



Small Grants – Project Completion and Impact Report

Instructions to grantees: please complete all fields, and respond to all questions listed below.

Organization Legal Name	Amjad and Majdi Salameh Company (Enviromatics)
Project Title	Land Use Measures to Sustain Traditional Uses of Productive Landscapes in Dibeen Key Biodiversity Area, Jordan
Grant Number	CEPF110274
Date of Report	April 27, 2020

CEPF Hotspot: East Mediterranean – Dibeen KBA

Strategic Direction: (3) Promote the maintenance of traditional land-use practices for the conservation of Mediterranean biodiversity. **Strategic Priority 3.2:** Promote awareness of the value of traditional, biodiversity-friendly land-use practices among local community and government decision makers, to secure their recognition and support.

Grant Amount: US\$ 20,000.00

Project Dates: October 27th 2019 to February 27th 2020

PART I: Overview

1. Implementation Partners for this Project (*list each partner and explain how they were involved in the project*)

Our project is designed to have strong collaboration and coordination with key stakeholders who are concerned with nature conservation, sustainable use of productive landscapes, and agriculture. This include governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, research centers and universities, experts in the field, in addition to local users of the productive landscape in Dibeen KBA. The following summarizes project partners involvement in the implementation of this project:

1. The Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature (RSCN) involvement was pivotal to the conducted cauterization and sensitivity analysis of the study area as they shared relevant information from their most recent CEPF-funded project on KBAs and important plant areas. They also took part in the consultation process through the project life cycle, most importantly during the national consultation workshop during which RSCN field researchers, representatives of the management of the protected areas within the landscape and decision makers took part in the event

and effectively contributed to the discussions. They also encouraged and facilitated the participation of representatives from the Ministry of Local Administration (MoLA).

2. UNDP Jordan were contacted to obtain relevant information and were invited to attend the consultation workshop. The information was collected from the website and it was unfortunate that UNDP could not nominate a participant to attend the workshop, perhaps due to their engagement in other workshops in the same time.
3. GIZ were invited to attend the consultation workshop but unfortunately, they did not nominate a participant to attend the workshop, perhaps due to their engagement in other workshops in the same time.
4. MoLA representatives attended the national consultation workshop and expressed their interest and willingness to support related initiatives and programmes as long as it is in line with existing laws and regulations. Hence, they also explained that they are working closely with the civil society in Jordan, especially the RSCN and UNDP, to mainstream natural heritage and biodiversity in land use planning and management. They further elaborated that they regularly work with local municipalities in similar initiatives.
5. Jordanian consulting firms providing land use planning services to the government of Jordan and related development and donor agencies were part of the consultation process and workshop. Representatives of these firms attended the workshop, provided comments on the draft report, and also provided some suggestions and recommendations which have been incorporated in the final version of the assessment report. The participants in the consultation process explained that the study provided them with good information about productive landscape considerations to be considered in land use planning and management. They elaborated that they are interested in taking part in any similar information sharing and consultation events, and they would be happy to contribute to awareness raising of related governmental organizations and local municipalities on the subject matter.
6. University professors and experts from national research centers and NGOs specialized in productive landscapes, biodiversity, agriculture and GIS were involved in the consultation process and the review of the report. They contributed information about uses of the productive landscape, traditional and current uses and practices, and also provided suggestions for sustaining the productive landscape in Dibeen KBA. The workshop facilitated good exchange of experience and knowledge among the participants, and some mutual research interest was discussed among some of the participants to link biodiversity, agriculture and GIS research to create knowledge about productive landscapes and the measures needed to maintain it. List of participants in the workshop is provided as a separate document.
7. A number of local farmers located within the Mediterranean Hotspot in north Jordan were consulted during the field activity. They contributed information about uses of the productive landscape, traditional and current uses and practices, and also provided suggestions for sustaining the productive landscape in Dibeen KBA.

2. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

What is/are your overall objective(s) / long-term impact(s)?

Civil society and government decision makers understanding of the value of traditional, biodiversity-friendly land-use practices within Dibeen KBA improved, and their appreciation of the need to maintain such uses is enhanced.

What is/are your specific objective(s) / short-term impact(s)?

These need to be achieved within the time frame of your project.

1. Knowledge about traditional and present uses of productive landscape within Dibeen KBA improved and shared with key stakeholders, including its impacts (positive and negative) on biodiversity, and options for maintaining biodiversity-friendly practices.
2. Land use planners and managers related to Dibeen KBA are informed and consulted about science-based and practical approaches for effective, biodiversity responsive and sustainability-oriented land use planning.
3. Project outcomes and lessons learned are discussed with other KBAs within the Mediterranean region.

3. Briefly describe actual progress towards each planned long-term and short-term impact (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each long-term impact from your proposal

a. Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
Civil society and government decision makers understanding of the value of traditional, biodiversity-friendly land-use practices within Dibeen KBA improved, and their appreciation of the need to maintain such uses is enhanced.	The assessment report produced by our project, in addition to the achieved exchange of knowledge and experiences between the participants in the consultation process provides good opportunity to enhance the understanding of national and local decision makers, and also the civil society of Dibeen KBA, about the value of traditional, biodiversity-friendly land-use practices within Dibeen KBA improved, and to simulate their appreciation of the need to maintain such uses is enhanced. It is our understanding the making such information available to the decision makers and civil society organizations would support their action toward advocating and supporting measures and actions aimed to maintain the productive landscape in Dibeen through the application of effective biodiversity-responsible

	<p>land use measures, and through promoting and supporting sustainable uses and best practices.</p> <p>We also understand that future investments to pilot, support and scale up environment and socially friendly uses of the productive landscape, and supporting best practices and innovation aiming at sustainable use of such a landscape would play pivotal role in maintaining the values of the landscape and to achieve sustainable development goals in the area.</p>
--	--

b. Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
<p>1. Knowledge about traditional and present uses of productive landscape within Dibeem KBA improved and shared with key stakeholders, including its impacts (positive and negative) on biodiversity, and options for maintaining biodiversity-friendly practices.</p>	<p>The produced study / assessment report and the consultation process shared all available information on the subject matter with the identified stakeholders. The draft and final version of the main report was shared by email with all attendees of our consultation workshop. The final version is understood to be shared through CEPF. The following short-term impacts were achieved by the project:</p> <p>The study/assessment report was prepared and submitted to CEPF by email immediately after the consultation process and review by the attendees of the national consultation workshop. This report covers the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Assessment of traditional and present uses of the productive landscape within Dibeem KBA, including its impacts (positive and negative) on biodiversity, and options for maintaining biodiversity-friendly practices. ii. A summary of best practices (up to 4), on traditional and non-traditional practices, including products or value chains, which include the integration of biodiversity-friendly land uses with a proven added value of increased benefits to local people adopting such practices. iii. Discussion of the proposed approach for effective, biodiversity responsive and sustainability-oriented land use planning <p>Overall, these milestones have contributed to the participants knowledge about traditional and present uses of productive landscape within Dibeem</p>

Impact Description	Impact Summary
	<p>KBA, including its impacts (positive and negative) on biodiversity, and options for maintaining biodiversity-friendly practices, in addition to best traditional and non-traditional practices. The exchange of knowledge and experience between the participants was instrumental for the prioritization of four best uses and practices, and it is understood to positively contribute to advancing collaboration between related organizations and the civil societies in the area.</p> <p>The participants in the workshop (Total of 33 participants) were encouraged to share the final report with their colleagues and managers, and to update decision makers in their organizations about gathered information and lessons learned. They were also notified about the prospect call for proposals by CEPF which is hoped to address priority options for maintaining biodiversity-friendly practices within the productive landscape of Dibeen, and for the piloting and/or scale up of best traditional and non-traditional practices in the same context.</p>
<p>2. Land use planners and managers related to Dibeen KBA are informed and consulted about science-based and practical approaches for effective, biodiversity responsive and sustainability-oriented land use planning.</p>	<p>The consultation process allowed for fruitful discussion of the main study subject and several related topics. The rich discussions, especially during the consultation workshop which took place at Movenpic Hotel Amman on Tuesday 14/1/2020, were pivotal to the production of the final report. It was also pivotal for informing and consulting the land use planners and managers related to Dibeen KBA are informed and consulted about science-based and practical approaches for effective, biodiversity responsive and sustainability-oriented land use planning. Those planners and managers include representatives of MoLA, the Ministry of Agriculture, local municipalities, the RSCN, the National Agricultural Research Center, university professors from the University of Jordan and Jordan University of Science and Technology, urban and land use planners from key Jordanian consulting firms, and other civil society organizations.</p>
<p>3. Project outcomes and lessons learned are discussed with other KBAs within the Mediterranean region.</p>	<p>This was achieved during the consultation and coordination workshop organized by CEPF at the Dead Sea area in Jordan on the 1st and 2nd of February 2020. All project findings and lessons</p>

Impact Description	Impact Summary
	<p>learned from Jordan were presented and discussed with the participants from CEPF, and CEPF grantees Tunisia, Lebanon and Morocco.</p> <p>This event also allowed our project team representative to obtain more information about similar studies from the mentioned countries, including their lessons learned, and allowed for fruitful discussions and exchange of knowledge and experience.</p>

4. Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impacts

Successes:

- 1) The produced study / assessment report and the consultation process shared all available information on the subject matter with the identified stakeholders. The draft and final version of the main report was shared by email with all attendees of our consultation workshop. The final version is understood to be shared through CEPF.
- 2) Information from local farmers and users of the productive landscape were gathered and included in the assessment report. Their perceptions, views and interested was taken seriously into consideration during the development of study conclusions and recommendations.

Challenges and Overcoming Outcomes:

- 1) Little information is available in the literature about productive landscapes in Dibein in specific and Jordan in general. This also applies to uses of the productive landscape, change in uses and change trends, positive and negative impacts from such changes, and also about potential measures to sustain it. Hence, the locals and experts in the field have inherited a wealth of knowledge which worth documentation and additional assessment.
- 2) Some of the published research on land use trends in the study area were noted to be debatable within the scientific community given that it is based on remote sensing technology, and seems to witness some shortcomings related to resolution of used aerial images for older captures of the study area and comparing it with more recent sat images. Technical remarks regarding the ability of the research to reach reported conclusions are likely to be correct in terms of measuring change trends, hence, all reviewers and consulted experts agreed with trend description (i.e. the nature of change reported but not necessarily the magnitude of change).

- 3) During the field activity it was quite difficult to locate the owners of the farms and we had to identify many of them after inquiring local residents, to collect contact details and then communicate with them to arrange for interviewees.
- 4) Equally important, some of the identified key stakeholders like the UNDP and GIZ could not make it to the consultation workshop due to previous commitments for other events. Hence, their reports were collected from their official websites.
- 5) The field work required additional working days compared to the level of effort estimated in our proposal. This include the work load from the staff and from the hired consultants. Also, we had to replace one of the originally nominated experts with GIS expert given unavailability of the expert nominated in the proposal and also our need to produce GIS maps to present and discuss during the consultation process. We undertook marginal relocation of the level of effort required from the providers of the consultancy services to address study needs, and we replaced the originally nominated urban planner with GIS expert. Thanks to organizing the coordination workshop with other CEPF grantees in Jordan we could cover the costs of additional man-days for the experts.

5. Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

- 1) With exception to Dibeen protected area, most of the biodiversity information, in particular species records, were sparse, scattered and not geo-referenced. This have caused some impact on our ability to produce biodiversity sensitivity maps at the beginning of the project. Hence, participants input during the consultation process allowed us to establish good sense of the spatial biological importance and sensitivity of many localities within the KBA.
- 2) The GIS data gathered and the GIS-analysis maps produced were provided to the RSCN for their use. A positive impact anticipated in perhaps improving the RSCN ability to produce and implement spatial conservation and community development measures within the buffer zone of Dibeen Protected area in specific and the overall KBA.

PART II: Project Components and Products/Deliverables

6. Components (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each component and product/deliverable from your proposal

6. Describe the results for each deliverable:

Component		Deliverable		
#	Description	Sub-#	Description	Results for Deliverable
1	Assessment of the uses of the productive landscape within Dibeen KBA	1.1	Comprehensive review of literature regarding traditional and present use of productive landscape within Dibeen KBA	Completed and results have been included in the Assessment Report submitted by email to CEPF and shared with all participants in the national consultation workshop and in the CEPF-grantees coordination workshop.

		1.2	Field reconnaissance of the KBA and stakeholders interview activities to validate and update data available from literature	Completed and results have been included in the Assessment Report submitted by email to CEPF and shared with all participants in the national consultation workshop and in the CEPF-grantees coordination workshop.
		1.3	Preparation of report on assessment findings	Completed and results have been included in the Assessment Report submitted by email to CEPF and shared with all participants in the national consultation workshop and in the CEPF-grantees coordination workshop.
2	Designing approach for biodiversity responsive land use planning	2.1	Review of the methodologies applied for land use planning within the KBA	Completed and results have been included in the Assessment Report submitted by email to CEPF and shared with all participants in the national consultation workshop and in the CEPF-grantees coordination workshop. Additional GIS maps were produced and shared with CEPF and RSCN.
		2.2	Designing planning approach and guidelines for effective, biodiversity responsive, rights-based and sustainability-oriented land use within Dibeen KBAs	An outline of the suggested approach to sensitivity analysis was included in the draft report version but not in the revised summary report which followed a table of content agreed between CEPF RIT team, our project and other grantees implementing similar projects.
3	Organizing consultation, awareness raising and exchange of lessons learned	3.1	Development of non-technical summary on study findings and key awareness messages for distribution to the participants	Summary report was prepared, submitted to CEPF for review and approved. This report follows a table of content agreed between CEPF RIT team, our project and other grantees implementing similar projects.
		3.2	Organizing workshop for up to 30 participants representing key stakeholders to present assessment findings, proposed approach and guidelines, and to discuss stakeholders' issues and considerations	A national workshop was organized at Movenpic Hotel in Amman on January 14 th 2020 with the participation of 33 participants. Total of 44 persons, of whom 12 are females, were invited to take part in the national consultation workshop. Those persons represent 18 different organizations and are known to have direct contact and communication with other users of the productive landscape in the study area. 33 participants, including our project team members and consultants, were able to take part in the workshop and a list of the participants is provided in Annex 1.
		3.3	Meeting with other CEPF grantees implementing similar projects to present project findings and exchange lessons learned	Our project manager attended this workshop, presented the results from our project including all lessons learned and method remarks. This participation also included very fruitful and elaborated discussion about all aspects listed in the workshop agenda.

7. Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

The main draft report was submitted on 31st of January 2020, and upon receipt of CEPF comments we updated it and prepared a summary report version based on the template agreed during the regional workshop. The summary report was submitted on February 25th 2020.

PART III: Lessons, Sustainability, Safeguards and Financing

Lessons Learned

8. Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building.

Consider lessons that would inform:

- Project Design Process (*aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
 - Project Implementation (*aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
 - Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community
- 1) Reliance on secondary sources and published literature to discuss trends in land use and changes to the productive landscape created healthy debate about possible means to improve the quality of research using new technology and better resolution images. It perhaps worth investing in undertaking of remote sensing of high resolution and quality sat and aerial images by highly qualified expert to produce more trust-worthy knowledge which can be more easily defended during similar consultation events which involve highly experienced professionals in the field. This is likely to require bigger investment of money to purchase such images and services, and would require longer time to analyze and report on these images.
 - 2) Also, the regional coordination workshop was pivotal and of great value as it allowed us to understand the similarities and differences across the Mediterranean region. Having more similar events is likely to enhance knowledge sharing across the region.

Sustainability / Replication

9. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.

- The project is basically a research to gather and share knowledge. It is replicable and can be repeated using the same methods applied for this study. It is also important to note that the sensitivity analysis method is of particular importance and can be used in similar projects and for informed land use planning to achieve biodiversity responsible land use planning.

Safeguards

- Not applicable

10. If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social or environmental safeguards that your project may have triggered.

- Not relevant as the project did not trigger any social or environmental safeguard requirements.

Additional Funding

11. Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of CEPF investment

a. Total additional funding (US\$)

- Zero.

b. Type of funding

Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source, categorizing each contribution into one of the following categories:

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

* Categorize the type of funding as:

- A *Project Co-Financing (other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B *Grantee and Partner Leveraging (other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project)*
- C *Regional/Portfolio Leveraging (other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project)*

Additional Comments/Recommendations

12. Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF.

- All related technical recommendations are provided in the assessment report.

PART IV: Impact at Portfolio and Global Level

CEPF requires that each grantee report on impact at the end of the project. The purpose of this report is to collect data that will contribute to CEPF's portfolio and global indicators. CEPF will aggregate the data that you submit with data from other grantees, to determine the overall impact of CEPF investment. CEPF's aggregated results will be reported on in our annual report and other communications materials.

Ensure that the information provided pertains to the entire project, from start date to project end date.

Contribution to Portfolio Indicators

This project is basically an assessment study which is hoped to support informed decision making regarding CEPF future investments in Jordan and the region, more specifically investments concerned with the maintenance of productive landscapes and best use practices. The delivered assessment report provides details on priority actions and indicators. Hence, change in land use in terms of increased residential and mixed uses on the expense of wilderness and agriculture is advised to be considered as indicator. Such indicator can be measured as either area of land under each use category, and/or percentage of land area subject to positive or negative change.

13. If CEPF assigned one or more Portfolio Indicators to your project during the full proposal preparation phase, please list these below and report on the project's contribution(s) to them.

Indicator	Narrative
3.3 Local authorities in at least 3 priority corridors recognize the importance of traditional, biodiversity-friendly land-use practices and engage in supporting their maintenance.	consultations with key stakeholders in Jordan and Lebanon (local authorities, local communities, Academia and CSOs) has improved knowledge about the importance of traditional practices, their association and positive impacts on biodiversity. Stakeholders participated to the consultation process, recognized such links and are aware of the importance of engaging in maintaining traditional practices that are biodiversity friendly..

Contribution to Global Indicators

Please report on all Global Indicators (sections 16 to 23 below) that pertain to your project.

Not applicable for this project.

14. Key Biodiversity Area Management

Number of hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) with improved management

Please report on the number of hectares in KBAs with improved management, as a result of CEPF investment. Examples of improved management include, but are not restricted to: increased patrolling, reduced intensity of snaring, invasive species eradication, reduced incidence of fire, and introduction of sustainable agricultural/fisheries practices. Do not record the entire area covered by the project - only record the number of hectares that have improved management.

If you have recorded part or all of a KBA as newly protected for the indicator entitled “protected areas” (section 17 below), and you have also improved its management, you should record the relevant number of hectares for both this indicator and the “protected areas” indicator.

Name of KBA	# of Hectares with strengthened management *	Is the KBA Not protected, Partially protected or Fully protected? Please select one: NP/PP/FP

** Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were improved due to implementation of a fire management regime in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were improved due to invasive species removal in the second year, the total number of hectares with improved management would be 500.*

15. Protected Areas

15a. Number of hectares of protected areas created and/or expanded

Report on the number of hectares of protected areas that have been created or expanded as a result of CEPF investment.

Name of PA*	Country(s)	# of Hectares	Year of legal declaration or expansion	Longitude**	Latitude**

** If possible please provide a shape file of the protected area to CEPF.*

*** Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).*

15b. Protected area management

If you have been requested to submit a Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), please follow the instructions below. If you have not been requested to submit a METT, please go directly to section 16.

Should you want to know more about the monitoring of protected area management effectiveness and the tracking tool, please click [here](#).

Download the METT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with the protected area authorities to fill it out. Please go to the Protected Planet website [here](#) and search for your protected area in their database to record its associated WDPA ID. Then please fill in the following table:

WDPA ID	PA Official Name	Date of METT*	METT Total Score

** Please indicate when the METT was filled by the authorities of the park or provide a best estimate if the exact date is unknown. And please only provide METTs less than 12 months old.*

Please do not forget to submit the completed METT together with this report.

16. Production landscape

Please report on the number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity, as a result of CEPF investment. A production landscape is defined as a landscape where agriculture, forestry or natural product exploitation occurs. Production landscapes may include KBAs, and therefore hectares counted under the indicator entitled “KBA Management” may also be counted here. Examples of interventions include: best practices and guidelines implemented, incentive schemes introduced, sites/products certified and sustainable harvesting regulations introduced.

Number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity.

Name of Production Landscape*	# of Hectares**	Latitude***	Longitude***	Description of Intervention

** If the production landscape does not have a name, provide a brief descriptive name for the landscape.*

***Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were strengthened due to certification in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were strengthened due to new harvesting regulations in the second year, the total number of hectares strengthened to date would be 500.*

**** Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).*

17. Beneficiaries

CEPF wants to record two types of benefits that are likely to be received by individuals: structured training and increased income. Please report on the number of men and women that

have benefited from structured training (such as financial management, beekeeping, horticulture) and/or increased income (such as from tourism, agriculture, medicinal plant harvest/production, fisheries, handicraft production) as a result of CEPF investment. Please provide results since the start of your project to project completion.

17a. Number of men and women receiving structured training.

# of men receiving structured training *	# of women receiving structured training *

**Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received structured training in beekeeping, and 3 of these also received structured training in project management, the total number of men who benefited from structured training should be 5.*

17b. Number of men and women receiving cash benefits.

# of men receiving cash benefits*	# of women receiving cash benefits*

**Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received cash benefits due to tourism, and 3 of these also received cash benefits from increased income due to handicrafts, the total number of men who received cash benefits should be 5.*

18. Benefits to Communities

CEPF wants to record the benefits received by communities, which can differ to those received by individuals because the benefits are available to a group. CEPF also wants to record, to the extent possible, the number of people within each community who are benefiting. Please report on the characteristics of the communities, the type of benefits that have been received during the project, and the number of men/boys and women/girls from these communities that have benefited, as a result of CEPF investment. If exact numbers are not known, please provide an estimate.

18a. Please provide information for all communities that have benefited from project start to project completion.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics (mark with x)							Type of Benefit (mark with x)							# of Beneficiaries			
	Subsistence economy	Small landowners	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Other*	Increased access to clean water	Increased food security	Increased access to energy	Increased access to public services (e.g. health care, education)	Increased resilience to climate change	Improved land tenure	Improved recognition of traditional knowledge	Improved representation and decision-making in governance forums/structures	Improved access to ecosystem services	# of men and boys benefiting	# of women and girls benefiting

*If you marked "Other" to describe the community characteristic, please explain:

19b. For each law, policy or regulation listed above, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

No.	Country(s)	Date enacted/ amended MM/DD/YYYY	Expected impact	Action that you performed to achieve this change
1				
2				
3				

20. Sustainable Financing Mechanism

Sustainable financing mechanisms generate financial resources for the long-term (generally five or more years). Examples of sustainable financial mechanisms include conservation trust funds, debt-for-nature swaps, payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes, and other revenue, fee or tax schemes that generate long-term funding for conservation.

All CEPF grantees (or sub-grantees) with project activities that pertain to the creation and/or the implementation of a sustainable financing mechanism are requested to provide information on the mechanism and the funds it delivered to conservation projects during the project timeframe, unless another grantee involved with the same mechanism has already been or is expected to be tasked with this.

CEPF requires that all sustainable financing mechanism projects to provide the necessary information at their completion.

20a. Details about the mechanism

Fill in this table for as many mechanisms you worked on during your project implementation as needed.

NO.	Name of financing mechanism	Purpose of the mechanism*	Date of Establishment**	Description***	Countries
1					
2					
3					

*Please provide a succinct description of the mission of the mechanism.

**Please indicate when the sustainable financing mechanism was officially created. If you do not know the exact date, provide a best estimate.

***Description, such as trust fund, endowment, PES scheme, incentive scheme, etc.

20b. Performance of the mechanism

For each Financing Mechanism listed previously, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

NO.	Project intervention*	\$ Amount disbursed to conservation projects**	Period under Review (MM/YYYY -MM/YYYY)***
1			
2			
3			

*List whether the CEPF grant has helped to create a new mechanism (Created a mechanism) or helped to support an existing mechanism (Supported an existing mechanism) or helped to create and then support a new mechanism (Created and supported a new mechanism).

**Please only indicate the USD amount disbursed to conservation projects during the period of implementation of your project and using, when needed, the exchange rate on the day of your report.

***Please indicate the period of implementation of your project or the period considered for the amount you indicated.

Please do not forget to submit any relevant document which could provide justification for the amount you stated above.

21. Biodiversity-friendly Practices

Please describe any biodiversity-friendly practices that companies have adopted as a result of CEPF investment. A company is defined as a legal entity made up of an association of people, be they natural, legal, or a mixture of both, for carrying on a commercial or industrial enterprise. While companies take various forms, for the purposes of CEPF, a company is defined as a for-profit business entity. A biodiversity-friendly practice is one that conserves or uses biodiversity sustainably.

Number of companies that adopt biodiversity-friendly practices

No.	Name of company	Description of biodiversity-friendly practice adopted during the project
1		
2		
...		

22. Networks & Partnerships

Please report on any new networks or partnerships between civil society groups and across to other sectors that you have established or strengthened as a result of CEPF investment. Networks/partnerships should have some lasting benefit beyond immediate project implementation. Informal networks/partnerships are acceptable even if they do not have a Memorandum of Understanding or other type of validation. Examples of networks/partnerships include: an alliance of fisherfolk to promote sustainable fisheries practices, a network of environmental journalists, a partnership between one or more NGOs with one or more private sector partners to improve biodiversity management on private lands, a working group focusing on reptile conservation. Please do not use this tab to list the partners in your project, unless some or all of them are part of such a network / partnership described above.

Number of networks and/or partnerships created and/or strengthened

No.	Name of Network	Name of Partnership	Year established	Did your project establish this Network/ Partnership? Y/N	Country(s) covered	Purpose
1						

2						
...						

23. Gender

If you have been requested to submit a Gender Tracking Tool (GTT), please follow the instructions provided in the Excel GTT template. If you have not been requested to submit a GTT, please go directly to Part V.

Should you want to know more about CEPF Gender Policy, please click [here](#).

Download the GTT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with your team to fill it out. Please do not forget to submit the completed GTT together with this report.

Part V. Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

- 17. Name:** Majdi Salameh
- 18. Organization:** Amjad and Majdi Salameh Company (Enviromatics)
- 19. Mailing address:** 1126 Amman 11947 Jordan
- 20. Telephone number:** +962797077088
- 21. E-mail address:** msalameh76@gmail.com and/or majdi@i-telematics.com