <p>7. Shaumari Project</p> <p>7.2. Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RSCN is in the process of importing | <p>7. Shaumari Project</p> <p>7.2. Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IRs believe that the priority will be given to |

| Initial IR (Questions/Concerns/Comments) | NFP Responses/ Clarification | Final IR Observation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importing of new blood lines of Oryx. One of the main factors for poor performance of the Oryx animals at the Shaumari Reserve is in-breeding. Therefore, it is very important to import the Oryx as soon as possible to develop the needed plans for out-breeding which expected to improve the vigor of the herd. • Replacing the perimeter fence of the Reserve. The RSCN indicated that total replacement of the fence exceeds (US\$ 350,000) the allocated budget (US\$ 250,000). At least, the RSCN should fix a timeline for replacing the most damaged parts of the fence with a proper estimate of the costs. <p>b) Technical Report on “Grazing Capacity”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Report is lacking the table of contents, list of figures, and list of tables in addition to the list of Annexes. • It was indicated in the introduction of CHAPTER 2 that the large pond was built across Wadi Al Ghadaf, but in the caption of Figure 2.1 it was articulated that the pond was built across Wadi Al Shaumari (which one is correct?). • The Report is lacking the following figures (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 3.1, and 3.2). • The timeline table under section 3.4 is incomplete. | <p>new herd of Oryx with a well known genetic profile. This is required to introduce a new blood stock to the Shaumari reserve and to overcome the problems of existing herd.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RSCN conducted a survey to assess the situation of the current fence. Base on that, areas which needed replacement of old fence were identified and prioritized in the light of available budget. Specifications for the fence were re-identified based on the past experience and the local conditions of the area to ensure durability and sustainability of the fence. <p>b) Technical Report on “Grazing Capacity”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PMU of BRP will ask the RSCN to take these points into consideration and to correct these shortcomings. | <p>animals with a well known genetic profile. In case that the genetic profile is not available, the alternative is to import animals with known pedigree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regardless of the circumstances, the IRs need to know the suggested timeline for replacing the damaged fences. <p>b) Technical Report on “Grazing Capacity”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PMU-BRP agreed to convey the comments in items 7.2.a to 7.2.b to RSCN. |

| Initial IR (Questions/Concerns/Comments) | NFP Responses/ Clarification | Final IR Observation |
|--|---|---|
| <p>c) Master Plan of the Shaumari Nature Reserve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is nice to collaborate with other donors and experts, but it is very important to make sure that the credit should be given solely to the Badia Restoration Program (e.g. UNCC award number 5000304) for the achievements at the Reserve. It is informative to know about the Master Plan, but it is not appropriate to be included in the Progress Report on the Shaumari Project. | <p>c) Master Plan of the Shaumari Nature Reserve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The outputs of the Master Plan of the Shaumari Reserve serve the objectives of the Shaumari Project. The inclusion of this Master Plan (as Annex) in the Shaumari Progress Report does not affect the credit of the BRP and UNCC contribution and award. | <p>c) Master Plan of the Shaumari Nature Reserve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the IRs recommended that a small paragraph about the Master Plan of the Shaumari Project may be included in the progress report and not including the entire document (or an abstract) in a separate annex. However, the Master Plan was attached according to IR-wildlife expert. |
| <p>8. Financial issues (1st July 2009 to 31st December 2009):</p> <p>8.1. Financial statement provided represents the Dec 2009 month and the aggregate since the beginning of the project, while the required is amounts paid until June 30th 2009 “as per the first Biannual report”, transactions made between July 2009 and December 2009, and the aggregate balances as of 31st December 2009.</p> <p>8.2. The report on financial management does not show the plan to improve the reporting process and the internal control tool required. As discussed and reported in the previous Biannual report the accounting department and the accounting and reporting process needs improvement to better meet the different needs of the different stakeholders.</p> <p>8.3. The current report is similar to the previous report, it does not reflect the amounts committed but not paid which means that the real picture of the project and the spending plan is incomplete.</p> | <p>8. Financial issues (1st July 2009 to 31st December 2009):</p> <p>8.2. There were internal discussion with H.E the Minister of Environment and with UNCC to have an external auditor. The PMU of BRP is in the process for contracting the External Auditor.</p> | <p>8. Financial issues (1st July 2009 to 31st December 2009):</p> <p>8.1. The JFNP and the IRs agreed on all financial issues which are presented in Annex C.</p> |

THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN

Ministry of Environment

Badia Restoration Programme (BRP)

Phasing Plan of the Badia Restoration Programme

March 2010

Phasing Plan of the Badia Restoration Programme

1. The environmental compensation awards under decision 258 (2005) require that phasing plans to be approved by the Governing Council before the implementation of restoration projects valued at greater than \$50 million.
2. The phasing serves two main purposes: (i) to test the efficacy of the restoration approach(es) at a small scale, before scaling the program up for the entire targeted area, and (ii) to manage the release of award funds from UNCC to the Government upon the completion of measurable and agreed milestones, which are achieved by eligible institutions implementing the restoration projects.

Badia Restoration Programme Implementation

3. In compliance with the UNCC decision 258, the JNFP proposed two main phases: the demonstration phase (7 years) and the full implementation phase (10 years) to implement the Badia Restoration Programme (BRP). The BRP-PMU phasing plan ensures proper selection of restoration approaches and effective monitoring of the interventions.

1. Demonstration phase

4. The main objective of this phase is to demonstrate and select the best technical, institutional and political options (TIPOs) at the demonstration sites. The outcomes of the demonstration phase will be the benchmark for the full implementation phase.
5. To achieve this objective, a roadmap was developed to guide and ensure that all the work-plans, interventions, and actions associated with restoration of targeted areas will lead to restoration of damaged ecosystems and a sustainable pastoral animal production in Jordan Badia. In this regard, the resources (expertise and funds) available for the BRP-PMU are expected to be allocated appropriately and used effectively.
6. The demonstration phase is subdivided into 4 subphases: baseline study, development of the Community Action Plan (CAP), CAP implementation at a small scale, and community-based management of the sites after being restored (**Table1**).

Table 1: Timeline and Duration of the Sub-phases of the Demonstration Phase

| Sub-phase | Timeline | Duration (month) |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Baseline study | March 2009 – November 2010 | 20 |
| Development of CAP document | December 2010 | 1 |
| CAP implementation | January 2011 – December 2012 | 24 |
| Management of restored sites | August 2012 – June 2016 | 46 |

1.1. Baseline study

7. The baseline study is an analysis of the current situation to identify the starting point for the demonstration phase of the BRP. It involves the systematic collection and presentation of data in order to provide a clear picture of the targeted communities and the demonstration sites.

TOR of the baseline study

8. To ensure quality data, a set of terms of reference for the baseline study was developed to set out the guidelines for the design, collection, analysis and reporting of the baseline data pertaining to the socioeconomics of targeted community and the biophysics of the demonstration sites.

9. The baseline study is expected to serve two main purposes: (i) collection of information needed for the development of a practical and rational community work plan, and (ii) development of a monitoring program to track the changes over time in response to future interventions.
10. The TOR of the baseline study was discussed with all potential organizations and institutions on 7 April 2009 at the National Center for Agricultural Research and Extension (NCARE).

The baseline study proposals

11. The BRP-PMU called all potential implementing organizations to submit proposals to undertake the baseline study.
12. The BRP-PMU adopted the fixed cost approach because the requested budgets by the applicants were not reasonable. The cost estimate for conducting the baseline study was \$206,540.
13. The submitted proposals were evaluated by the BRP-PMU and the Independent Reviewers (IRs). A scoring system was developed for evaluating the baseline study proposals. The scoring system was based on three main criteria: (i) the applicant capacity, (ii) the quality of the technical team and (iii) the proposed work plan for achieving the purpose of the Baseline Study, in particular the selected attributes and timing. Because of delays beyond control, the proposed dates in the submitted work-plans were passed which necessitates confining scoring to applicant capacity and technical team quality.
14. The scoring system was applied to the eight proposals. The roadmap suggested 5 conceptual projects including the Burqu project. Therefore, the first 5 proposals with the highest scores were selected and the corresponding applicants were contacted to sign the contract with the JNFP.

The baseline study contract

15. The BRP-PMU formulated the contract, which was sent to UNCC for approval. The items of the contract were mostly borrowed from the roadmap and the TOR of the Baseline Study. The contracts were signed by the JNFP and the implementers on 26 June 2009.

Reporting

16. A template for progress and final reports was developed. The implementer of the baseline study is expected to submit three progress reports to the BRP-PMU:
 - i. Progress report (P-1) after concluding the selection and delineation of demonstration site.
 - ii. Progress report (P-2) after concluding the biophysical assessment of the demonstration site and characterization of the targeted community.
 - iii. Progress report (P-3) after concluding the data analysis.
17. The final report should be comprehensive, highlighting the achievements according to the expected outputs, discussing the lessons learned, and framing a vision for potential restoration approaches, practical incentives, and institutional arrangements needed within the community. The progress and final reports should include detailed information on all activities and expenses and submitted in an electronic and hard copy format.
18. The progress and final reports of the baseline studies will be delivered for the UNCC for evaluation.

Releasing of funds

19. The release of the baseline fund (\$206,540 per demonstration site) to the implementers is planned as follows:

- 30% after signing the contract between JNFP and implementer,
- 20% after submitting progress report (P-1),
- 20% after submitting progress report (P-2),
- 20% after submitting progress report (P-3), and
- 10% after submitting and approval of the final report

Expected outputs of the baseline study

20. The baseline study should deliver the following:

- i. A geo-referenced data base of site biophysics (vegetation, soils, and wildlife habitat),
- ii. Social and economical database of community primarily the users of the demonstration site, and
- iii. A vision for the development of a community action plan.

21. The detailed expected outputs of the baseline study are listed in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Expected Outputs from the Baseline Study

| Expected Outputs | Verification |
|--|------------------------------|
| I. Biophysics: Demonstration sites selected, delineated and mapped | Reports (maps), field visits |
| Range sites identified, key areas delineated and mapped | Reports (maps), field visits |
| Reference area(s) selected and fenced | Field visits |
| Sampling transects marked and geo-referenced | Reports, field visits |
| Structure and function of vegetation quantified | Reports |
| Main vegetation types (communities) within each range site delineated | Reports (maps) |
| Range maps including grazable biomass and grazing capacity developed | Reports (maps) |
| Wildlife population estimated and wildlife habitats identified and described | Reports |
| II. Socioeconomics: Community stakeholders analyzed and key players identified | Reports |
| Human, natural, physical, and financial capitals determined | Reports |
| Production systems (livestock production and cropping) described | Reports |
| Population and production of livestock determined | Reports |
| Feed and water resources identified | Reports |
| Grazing practices within and outside the demonstration site documented | Reports |
| Grazing routes identified and mapped | Reports (maps) |

Methodology standardization of data collection and analysis

22. The TOR of the baseline study addressed the issue of methodology standardization for data collection and analysis. The implementers of the baseline study have different backgrounds in terms of approaches and techniques for the collection and analysis of data which will result in diverse and unharmonized data sets.

Therefore, standardization of methodologies of data collection and analysis is the cornerstone upon which a successful database will be built, and is essential for future planning and management of the targeted ecosystems. The BRP-PMU in collaboration

with national experts designed a training workshop on methodology standardization. The training workshop was conducted as scheduled in July 2009.

Goal and objectives of the training workshop

23. The goal of the workshop is to ensure that all the project teams, especially the field crews, have a comprehensive understanding and awareness of the methodologies to be used in the Baseline Study. This means that a standard format of data will be generated during the different subphases of the demonstration phase of the BRP.

24. The specific objectives of the training workshop are:

- i. To standardize the sampling protocols and methodologies for the collection of data of the Baseline Study and future monitoring programs.
- ii. To standardize the statistical analysis of the collected data, this is essential in the interpretation and comparison of the results of the different targeted ecosystems.

Expected outputs of the training workshop

25. The main expected outcomes of the training workshop are:

- i. The project teams' capacity of sampling the socioeconomics of communities and biophysics of the sites enhanced and harmonized.
- ii. The project teams' skills of the statistical analysis of the collected data improved and harmonized.
- iii. The baseline data collected according to a unified methodology and a standard format of data provided to the BRP-PMU.

26. Training topics

- i. Characterization of the targeted communities: Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) and analysis of stakeholders.
- ii. Biophysical assessment of the demonstration sites: Sampling vegetation attributes and characterization of pastoral animal production
- iii. Sampling wildlife
- iv. Description of soil surface conditions

1.2. Community action plan (CAP)

27. Community action plan is a shared vision of a community with a range of stakeholders to achieve the goal and objectives of a certain project. The CAP will be based on the findings of the baseline study, the community needs and community indigenous knowledge. The objective of the CAP is to outline the issues that should be discussed, the measures that should be undertaken, and the responsibility of all stakeholders to demonstrate the proposed interventions and management plans.

TOR of the community action plan

28. The TOR for the CAP will be developed, discussed and approved by the end of August 2010. The TOR of the baseline study will be developed in house by the BRP-PMU or calling on the expertise of national and/or international consultants.

Development of the "Community Action Plan" document

29. The CAP document is a detailed outline of the actions and interventions (technical and non-technical) that should be undertaken by the implementer and the assignments of

responsibilities to all the stakeholders. The development of the CAP document requires one month and will be reviewed, and approved by the end of December 2010.

Workshop to discuss the CAP documents

30. The workshop aims to give all the stakeholders an opportunity to express their viewpoints, expectations, and concerns on the developed CAPs. National, regional and international organizations are encouraged to participate in this event for potential entry points to BRP. The funds from these potential donors will be used for the development of income generating activities at large scale to benefit large numbers of community members.

1.3. CAP implementation

31. The CAP implementers should adhere to the CAP document in particular the agreed type and scale of restoration.
32. Incentives are the keys for sustainable collaboration with the targeted stockowners. Therefore, the incentives should be reasonable and practical, and not encouraging additional increase in animals' population in the targeted site or moving the overstocking problem to other locations.
33. The participatory approach and the cooperative management scheme will be the "vehicles" for a successful implementation and operation of the CAP.

Participatory evaluation of the implemented intervention

34. Local communities should feel that the BRP is their project and vital for the enhancement of their livelihoods. The local communities should share in the evaluation of the implemented CAP interventions (e.g. water harvesting and spreading techniques, fodder plantation techniques, types and structure of the incentives...) at the demonstration sites.
35. Field days will be arranged for local communities to participate in the evaluation of the implemented interventions at the demonstration sites.

1.4. Community-based management (CBM)

36. Cooperative or co-management is based on the premise that resource users (e.g. livestock owners) and resource managers can find a common solution which produces gains for both of them in the long term. Resource users wish to have access to rangeland vegetation in order to lower the costs of raising their livestock, while resource managers often have broader social objectives, including preservation of the ecological health of rangeland resources.
37. A cooperative management program brings the interested parties together to collaborate in establishing agreed management objectives and practices. When the objectives and practices for ecological restoration are established by agreement between the interested groups, the success of the program will depend more on maintaining their collaboration to achieve the agreed objectives than on the strength of enforcement measures.

Targeted group(s) organization

38. A pre-requisite for successful demonstration of the CBM is organizing the targeted groups (e.g. stockowners and shepherds) under a certain umbrella to facilitate communication and collaboration. The laws and by-laws of the formed entity will specify the rights and responsibilities of the members to avoid dominancy and to maintain a friendly relationship among members and other stakeholders.

39. There are several NGOs in Jordan with good expertise in dealing with rural and pastoral communities. The BRP-PMU will collaborate with these NGOs and other stakeholders in the organization of the targeted groups within the framework of the BRP.

Development of sound grazing plans

40. Simple and practical grazing plans will be designed to maintain the structure and function of vegetation at the restored sites.
41. Since the Badia is prone to drought, the grazing plans will consider practical alternatives in order to maintain the integrity of the restored sites and to secure a reasonable level of livelihood during the drought period.

2. Full implementation phase

42. This phase will last for 10 years (July 2016 – May 2026) which requires the development of a comprehensive master plan. The findings and the lessons learned from the demonstration phase will serve as a benchmark for the master plan.
43. It is worth noting that the socioeconomic dimension will be the focal point in the intended master plan. Therefore, new partners are expected to be engaged in the restoration activities.
44. The design of the full implementation phase is governed by many factors including:
- i. The findings of the demonstration phase especially the effectiveness of the cooperative entities in the regulation of grazing at the restored sites.
 - ii. The recommendations of the workshop on “Rehabilitation and Restoration of Degraded Rangelands in Arid Areas”.
 - iii. The community viewpoints and feedback regarding the demonstrated technologies and the structured incentives.
 - iv. The BRP-PMU projected scaling (e.g. 1.0 million ha by the end of 2026).

3. Proposed schedule for the release of funds

45. The purpose of this section is to inform the stakeholders (UNCC, IRs, implementers and consultants) about the tentative timing for the release of funds during the demonstration phase which facilitates the financial management.

46. **Table 3** presents the proposed timeline for fund release during the demonstration phase.

Table 3: Suggested Schedule for the Release of Funds During the Demonstration Phase

| Sub-phase | Schedule | Budget (USD\$) |
|---|----------------|----------------------|
| Baseline Study (March 2009-November 2010): | | |
| Preparation of TOR | May 2009 | 4000 |
| Evaluation of proposals | June 2009 | 4000 |
| Training programme | July 2009 | 11,000 |
| Implementation: | | |
| 30% after signing the contract | October 2009 | 309,810 (5 x61,962) |
| 20% after submitting progress report (P-1) | March 2010 | 206,540 (5 x41,308) |
| 20% after submitting progress report (P-2) | June 2010 | 206,540 (5 x41,308) |
| 20% after submitting progress report (P-3) | September 2010 | 206,540 (5 x 41,308) |
| 10% after submitting and approval of the final report | October 2010 | 103,270 (5 x 20,654) |
| Evaluation of final reports | November 2010 | 15,000 |
| Workshop | November 2010 | 25,000 |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| BUDGET TOTAL | | 1,091,700 |
| Community Action Plan (November-December 2010): | | |
| Preparation of TOR | August 2010 | 10,000 |
| Development of documents | December 2010 | 60,000 (5 x 12000) |
| Evaluation of documents | December 2010 | 15,000 |
| Workshop | December 2010 | 25,000 |
| BUDGET TOTAL | | 110,000 |
| Implementation of Community Action Plan (January 2011-December 2012): | | |
| 30% after signing the contract | January 2011 | 750,000 (5 x 150,000) |
| 20% after submitting progress report (P-1) | June 2011 | 500,000 (5 x 100,000) |
| 20% after submitting progress report (P-2) | December 2011 | 500,000 (5 x 100,000) |
| 20% after submitting progress report (P-3) | June 2012 | 500,000 (5 x 100,000) |
| 10% after submitting and approval of the final report | December 2012 | 250,000 (5 x 50,000) |
| Evaluation of reports | June 2011-Dec 2012 | 25,000 |
| Field visits to demonstration sites and reporting (3 times per site) | June 2011-June 2012 | 25,000 |
| Workshop | July 2012 | 25,000 |
| BUDGET TOTAL | | 2,575,000 |
| Community-based management (August 2012-July 2016): | | |
| Targeted groups organization | August-October 2012 | 100,000 (5 x 20,000) |
| Workshop on cooperative management | November 2012 | 25,000 |
| Workshop on incentives | December 2012 | 25,000 |
| Development of grazing plans | March 2013 | 25,000 (5 x 5000) |
| Structured incentives and drought relief | August 2013-July 2016 | 6,075,000 (5 x 1,215,000) |
| BUDGET TOTAL | | 6,250,000 |
| Shaumari Project (2009-2011): | | |
| | 2009 | 50,141 |
| | 2010 | 100,000 |
| | 2011 | 96,732 |
| BUDGET TOTAL | | 246,873 |
| Database and Information Unit (2009-2015)* | | |
| | 2009 | 56,210 |
| | 2010 | 52,800 |
| | 2011 | 102,520 |
| | 2012 | 46,200 |
| | 2013 | 46,200 |
| | 2014 | 49,390 |
| | 2015 | 52,800 |
| BUDGET TOTAL | | 406,120 |

*Although the budget starts in 2009, it will be amended when the DBIU actually starts.

ECU Administration Budget

47. According to the guidelines of the UNCC, a maximum of 3% of the UNCC award is permissible for paying the staff and covering the operational costs of the BRP-PMU throughout the project life (20 years). The BRP-PMU will phase the spending of the 3% of the award on the BRP-PMU staff and the operational costs at a rate of USD\$ 300,000 from 2009-2015 with an incremental increase of 5% annually from 2016 to 2026.

Summary of Fund Release

48. The release of funds to cover the activities of the Badia Restoration Programme are listed in **Table 4**.

49. It is worth noting that this phasing plan will be amended to include the budget of the project "**Production of Irrigated Forage Crops in the North Eastern of the Jordanian Badia**" after the approval of the IRs and UNCC on the proposal document.

Table 4: Suggested Release of Funds

| Year | | Year Quarters | | | | Sub-total |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | |
| Demonstration Phase | | | | | | |
| 2009 | Project Expenditure | 53,140 | 6,999 | 19,569 | 314,379 | 394,087 |
| | ECU administration and IRs | 145,132 | 145,132 | 44,068 | 44,068 | 37,8400 |
| | Sub-total | 198,272 | 152,131 | 63,637 | 358,447 | 772,487 |
| 2010 | Project Expenditure | 262,750 | 332,940 | 216,540 | 269,670 | 1,081,900 |
| | ECU administration and IRs | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 400,000 |
| | Sub-total | 362,750 | 432,940 | 316,540 | 369,670 | 1,481,900 |
| 2011 | Project Expenditure | 846,732 | 565,843 | 0 | 565,843 | 1,978,418 |
| | ECU administration and IRs | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 400,000 |
| | Sub-total | 946,732 | 665,843 | 100,000 | 665,843 | 2378418 |
| 2012 | Project Expenditure | 0 | 537,684 | 125,000 | 329,350 | 992,034 |
| | ECU administration and IRs | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 400,000 |
| | Sub-total | 100,000 | 637,684 | 225,000 | 429,350 | 1,392,034 |
| 2013 | Project Expenditure | 25,000 | 23,100 | 506,250 | 529,350 | 108,3700 |
| | ECU administration and IRs | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 400,000 |
| | Sub-total | 125,000 | 123,100 | 606,250 | 629,350 | 148,3700 |
| 2014 | Project Expenditure | 506,250 | 530,945 | 506,250 | 530,945 | 2,074,390 |
| | ECU administration and IRs | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 400,000 |
| | Sub-total | 606,250 | 630,945 | 606,250 | 630,945 | 2,474,390 |
| 2015 | Project Expenditure | 506,250 | 532,650 | 506,250 | 532,650 | 2,077,800 |
| | ECU administration and IRs | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 400,000 |
| | Sub-total | 606,250 | 632,650 | 606,250 | 632,650 | 2,477,800 |
| 2016 | Project Expenditure | 506,250 | 506,250 | 0 | 0 | 1,012,500 |
| | ECU administration and IRs | 103,750 | 103,750 | 103,750 | 103,750 | 415,000 |
| | Sub-total | 610,000 | 610,000 | 103,750 | 103,750 | 1,427,500 |
| Budget for the scaling-up phase* | | | | | | |

*: Will be the sum of the remaining budget in the special account after the demonstration phase, the total amount of the interest on the special account, and withhold amount at the UNCC.

Annex C

BRP Expenditures

| Description | Amounts spent until 30 th of June 2009 as reported in the JNFP 1 st Biannual Report | Amounts spent between 1 st of July until 30 th and 30 th of December 2009 | Total amount spent until 30 th of December as reported in the JNFP 2 nd Biannual Report |
|---|---|--|---|
| I. Capital Expenditures: | | | |
| 1. Vehicles: | | | |
| Field car #1 | 25,070 | 0 | 25,070 |
| Office car #1 | 19,061 | 0 | 19,061 |
| Double cabin pickups #2 | 45,396 | 0 | 45,396 |
| Director car #1 | 72,359 | 0 | 72,359 |
| Total vehicles | 161,886 | 0 | 161,886 |
| 2. Computers and printers: | | | |
| Desktop #5 | 7,654 | 0 | 7,654 |
| Laptop #2 | 4,069 | 0 | 4,069 |
| Laser printer #5 | 1,695 | 0 | 1,695 |
| Colored laser printer #2 | 10,585 | 0 | 10,585 |
| Total computers and printers | 24,003 | 0 | 24,003 |
| 3. Office equipment and furniture | | | |
| Photocopy machine #2 | 2,953 | 0 | 2,953 |
| Office furniture | 2,175 | 1,511 | 6,639 |
| Total office equipment & furniture | 5,128 | 1,511 | 6,639 |
| Total Capital Expenditures | 191,017 | 1,511 | 192,528 |
| II. Operating Expenditures: | | | |
| 1. Personnel: | | | |
| Director | 86,844 | 22,842 | 109,686 |
| Legal advisor | 55,358 | 2,353 | 57,711 |
| Assistant | 33,436 | 0 | 33,436 |
| Natural resources management specialist #1 | 25,070 | 8,317 | 33,387 |
| Socioeconomic specialist #1 | 24,570 | 8,849 | 33,419 |
| Monitoring and evaluation specialist #1 | 26,319 | 4,158 | 30,477 |
| Administrative #8 | 81,412 | 22,699 | 104,111 |
| Total personnel | 333,009 | 69,218 | 402,227 |
| 2. Experts: | | | |
| Independent reviewers | 377,131 | 0 | 377,131 |
| International experts Rangeland | 11,033 | 0 | 11,033 |
| Wildlife | 11,033 | 0 | 11,033 |
| Socioeconomic | 15,836 | 0 | 15,836 |
| National experts Impact assessment | 6,017 | 0 | 6,017 |
| Feed crops | 6,017 | 0 | 6,017 |
| Travel of international experts | 2,966 | 0 | 2,966 |
| Workshops | 10,181 | 9,138 | 19,319 |
| Total experts | 440,214 | 9,138 | 449,352 |
| 3. Running Costs | | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Travel and allowances | 17,174 | 1,197 | 18,371 |
| Fuel | 14,316 | 3,271 | 17,587 |
| Water and electricity | 1,428 | 844 | 2,272 |
| Communication | 7,242 | 3,477 | 10,719 |
| Office rent | 61,016 | 3,390 | 64,406 |
| Maintenance | 3,855 | 3,281 | 7,136 |
| Others | 14,267 | 1,947 | 16,214 |
| Total running costs | 119,298 | 17,407 | 136,705 |
| Total Operating Expenditures | 892,521 | 95,763 | 988,284 |
| Projects Expenditures | | | |
| Shaumari project | 50,141 | | 50,141 |
| RSCN project | | 51,635 | 51,635 |
| NCARE project | | 51,635 | 51,635 |
| BRDC project | | 51,635 | 51,635 |
| MoA project | | 51,635 | 51,635 |
| JSSD project | | 51,635 | 51,635 |
| Total Projects Cost | 50,141 | 258,175 | 308,316 |
| Total Expenditures | 1,133,679 | 355,449 | 1,489,128 |