

UNDAF Mid-Term Review Workshop Report

Monday, 8 June 2009 and Tuesday, 9 June 2009

Hotel Conrad, Cairo

DAY 1

Monday, 8 June 2009

AGENDA

Time	Activities
8:30	Registration and coffee/tea
9:00 – 9:30	Welcome and Overview by Mr. James Rawley, UNRC <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expectations for the Workshop
9:30 – 11:00	Overview of national priorities Highlights by Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek, MoIC and Dr. Heba Handoussa
11:00 – 11:15	Coffee Break
11:15 – 12:15	Presentation on Egypt's emerging issues by Mr. Ziad Rifai, UNFPA
12:15 – 13:45	Challenges of strategic management in the UN by Mr. Jean Serge Quesnel
<i>13:45 – 14:30</i>	<i>Lunch</i>
14:30 – 15:30	Presentation and highlights of the draft MTR Report by Mr. Christian Privat
15:30 – 16:30	Lessons learned from the UNDAF cycles 2001-2006 and 2007-2011 by Mr. Christian Privat
	<i>Break</i>
16:30 – 16:45	Synthesis, conclusions & wrap-up

Welcome and Overview by Mr. James Rawley, UN RC

- **Expectations for the Workshop**

The UN Resident Coordinator welcomes the participants and thanked Mr. Jean Serge Quesnel and Mr. Christian Privat for supporting the MRT exercise.

Mr. Rawley also provided some background info on the UNDAF M&E process: While each of the UN agencies operating in Egypt is pursuing its specific mandate, they all operate under the framework of the UN Resident Coordinator system currently under the second UNDAF 2007-2011, designed on the basis of the diagnostic analysis of Egypt as provided by the Common Country Assessment (CCA) of 2005.

At the Strategic Planning Retreat in September 2005, Government partners were invited to assist the UN Country Team in formulating the UN family priority areas for the current 5-year UNDAF cycle, spanning from 2007 to 2011.

Based on areas of priority highlighted in the CCA, the eight MDGs and the Government priorities, the UN Country Team and its partners agreed on our five current strategic outcomes that will form the basis of UN assistance.

The UN system, in cooperation with PEMA, designed the UNDAF M&E mechanism and the result was the creation of six UNDAF outcomes M&E task- forces, mandated to report, every year, on the progress towards the five UNDAF priorities. [UNDAF Outcome 3 was divided into two task-forces: one for Environment and one for Regional Disparities].

In addition to the above, the UN Resident Coordinator announced the purpose of the UNDAF MTR strategic exercise as follows:

- (1) Assess progress on the first two and a half years of the UNDAF;
- (2) Analyze both current and emerging priorities for Egypt and help refocus our UNDAF Results Matrix, providing a clear sense of direction especially in view of the next UNDAF cycle;
- (3) Revisit our M&E structure and fine tune the UNDAF Task-Forces indicators.

It was underlined that preliminary findings of the MTR process clearly showed that the current UNDAF, composed of more than 110 outputs, is hard to manage and to monitor, and leaves out important emerging issues. For this reason, outputs that have not yet been acted upon, if not essential, should be withdrawn.

This 'pruning' exercise is at the core of the MTR and will constitute the main discussion of the second day of the workshop- 9 June.

Mr. Rawley highlighted that the UNDAF Mid Term Review will pave the road for the next two and half years of the current UNDAF cycle and represents a strategic exercise in view of the next CCA/UNDAF cycle 2012-2016.

Overview of national priorities

Highlights by Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek, MoIC and Dr. Heba Handoussa

Soft copies of the PowerPoint presentations delivered by Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek, MoIC and Dr. Heba Handoussa will be shared electronically by e-mail and uploaded on the UN Intranet. Participants are kindly encouraged to share copies of these presentations with relevant Agency staff and partners in development.

Presentation on Egypt's emerging issues

Highlights by Mr. Ziad Rifai, UNFPA

Mr. Rifai invited the audience to reflect on the following development and emerging priorities in Egypt: Climate change, refugees, food security, financial and economic crisis, H1N1 /AHI, regional disparities, climate change, population growth, children/youth, water and sanitation, human rights and governance, capacity development).

Mr. Rifai asked the audience to break-out in 5 working groups and rate the above mentioned priorities on the basis of a number of criteria, including: being a national /Government priority; UN technical and financial capacity to tackle the issue; UN comparative advantage and presence of the enabling environment.

The audience was also invited, after rating the priorities, to indicate whether those issues would be better addressed through (1) joint UN programmes (JPs), (2) individual agency programmes, (3) through exercising a convening role with partners or (4) advocacy/awareness raising and (5) technical assistance (TA).

Feedback from the working groups resulted as follows:

Group 1- Rapporteur: Maya Morsy, UNIFEM

Priority areas identified:

1. Poverty
2. Human rights (women empowerment, children)
3. Pandemic/Avian/H1N1
4. Employment
5. Youth Development

The priorities identified above would be tackled by means of joint programming, inter-agency missions, and provision of technical expertise.

Group 2- Rapporteur: Mounir Tabet, UNDP

Priority areas identified:

1. Food crisis: to be tackled by JPs, TA, advocacy and convening partners in development.
2. Regional disparities: a potential pilot programme could be established in one or two Governorates, to be tackled by means of JPs with the UN convening partners.

3. Climate change: the comparative advantage of the UN is reinforced by the presence of a global momentum, with global norms already set.
4. AHI/H1N1: the UN has a comparative advantage and capacity to assist the Government.
5. Population growth

Group 3- Rapporteur: Noha Rifaat, UNDP

This working-group identified a number of cross-cutting areas in each sector:

1. Gender
2. Capacity development
3. Children/Youth
4. Regional disparities

Priority areas identified:

1. Climate change
2. Food crisis
3. Financial and Economic crisis- the UN does not have the financial and technical capacity to tackle the wider spectrum of issues related to this item.
4. HIV/AIDS was not rated as a Government priority and the role of the UN would encompass awareness raising and advocacy.
5. Water/sanitation- the UN is not believed to have the comparative advantage in this area
6. Refugees/migration: was not rated as a Government priority and the role of the UN would encompass awareness raising and advocacy.
7. Slums/population: the UN is believed to have the technical capacity to tackle this specific issue.

Group 4- Rapporteur: Dorothea Schmidt, ILO

Priority areas identified:

1. Regional disparities (employment, decentralization and poverty reduction strategies)
2. Governance (including human rights)
3. Climate Change
4. Education

Group 5- Rapporteur: Karim Bayoumi UNIFEM

Priority areas identified:

1. AHI/H1N1: the UN is believed to have the comparative advantage in this field and the technical capacity to make a difference
2. Population Growth: the UN is believed to have the comparative advantage in this field and the financial and technical capacity to make a difference

3. Financial and economic crisis: the UN is believed to have the comparative advantage in this field and the technical capacity to make a difference.

Challenges of strategic management in the UN
Highlights by Mr. Jean Serge Quesnel

Mr. Quesnel's presentation will be uploaded on the UN Intranet and shared with participants in the workshop.

Presentation on the main findings and recommendations of the draft MTR report by Mr. Christian Privat

After having presented the focus and structure of the MTR report (soft copies of the PowerPoint presentation will be shared electronically by e-mail and uploaded on the UN Intranet), Mr. Privat invited the audience to break-out in seven working groups, each mandated to discuss and provide feedback on the MTR report. Specifically groups were asked to state if they agreed with the findings of the MTR report, if there were any major oversights, if they agreed with the recommendations, and if they would add any other recommendations.

Group 1 was mandated to discuss the section related to ownership and underlined the following:

1. All the findings of the MTR are correct;
2. Ownership is generally not felt enough by the Government;
3. A major oversight is related to unclear objectives of the MTR and the UN added value;
4. It was recommended that UN ownership could be enhanced at different level by defining roles and giving assignments to all actors and that the UNDAF language be more user-friendly.

Group 2 was mandated to discuss the section related to design and focus and underlined the following:

1. Group agrees that the UNDAF is results based, coherent and focused.
2. UNDAF may seem unfocused to outsiders, not due to the number of outputs but rather due to the logic and connections in the logical framework, therefore they recommended:
 - a) Better strategic positioning of the UNDAF. Connections and logic of the results framework matrix could be made simpler through: (1) Pruning exercise; (2) Elevate Outputs and Outcomes to language that demonstrates strategic intent.
 - b) Focusing UNCT limited resources. Better focus and articulation of strategic intent would lead to a better alignment of resources.
3. Other recommendations:

- a) Despite the fact government agencies were involved in the design, they found a challenge in balancing between national goals, international objectives and a deep comprehension of the logical framework. Therefore more capacity building needed in RBM and the development of logic/results chains.
- b) Problem of the current reporting on input level. Need of better training and reporting on UN results.
- c) Indicators need to be focused as well as the results (SMART indicators that could actually measure what the UN is doing).

Group 3 was mandated to discuss the section related to *effectiveness and efficiency* and underlined the following:

1. NCCM recommendation the UN to strengthen its outreach towards champions in GoE, to narrow the communication gap between GoE priorities and UN programmes.
2. It was recommended that the UN should better communicate its mandate and objectives to the wider public, including CSOs, and that line ministries should be better informed about the UNDAF.

Group 4 was mandated to discuss the section related to *five interrelated principles (Human rights-based approach , gender equality, RBM, environmental sustainability and capacity development)* and underlined the following:

1.HRBA

- Not all rights-holders are reflected in the UNDAF (i.e. children at risk)
 - Duty-bearers are limited to one actor (i.e. GoE) while other players are virtually absent.
 - Right holders-receptors lacking the participatory/empowerment aspect
 - Accountability is missing (i.e. who does what?)
2. GENDER – This section was deemed well structured and no recommendations were brought to attention.
 3. RBM- This section contained no SMART results- not all indicators are deemed realistic and measurable, the geographic focus is absent and most results not responding to the policy level.
 4. ENVIRONMENT- This section was deemed well structured and no recommendations were brought to attention.

5. CAPACITY-BUILDING efforts are mostly reflected at the outcome level, while this should happen at the output level. It was also noted that capacity-building and capacity-development are not institutionalized.

In addition to the above, the following recommendations were highlighted:

1. HRBA should include the vulnerable categories, enhance the empowerment and participatory aspects and mechanisms for accountability;
2. Reporting should be more results-based and built against indicators;
3. Reporting is expected to be consistent and not made up of separate organizational reports;
4. An inter-sectoral approach is necessary to integrating a gender perspective;
5. Action plans need to follow capacity-building results.

Group 5 was mandated to discuss the section related to the *monitoring and evaluation* section and underlined the following:

1. Agreed on the MTR findings.
2. Group main concerns were:
 - a) At the beginning there was not a common understanding of the monitoring and evaluation process among part of the UN agencies and especially the government partners as well as CSOs.
 - b) DevInfo wasn't available at the beginning of the process.
3. Agreed upon recommendations of the MTR and added:
 - a) Taskforce meetings should not be limited to reporting times and should take place periodically.
 - b) More commitment from the government is needed, in addition to consistent participation

Group 6 was mandated to discuss the section related to *the role of the UN* and underlined the following:

The MRT report correctly identifies the role of the UN in Egypt's development context, but it was recommended that the UN role includes the following:

1. Awareness raising;
2. Advocacy;

3. More M&E support to GoE.

Synthesis, conclusion and wrap-up by Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek, PEMA; Ms. Erma Manoncourt, UNICEF and Mr. James Rawley, UN RC.

Dr. Talaat Abdel-Malek addressed the audience by sharing the following eight remarks and recommendations:

1. The UNDAF should be outcome-driven, and results-based;
2. The main overarching priority for Egypt is poverty reduction, together with basic primary education, protection of the environment including climate change, governance and human rights, health including the eradication of chronic diseases, and the pursue of long-run food security;
3. The UNDAF pruning exercise is badly needed, and an aggressive pruning is recommendable if we are to end up with a strategic focus, perhaps based on a two-tiers priority structure;
4. The UNDAF document needs to become more clearly understood by the non-specialist, by the policy maker, the CSOs and the general public;
5. Effective ownership and responsibility by the Government can be ensured by identifying ‘champions’ within Line Ministries and institutions, willing to commit humanly and professionally to the UNDAF and the cause of human development;
6. Information derived from monitoring the UNDSAF should be readily provided to policy- makers;
7. Coordination : we needed to open up the coordination scope outside the UN and including a vast range of development partners;
8. Egypt’s national capacity needs to be consistently built and should be implemented through a wider range of interventions than training programmes.

Dr. Abdel-Malek underlined the fact that cross-cutting issues are very important determinants within the development process and should be addressed by establishing inter-Ministerial round-tables.

Ms. Erma Manoncourt underlined the function of the UNDAF DNA diagram, which symbolizes the bridging of gaps in human development by means of a full partnership between the State and its citizens to attain human development.

Ms. Manoncourt also underlined the critical role of inter-agency communication in reporting to colleagues and institutions the outcomes of the UNDAF MTR report.

Mr. Rawley highlighted the importance of tomorrow's pruning exercise and the roadmap for the next CCA and 2012-2016 UNDAF cycle.

DAY 2

Tuesday, 9 June 2009

AGENDA

9:00 – 9:30	Welcome and Overview by Mr. Christian Privat
9:30 – 10:45	Review of the revised UNDAF Results <i>Outcomes 1 & 2</i>
10:45 – 11:00	<i>Coffee Break</i>
11:00 – 12:00	Review of the revised UNDAF Results <i>Outcome 3A and 3B</i>
12:00 – 13:30	Review of the revised UNDAF Results <i>Outcomes 4 & 5</i>
13:30 – 14:30	<i>Lunch</i>
14:30 – 15:30	Challenges for the next UNDAF 2012-2016 by Mr. Jean Serge Quesnel
15:30 – 16:30	Roadmap for the next CCA/UNDAF cycle 2012-2016
	<i>Break</i>
16:30 – 17:00	Synthesis, Conclusions & Wrap-up

Welcome and Overview by Mr. Christian Privat

The UN Resident Coordinator welcomed the participants and thanked them for their participation on the previous day before giving the floor to Mr. Privat, who also thanked all the people involved in the UNDAF Mid-term review, especially the UNDAF M&E taskforces, UN agencies and other partners that worked on the revision of the UNDAF outputs during the last month.

Mr. Privat commented on the fact that the UNDAF results matrix should be 'alive' and updated in a constant basis and reminded to the participants that outputs stated in the results framework matrix should be signed at least by two agencies, so that they will serve as a basis for Joint Programmes.

Before undergoing the revision of each UNDAF outcome area, Mr. Privat explained the criteria that were followed by UNDAF M&E taskforces and UN agencies for this exercise. The revision of the UNDAF outputs – referred as "pruning" – would enable a clearer focus on the strategic results of the UNDAF. It will also offer the opportunity to include ongoing joint activities that were not initially planned and allow the consideration of emerging issues. Agencies were asked to indicate if they were: (1) are currently working on outputs, (2) intend to work on outputs where no

results have been recorded yet, and (3) identify any additional outputs that should be included in the UNDAF.

The revised version of the matrixes for each UNDAF outcome area will be attached as annexes to the minutes.

Review of the revised UNDAF Results Matrix for Outcome 1 and 2

The presentation was made by Ms. Dalia Hassan (Chair) and Mr. Dennis Arrends (Co Chair).

Comments/Suggestions made by participating UN agencies during the pruning exercise:

- CP Outcome 3 focuses on service provision so it is suggested to reposition CP outcome 3 to UNDAF Outcome 3A
- To reposition CP outcome 4 which focuses on gender to UNDAF Outcome 4.
- Include outputs on corporate social responsibility and growing sustainable business (UNDP suggestions)
- Outputs should also be included on emerging diseases such as Avian Influenza
- School feeding should be a component of this outcome area (WFP).

Conclusion:

- The task force should meet again and ensure that the focus of this outcome area is on pro poor policies and state capacity.
- The idea of moving CP outcome 4 to UNDAF outcome 4 was questioned as gender mainstreaming which is different from Women Empowerment which is the focus of UNDAF outcome 4. It was decided to leave CP outcome 4 in UNDAF outcome 1 and simply rephrase/reformulate some of the outputs to ensure more than one UN agency is working on each.
- The World Bank should be an active participant in this UNDAF Outcome area.

The main challenge identified by the group is that some agencies sign up to be responsible for an output but they do not attend the task force meetings and provide very limited inputs during the annual progress report exercise.

Review of the revised UNDAF Results Matrix for Outcome 2

The revised version of the matrix was presented by Ms. Dorothea Smidth (Co Chair) of ILO and Amb. Farouk Ghonem (Chair) Ministry of Manpower and Immigration.

The suggestion made during the pruning exercise was:

- Remove outputs on social dialogue and working conditions as only ILO has signed up to work in these output areas. ILO raised concern about removing these two outputs as that is the only area in the UNDAF where the issue of social dialogue and working conditions are mentioned.
- To add two outputs on migration (IOM).

Conclusion:

- ILO was advised to reformulate the output which might provide other agencies and opportunity to participate in those particular outputs. However some participants raised the issue of the criteria being if only one agency signs up for an output than it should be removed. If this criterion is to be followed then there should be no exceptions.
- This proposal was supported by the Ministry of Manpower because migration is now considered as a government priority as migrants are most affected by the current global economic and financial crises. Egypt depends heavily on remittances and is very much concerned about the rights of its citizens in other countries. This suggestion was welcomed as migration is considered as an emerging priority and currently the EC and UN have a joint programme on migration and development which allows CSOs with the help of the government and UN agencies to implement projects which tackle the issue of the migration within the larger development context.

Review of the revised UNDAF Results Matrix for Outcome 3A

The task-force established to monitor progress on UNDAF Outcome 3 A focuses on gender gaps and regional disparities as reflected in Country Programme Outcome 1 and 2.

It was noted that CP Outcomes 1.1 and 1.7 are different, so the merging of them might not be accurate.

It was highlighted that the main target group of this task-force are local communities including vulnerable groups.

Review of the revised UNDAF Results Matrix for UNDAF Outcome 3B

Outcome 3 B did not present major challenges and the attention of the task-force will be devoted to the revision of the indicators.

Review of the revised UNDAF Results Matrix for UNDAF Outcome 4

The revised version of the matrix was presented by H.E. Ambassador Samiha Abou Steit (Chair) of the National Council for Woman and Ms. Maya Morsy (Co Chair), UNIFEM Regional Representative.

The suggestions/changes proposed during the 'pruning' exercise were:

- Output 1.4 under country programme 1, referring to improved access for girls' and women's access to education and literacy services is overlapping with other education related outputs throughout the UNDAF (UNDAF OC3, CPOC 1 Output 1.3 and UNDAF OC1, CPOC 1, Output 1.5 and UNDAF OC 1, CPOC 3, Output 3.1).
- IOM proposed to add an output on human trafficking (woman and children). A discussion followed if such output should be included under this outcome or under UNDAF OC 5, in governance. IOM underlined that UNDAF outcome 5 focuses on the judiciary system and not necessary on violence prevention and suggested to keep it under UNDAF outcome 4

- Outputs 5.1 and 5.3 under CPOC 5 will be merged together as only one agency has stated to be working under output 5.3 and they can both be easily merged.

Conclusion:

- All changes proposed by the agencies and taskforce will be taken into consideration and included in the revised results framework matrix for outcome UNDAF outcome 4.

Review of the revised UNDAF Results Matrix for UNDAF Outcome 5

The revised version of the matrix was presented by Ms. Iman El Mahdy, representing Dr. Maged Osman (Chair) of the Information and Decision Support Center and Ms. Naglaa Arafa (Co Chair), of UNDP.

The suggestions/changes proposed during the ‘pruning’ exercise were:

Under CPOC 1:

- Output 1.1 on “electoral laws and mechanisms that enable free, fair and transparent elections at all levels, including a digital voting system, are in place” will be removed.
- Output 1.2 under was rephrased in order to be gender sensitive.
- Output 1.4 will be moved and merge into output 3.3 (CPOC 3) on anticorruption issues.
- Output 1.5 was rephrased.

Under CPOC 2:

- The 3 outputs under this country programme outcome will all be merged in one output which will be more focused and directly related with enhancing knowledge and capacities of parliamentarians.

CPOC 3 remained more or less the same with the changes derived from incorporating an output from CPOC 1.

Conclusion:

- The taskforce compromised to make the necessary changes agreed and to send the revised matrix.

Challenges for the next UNDAF 2012-2016 by Mr. Jean Serge Quesnel

The presentation will be uploaded on the UN intranet and shared together with the minutes.

Exercise (Break-Out Groups): There were a set of 5 decisions focused on the next CCA/UNDAF cycle and how the agencies would like to move forward with that particular exercise. The questions and possible answers are attached to the report as an annex. The table below is a matrix of the answers provided by the 4 groups.

The groups were asked to base their decision on what they believe will ‘work’ within the Egypt context and to view the next UNDAF as a follow up to the existing one.

Groups	Decision 1 What is the scope of the UNDAF?	Decision 2 How to do the situation analysis?	Decision 3 What is the role of the UN?	Decision 4 What should be the strategic scenario for the UNDAF?	Decision 5 How the UN delivers the strategic results contained in the UNDAF?
A	4- Government with CSOs together with UN and development partners.	*In depth analysis with the involvement of UN, CSOs, Government and Development Partners.	3- UN as a catalyst of development 5--UN Working with CSO in collaboration with government and development partners	2- To have it done via government, CSO and partners.	3- Government with CSO together with UN and Development Partners
B	Either 3- Government with UN and Development Partners. OR 4- Government with CSO together with UN and development partners.	2- Situation Analysis for the development partners. AND 4- Baseline for the Government, CSO, UN and development partners	3- UN as a catalyst of development AND 4- UN as a support to the Government on strategic drivers of the top ten priorities	3- To support Government to enable national execution with development partners	3- Government with CSO together with UN and development partners
C	3- Government with UN and development partners	4- Baseline for the Government, CSO, UN and development partners	4- UN as a support to Government on strategic drivers of the top ten prioritise.	3- To support Government to enable national execution with development partners	3- Government with CSO together with UN and development partners
D	*Government	*Situation	3-	3-	3-

	CSO and UN, in close collaboration with development partners.	Analysis with baselines for development partners	UN as a catalyst of development	To support Government to enable national execution with development partners.	Government with CSO together with UN and development partners
--	---	--	---------------------------------	---	---

** Not part of the multiple choices.*

Conclusion: It is clear from the answers to these questions that the participants believe in that the next UNDAF exercise should be done in very close partnership with Government, CSO, and other development partners. The framework should be designed in an all inclusive manner without losing focus and ensuring all the partners are fully on board. The role of the UN should mainly be to support the Government achieve the national prioritise and share with all partners experience, lessons learnt, and 'know how'. This means that UN's contribution to development in Egypt should focus heavily on technical expertise and experience with some financial support where possible and when affordable.

Roadmap for the next CCA/UNDAF cycle 2012-2016

The roadmap presented in preparation for the next CCA/UNDAF cycle was agreed by participants and shall be shared electronically with UN heads of Agencies and Chairs/Co-Chairs of the six UNDAF Outcome task-forces.

CCA and UNDAF Roadmap	Jun-09	Sept to Dec 09	Jan to June-10	Oct-10	Nov to Dec-10	Feb-11	Mar-11
UNDAF 2007-2011 Mid-Term review							
Plan of engagement and set up of management committee (Egypt 2011 CCA preparations started)							
Situation Analysis and publication of Egypt 2011 Common Country Assessment (CCA)							
Strategic Planning Retreat in preparation for the UNDAF 2012-2016 (Identification of Top 10)							
Drafting of UNDAF 2012 -2016							
Joint Strategy Meeting for the UNDAF 2012-2016 -- Endorsement of UNDAF							
GoE and UN co-signature of final UNDAF 2012-2016							

Synthesis, conclusions and wrap-up

In closing this two days workshop, Ms. Erma Manoncourt underlined the importance of working in partnership to successfully complete the current UNDAF cycle and highlighted the importance of involving in the UNDAF monitoring and evaluation process more champions within our own organizations.

ANNEX 1- List of participants of Monday, 8 June 2009

Organization	Representative	Title
Academia	Dr. Heba Handoussa	National expert
UN	Mr. James W. Rawley	UN Resident Coordinator
Ministry of International Cooperation/PEMA	Dr. Talaat Abdel Malek	Executive Director & Economic Advisor to the Minister
FAO	Mr. Abdel Salam Ouldahmed	Representative
FAO	Mr. Mohamed El Ansary	Assistant FAOR Egypt
Egyptian Center for Women's Rights	Ms. Nihad Aboul Komsan	Director/ Outcome 4
ILO	Ms. Amal Medhat Mowafy	Senior Programme Officer/Outcome 2
ILO	Mr. Luca Azzoni	Senior Skills Specialist/Outcome 2
ILO	Ms. Dorothea Schmidt	Senior Employment Specialist/Outcome 2
Information & Decision Center (IDSC)	Ms. Iman El Mahdy	International Cooperation Specialist
Information & Decision Center (IDSC)	Ms. Inji Gamal Al Din	International Cooperation Specialist
IOM	Mr. Mathieu Luciano	Senior Officer
IOM	Ms. Siobhan Simojoki	Junior Project Development Officer
Ministry of Agriculture	Mr. Ismail El-Bagouri	Prof. of Soil and Water Resources Conservation, Scientific Advisor – Egyptian Observatory for Desertification
Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation	Mr. Mohamed Sami	Outcome 3 A
Ministry of Education	Dr. Amin Aboubacar	Officer/Outcome 1
Ministry of Finance	Ms. Ayat Abel Moaty	Director of the Equal Opportunity Unit
Ministry of International Cooperation/PEMA	MS. Yasmine F. Nader	Senior Research & Evaluation Officer & Co-ordinator of Research / Publications
Ministry of International Cooperation/PEMA	Ms. Hanan Khedr	Senior Officer
Ministry of Local Development (MoLD)	Mr. Mohamed Melawk	General Manager for Foreign Relations/Outcome 3 A
Ministry of Local Development (MoLD)	Ms. Mona Maher Aziz	Specialist Foreign Relations/Outcome 3 A

UN Coordination Office

Ministry of Man Power and Migration (MoMM)	H.E. Ambassador Farouk Ghoneim	Advisor to the Minister/Outcome 2
Ministry of Man Power and Migration (MoMM)	Ms. Mona Wahba Ali El Din	Director of International Cooperation/Outcome 2
Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs/EEAA	Mr. Atef Darwish Hassan	
Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation	Mr. Mohamed Ahmed Ghanem	
National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM)	Ms. Dalia Hassan	Officer/Outcome 1
National Council for Human Rights	Ms. Marwa Kazem	Researcher
National Council for Human Rights	Mr. Sameh Fathy	Reseracher
UNAIDS	Dr. Ahmed Khamis	UNAIDS Programme Officer & UNDAF Focal Point
UNAIDS	Mr. Giacomo Crescenzi	UNAIDS UNV and M&E Focal Point
UNAIDS	Dr. Wessam ElBeih	UNAIDS Country Officer
UNDP	Mr. Mohamed Bayoumi	Programme Officer/Outcome 3B
UNDP	Ms. Noha Rifaat	M&E Officer
UNDP	Mr. Mounir Tabet	Country Director
UNDP	Ms. Naglaa Arafa	Programme Officer/Outcome 5
UNDP	Ms. Ghada Waly	Programme Officer
UNFPA	Mr. Ziad Rifai	UNFPA Representative
UNFPA	Mr. Magdy Khaled	UNFPA Assistant Representative
UNFPA	Ms. Mona Moustafa	National Officer/Outcome 4
UNIC	Ms. Magda Khorshid	National Information Officer
UNICEF	Ms. Erma Manoncourt	Representative
UNICEF	Ms. Marilena Viviani	Deputy Regional Director

UN Coordination Office

UNICEF	Ms. Gillian Wilcox	Deputy Representative /Outcome 1
UNIDO	Mr. Paul Makin	Representative and Head of Regional Office in Egypt
UNIFEM	Ms. Maya Morsy	Regional Representative/Outcome 4
UNIFEM	Mr. Karim Bayoumy	Programme Assistant
UNRWA	Mr. Daoud Dawas	Head
UNV	Ms. Leticia Troncoso	Programme Officer
WFP	Mr. Gian Pietro Bordinon	Country Director
WFP	Mr. Wael Kamel	VAM assistant
WFP	Ms. Rania El-Razzaz	M&E Officer
WHO	Dr. Hala El Henawy	National Professional Officer
WHO	Dr. Magdi Bakr	Technical Officer

ANNEX 2- List of participants of Tuesday, 9 June 2009

UN	Mr. James W. Rawley	UN Resident Coordinator
Egyptian Center for Women's Rights	Ms. Nihad Aboul Komsan	Director/ Outcome 4
FAO	Mr. Mohamed El Ansary	Assistant FAOR- Egypt
Information & Decision Center (IDSC)	Ms. Iman El Mahdy	International Cooperation Specialist
Information & Decision Center (IDSC)	Ms. Inji Gamal Al Din	International Cooperation Specialist
ILO	Ms. Dorothea Schmidt	Senior Employment Specialist/Outcome 2
ILO	Ms. Amal Medhat Mowafy	Senior Programme Officer/Outcome 2
IOM	Mr. Mathieu Luciano	Senior Officer
IOM	Ms. Siobhan Simojoki	Junior Project Development Officer
Ministry of Finance	Ms. Ayat Abel Moaty	Director of the Equal Opportunity Unit
Ministry of International Cooperation/PEMA	Dr. Talaat Abdel Malek	Executive Director & Economic Advisor to the Minister
Ministry of International Cooperation/PEMA	Ms. Hanan Khedr	Senior Officer
Ministry of International Cooperation/PEMA	MS. Yasmine F. Nader	Senior Research & Evaluation Officer & Co-ordinator of Research / Publications
Ministry of Local Development (MoLD)	Ms. Mona Maher Aziz	Specialist Foreign Relations/Outcome 3 A
Ministry of Local Development (MoLD)	Mr. Mohamed Melawik	General Manager for Foreign Relations/Outcome 3 A
Ministry of Man Power and Migration (MoMM)	H.E. Ambassador Farouk Ghanem	Advisor to the Minister/Outcome 2
Ministry of Man Power and Migration (MoMM)	Ms. Mona Wahba Ali El Din	Director of International Cooperation/Outcome 2
National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM)	Ms. Dalia Hassan	Officer/Outcome 1

UN Coordination Office

National Council for Women	H.E. Ambassador Samiha Abou Steit	Advisor to the NCW/Outcome 4
National Council for Human Rights	Ms. Nagwa Ibrahime	
UNAIDS	Dr. Ahmed Khamis	UNAIDS Programme Officer & UNDAF Focal Point
UNAIDS	Mr. Giacomo Crescenzi	UNAIDS UNV and M&E Focal Point
UNDP	Mr. Mounir Tabet	Country Director
UNDP	MS. Ghada Waly	Programme Officer
UNDP	Mr. Mohamed Bayoumi	Programme Officer/Outcome 3B
UNDP	Ms. Naglaa Arafa	Programme Officer/Outcome 5
UNDP	Ms. Noha Rifaat	M&E Officer
UNFPA	Ms. Mona Moustafa	National Officer/Outcome 4
UNFPA	Ms. Germaine Haddad	
UNFPA	Ms. Amal Fahmy	
UNFPA	Ms. Maria Agosti	UNFPA
UN-HABITAT	Dr. Muhamad Kadhim	Programme Manager
UNIC	Ms. Magda Khorshid	National Information Officer
UNICEF	Ms. Erma Manoncourt	Representative
UNICEF	Marilena Viviani	Deputy Regional Director
UNICEF	Ms. Gillian Wilcox	Deputy Representative /Outcome 1
UNICEF	Dr. V. Moses	Chief
UNICEF	Mr. Dennis Arrends	Head of Social Policy Department/ Outcome 1
UNICEF	Ms. Inas Hegazi	Education Chief
UNIDO*	Mr. Paul Makin	Representative and Head of Regional Office in Egypt
UNIFEM	Ms. Maya Morsy	Regional Representative/Outcome 4
UNIFEM	Mr. Karim Bayoumy	Programme Assistant
UNV	Ms. Itziar Gomes	Programme Officer

UN Coordination Office

UNV	Ms. Leticia Troncoso	Programme Officer
WFP	Mr. Gian Pietro Bordignon	Country Director
WFP	Ms. Rania El-Razzaz	M&E Officer
WFP	Mr. Wael Kamel	VAM assistant
WHO	Dr. Hala El Henawy	National Professional Officer
WHO	Dr. Magdi Bakr	Technical Officer

ANNEX 3- Support Team for Monday, 8 June 2009 and Tuesday, 9 June 2009

Senior Consultants	Mr. Christian Privat
	Mr. Jean-Serge Quesnel

UN Coordination Office	Mr. John Apruzzese	Head of Coordination Office
	Ms. Daiana Marino	UN/Donor Coordination Officer
	Ms. Fatoumatta Sabally	UN Coordination Analyst
	Mr. Pablo Valenzuela	JPO Coordination Analyst
	Ms. May Seraphim	Coordination Associate