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**Executive Summary**

UNDP Egypt initiated this Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of Mainstreaming Global Environment in National Plans and Policies by Strengthening the Monitoring and Reporting System for Multilateral Environmental Agreements in Egypt Project (CB2). MTE is instrumental in aligning project activities, outputs and outcome, with defined targets and goals. The evaluation seeks to identify key entry points for enhanced project management, and effective and efficient use of available resources.

This evaluation stems from the information collected from documents and interviews of project staff, project partners, and beneficiaries, focal points for the three conventions and those working with them. The consultant designed and used a questionnaire that included both open-ended questions and questions. The evaluator also held group discussions with project staff and beneficiaries.

Egypt needs to observe the three Rio conventions and meet her obligations. There are actions gaining momentum in terms of institutional development and scaling up pilot projects into policies and plans. However, Egypt will need more time and assistance to be capable to fully meet her obligations. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting are three crucial activities to enable Egypt to be on a path for sustainable development. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting are central for other capacity constraints: a) public participation; b) coordinated mechanisms and synergies; and c) mechanisms for financing activities within the sphere of the three Rio conventions.

Without effective monitoring, evaluation and reporting, the development of integrated national policies cannot adequately take place, even if the necessary capacity developments for policy and strategy formulation were addressed. The objective of CB2 is, therefore, to strengthen monitoring, evaluation and reporting for in Egypt. This is possible through the following outcomes: Outcome 1: An operational monitoring and information management system for MEAs, with a primary emphasis on the three Rio Conventions and synergies between them is established. This is enhanced at the policy, institutional and individual levels; Outcome 2: Coordination mechanisms to comply with the reporting obligations under the global environmental conventions are established; and Outcome 3: Installed funding procedures to achieve monitoring evaluation and reporting practice on a sustainable basis are established.

CB2 is a medium-sized GEF project. It is aligned with the GEF approved Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building. It is also in line with the Interim Guidelines for Cross-Cutting Capacity Building Projects.Meanwhile, CB2 is in line with the UNDAF Outcome 4 on improving institutional capacity building for environmental sustainability. It contributes to achieving UNDP CPAP Outcome 5 on incorporating sustainable management of environment and natural resource into poverty reduction strategies into national development frameworks and sector strategies.

It is not possible to mainstream MEAs into national plans as described in the project document as the planning process in Egypt is sectoral. Fortunately, the Project Management Unit (PMU) and EEAA established number of entry points towards institutional transformation needed to shift from sectoral planning for development into planning for sustainable development, i.e., elaborating Egypt’s National Strategy for Sustainable development (NSSD) for number of reasons. First, the process of elaborating NSSD is not purely sectoral, as it acknowledges the linkages between economic sectors. Second, this process offers an opportunity to identify entry points for mainstreaming the issues related to the three conventions into national policies and plans.

Elaborating the NSSD is not the only entry point for mainstreaming MEAs in national plans. CB2 supported other projects of NCS that show how environmental management systems can support local economic growth as the case of the St. Katherine Protectorate, where the return on an invested US dollar is USD 57.

The implementation arrangements, as described in the project document, seem cumbersome. Yet, the project strategy and implementation arrangements in reality look more organized, simple, effective and efficient compared to that described in the project document. It seems that project strategy and implementation arrangements presently in place are the best for smooth execution.

UNDP-CO and EEAA are in full understanding, and cooperation. The Egyptian Government appreciates the support that UNDP-CO provides. The implementation arrangements as the PMU applies take care of the all coordination and operational issues. UNDP-CO facilitated engaging the project in several UNDP supported strategic initiatives, such as climate change projects and situation of development assistance in Egypt. The PMU of the project capitalized on these opportunities to promote global environment issues for the national development agenda and sustainable development plans to address.

CB2 is replicable, and replicates success stories from the past. The project supported establishing a Unit for International Cooperation at the Desert Research Center (DRC). Today DRC prepared two project proposals for GEF 5 to support. The success of NCS in the protectorate of St. Katherine, which is a GEF project, is another success story to be replicated – it is possible to protect environmental assets if they are tapped to local development.

No doubt that the project has contributed to upgrading the skills of national staff. Most of the interviewees seem to hold a positive view of the status of the project, and where it is right now. The overall opinion of the evaluator and the interviewees about the project is ***satisfactory.***

The project will need to concentrate on the issues pertaining to database. Without functional administrative and scientific databases of the three conventions, the contribution of CB2 will be minimal. EEAA and DRC have to figure out resources for procuring machines and licensed software that has to be simple and adequate to the purpose. The project has to maintain relationships with the constituents. The elaboration of the NSSD is an opportunity that should not be wasted.

To assure validity and reliability of the produced documents, it is recommended to have a system of peer reviewers before accepting outputs from consultants. Many of the reports and documents that the project reviewed did not include terms of reference of the consultant annexed to the report. Furthermore, many recommendations can in the form of “should” and “ought to” without saying how to implement these recommendations. CB2 may need to consider hiring peer reviewers to approve the delivered output.

EEAA has a plan for phasing out and sustainability. It is important that the project has these two schemes within the coming months. A Project Board meeting has to approve these schemes, and the annual work plan(s) have to reflect these two schemes.

It is recommended that PMU re-formulate the indicators as defined in the log-frame. There is also need to revise the wording of the outputs of the project. The Minister for Environmental Affairs has to present the Cabinet of Ministers with a request for a) mechanism of data collection, information generation and sharing knowledge; b) mechanism for coordinated action on monitoring and reporting; and last but not least, c) mechanism for financing the process of information generation. Elaborating the NSSD is an opportunity for extending CB2 outcomes to ultimately have global environmental issues on the national agenda for development.

It is not possible for CB2 to execute the remaining activities, produce the intended outputs and attain the expected outcomes by the closing date. Since the budget of the project shows surplus funds resulting from the conscious spending pattern the PMU adopts; then it is recommended, first, to have an extension at no cost for about 18 months, and then followed by applying schemes for sustainability and phasing out.
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# Introduction

## Purpose of the evaluation

UNDP Egypt initiated this mid-term evaluation. It is instrumental in aligning project activities, outputs and outcome, with defined targets and goals. The evaluation seeks to identify key entry points for enhanced project management, and effective and efficient use of available resources. The objectives of this mid-term evaluation are to:

1. Strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the Project;
2. Ensure accountability for the achievement of the UNDP/GEF objective;
3. Enhance organizational and development learning; and
4. Enable informed decision-making.

Thus, the overall purpose of the evaluation is to:

1. Assess the efficiency of the project;
2. Assess progress towards the achievement of objectives;
3. Identify potential project design problems; and
4. Identify and document lessons learned and to make recommendations to improve the project.

## Key issues addressed

This evaluation addresses number of questions. Atop the list of issues that a mid-term evaluation addresses is the efficiency of project management. To what extent has project management been efficient in using available resources to accomplish the mandates of the project? Has project management been innovative and resourceful? If yes, then how? The answers to these questions might enable project management to efficiently achieve the targets and objectives that the project was set to achieve.

Is the project bound to fulfill its mission? Will the project be able to achieve its goals? If no, what are the problems; what interventions are needed?

The third key issue is to assess the appropriateness of project design. If the project is not bound to achieve its mission, maybe there is a need for reviewing the project design. This revision could extend to project strategy and implementation arrangements; outputs and activities; role of project partners, and so forth.

Finally, the evaluation has to document the lessons learned, which in itself might help in improving the delivery of inputs, for example, revisiting the management structure, and so forth. This last issue will raise questions pertaining to the sustainability of project outcomes, and whether there are plans for phasing out. If not, then what need to be done?

## Methodology of the evaluation

This evaluation stems from the information collected from reviewed documents and interviews. Reviewed documents include, but not limited to, UNDP project document, GEF CEO Endorsement document, progress reports, documents that the project produced, and so forth. Annex 6.4 is an inventory of reviewed documents. The review of documents is a necessary step towards preparing for interviews and discussion for a holistic comprehension of where the project currently stands.

Interviewees are project staff working for the Project Management Unit (PMU), Project Partners, and project beneficiaries, the focal points for the three convention and those working with them. Annex 6.3 lists the interviewed persons. A questionnaire designed to collect information from interviewees is annexed to the report, Annex 6.5. The questionnaire included both open-ended questions and questions with the following a Likert type scale[[1]](#footnote-1) of specific responses: ***Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory,***and***Unsatisfactory.*** In addition to the questionnaire, the evaluator held a group discussion with project staff for a deeper understanding of project situation in terms of achievements, challenges and opportunities. Another discussion group was the people working for DRC who CB2 training and provided with technical assistance. The aim of the interviews and the group discussions is to enrich the analysis on the undercurrents affecting project performance; and then explore possibilities for enhancing project implementation for efficient and effective completion of project activities.

This report consists of six sections. Following this introduction, the report then, briefly, presents the project. This second section of the report depends on information gathered from the project document, GEF CEO Endorsement document, progress reports, etc. The section also addresses the design of the project in terms of its stakeholders; its development and immediate objectives; problems the project addresses; triggers and targets; and outputs and activities; and last but not least, expected outcomes. The section examines the risks, assumptions and external factors as the documents reveal. The section extends to examine issues pertaining to implementation by highlighting constraints, problems, challenges, opportunities and modalities of execution. The third section of the report presents the findings and conclusions of this mid-term evaluation. The section specifically renders findings and conclusions concerning project formulation; implementation; and results. The evaluator analyzed information from both documents, and interviews, including group discussions, to elaborate this section. The evaluator juxtaposed information gathered from the reviewed documents against views of the interviewees; and simple statistical analyses to reach findings and conclusions. This third section then serves as the basis for the fifth section, i.e., Recommendations and Lessons Learned. The sixth section of the report includes all annexes.

# The project and its development context

## Project start and duration

This project, known as CB2, is a medium-sized project. GEF approved the proposal May2008; and the project document was signed on July 2008. The project is designed to be implemented over a period of three years. It is supposed to close on August 2011, but the revised closed date is June 2011. The date of first disbursement was 21st of October-2010.

The project is aligned with the GEF approved Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building. The project is also fully in line with the Interim Guidelines for Cross-Cutting Capacity Building Projects.Meanwhile, the project is in line with the UNDAF Outcome 4 on improving institutional capacity building for environmental sustainability. The project contributes to achieving UNDP CPAP Outcome 5 on incorporating sustainable management of environment and natural resource into poverty reduction strategies into national development frameworks and sector strategies.

## Problems addressed

He who knows others is wise;

He who knows himself is enlightened.

Lao-tzu, The Way of Lao-tzu

There is nothing more frightful than ignorance in action.

[Johann von Goethe](http://www.quoteland.com/author.asp?AUTHOR_ID=960)

Egypt ratified most of the international agreements, including the three Rio Conventions (UNCBD and UNFCCC in 1994, and UNCCD in 1995). During 2005 - 2007, GEF supported EEAA to conduct a National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) for Egypt revealed the thematic and cross-cutting capacity building issues hindering the synergistic implementation of the three aforementioned Rio Conventions. NCSA identified number of factors hindering the capacities of Egypt to fully mainstream the three conventions in national development plans. Atop these issues are public participation; technology transfer; monitoring, evaluation and reporting; financial mechanisms and economic valuation; elaborating and enforcing legislations; and developing scientific research capacities.[[2]](#footnote-2)

NCSA specifically indicated that monitoring, evaluation and reporting represents a cause for a number of these other constraints. Without effective monitoring, evaluation and reporting, the development of integrated national policies cannot adequately take place, even if the necessary capacity developments for policy and strategy formulation were addressed. Tackling the issue of environmental monitoring, evaluation and reporting is a necessity for number of reasons. Information is important for assessment of the status quo. It is crucial to identify the driving forces and pressures; state, impacts, and responses.

This project addresses the constraints of monitoring, evaluation and reporting for the three Rio Conventions. By establishing process of properly reporting and effective monitoring and evaluation for the MEAs will eventually lead to mainstreaming the three conventions into national planning. Hopefully, the success of this project will encourage replication of the project to mainstreaming other environmental conventions.

## Immediate and development objectives

The aim of this project is to strengthen monitoring activities for Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) in Egypt by:

1. Improving data management (including acquisition, processing, exchange and utilization);
2. delineating the monitoring and reporting roles and responsibilities of different concerned entities; and
3. Ensuring the financial sustainability for environmental monitoring, evaluation and reporting.

Table 1 outlines project objectives, outputs and outcomes.

Table Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Objective | Outcomes | Outputs |
| Strengthen monitoring, evaluation and reporting for Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) in Egypt, to promote the mainstreaming of Global Environment in national plans and policies | 1. An operational monitoring and information management system for MEAs is enhanced at the policy, institutional and individual levels | 1.1: A database and its management system developed to include all data categories for global environmental management |
| l.2:Necessary legislative and regulatory changes developed for streamlining integrated monitoring and evaluation for global environmental management |
| 1.3: Capacity of the MSEA and other institutions strengthened for monitoring and evaluation through necessary technical assistance and targeted training |
| 2. Coordination mechanisms estab1ished to comply with the reporting obligations under the global environmental conventions | 2.1 : Necessary legislative and regulatory changes developed for involving sectorial agencies in national reporting to the global environmental conventions in a consistent manner |
|  | 2.2: Communication and feedback mechanisms established for the reporting process to contribute to national policy development and decision making |
| 3. Installed funding procedure to achieve monitoring evaluation and reporting practice on a sustainable basis | 3.1: Funding scenarios developed for monitoring, evaluation and reporting |
|  | 3.2: Necessary legislative and procedural changes developed for operationalizing funding mechanisms for sustainable monitoring, evaluation and reporting |

The project has three outcomes, and seven indicators to measure its immediate objective and three outcomes as indicated in the log-frame, Table 2. The long term objective of the project is to promote the mainstreaming of global environmental issues in national plans and policies. Notice that neither the long term nor the project objectives are Specific on what the project is set to achieve; Measurable to know whether the project is meeting its objective; Achievable, Realistic and Timed, i.e., SMART.

Table Project Log-Frame

| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | | | **Sources of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Baseline value** | **Target value and date** |
| **Project objective**: To strengthen monitoring, evaluation and reporting for Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) in Egypt. | * National Communications on the 3 Rio Conventions responding accurately and timely to Egypt’s obligations * State of the Environment report produced yearly and accurately. | * Inadequate information and reports are not responding to the government requirements; including its international obligations under the MEAs | * By end of project the National Communications on the Rio Conventions will be up-to-date and reflect accurately the state of implementation of these Conventions * By end of project, the yearly State of Environment report includes up-to-date monitoring information on the implementation of the MEAs | * National communications on the Rio Conventions issued by the Government of Egypt * Environmental reports such as the yearly State of Environment * Mid-term and final evaluation reports | 1. The government continues to fulfill its international commitments; including the obligations from the 3 Rio Conventions; 2. The government stays committed to produce yearly State of Environment report 3. The government of Egypt and UNDP-GEF continues to support the capacity development orientation of this project and the key features of capacity development for the environment; |
|  | * Monitoring information is being incorporated in new related plans and policies | * Limited environmental information is produced currently and it is not fed into the planning and policy making process | * By end of project the new policies and plans will integrate information from these National Communications on the Rio Conventions | * New plans and policies * National communications on MEAs | 1. The government of Egypt continues with its commitment to global environmental management and sustainable development, and that the national legislation, policies, programmes and allocation of resources will reflect this commitment; |
| **Outcome 1**: An operational monitoring and information management system for MEAs, with a primary emphasis on the 3 Rio Convention and the synergies between them is established. This is enhanced at the policy, institutional and individual levels. | * An integrated monitoring, evaluation and reporting system for the MEAs created and used to monitor and report the implementation of MEAs in Egypt | * The current approach does not have an unified methodological framework and data collection and management is not standardized * The existing set of environmental indicators is not comprehensive and does not respond to the information requirements | * By end of project the officials standards, norms and procedures are in place and use by the relevant institutions * By end of project the set of environmental indicators in place will respond to the MEAs obligations | * NCSA reports * Official Standards, Norms and Procedures * Official environmental indicators monitored by the relevant institutions | 1. The government (and particularly its relevant Ministry – the MSEA) pursues its policies and budget support to integrate the 3 Rio Conventions monitoring and reporting obligations into the national environmental monitoring and reporting system; |
|  | * Adequate regulations enacted for the use of this system; stating roles and responsibilities of relevant agencies | * The current regulation is not comprehensive for the implementation of an adequate national environmental monitoring system | * By end of project a set of Regulations stipulating R&R of all relevant agencies in monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Rio Conventions | * Statutes of relevant institutions | 1. The Government of Egypt is willing to improve its related regulatory framework |
| **Outcome 2**: Coordination mechanisms to comply with the reporting obligations under the global environmental conventions are established. | * Institutionalized coordination mechanisms in place to fulfill reporting obligations of the signed/ratified global environmental conventions | * Available monitoring data is not shared among the Agencies, no coordination and cooperation occur among the relevant institutions resulting in gaps and duplications | * By end of project the institutional framework is revised with clear mandates reflected in the statutes of the relevant institutions | * Coordination mechanisms in place at MSEA, EEAA and related Agencies * Statutes of relevant institutions | 1. EEAA as the technical arm of the MSEA continues to commit itself to improve the monitoring, evaluation and reporting system of Egypt’s environment; including the implementation of the Rio Conventions |
| **Outcome 3**: Installed funding procedures to achieve monitoring evaluation and reporting practice on a sustainable basis are established. | * An increased financial allocations for environmental monitoring, evaluation and reporting over the long run | * Inadequate funding level to carry out monitoring, evaluation and reporting of the Egyptian’s environment | * Level of funding covering the need for an adequate and operational environmental monitoring and reporting system | * Budget allocated for monitoring, evaluation and reporting * Final Evaluation report | 1. The priorities and procedures of the EEAA and of the MSEA include environmental monitoring and reporting 2. Financial resources sustainable over the long run |

## Main stakeholders

### Target groups

The project has two groups of beneficiaries. The first group of beneficiaries is those agencies that serve as focal points for the three conventions. Climate Change Unit and Nature Conservation Sector at EEAA are responsible for activities under the umbrella of UNFCCC and UNBOD, respectively. Meanwhile, DRC, which is an affiliate of the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR), is the focal point for UNCCD. Other departments within EEAA, such as the General Department for Planning and Follow-up, also benefit from the project, which builds their capacities on mainstreaming the three conventions in the five-year plans of EEAA.

The second group of beneficiaries is the indirect target group. This includes number of line ministries, such as Ministry of Tourism (MoT), Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation (MWRI), etc. The group also includes private sector companies through associations, such as the Federation for Egyptian Industries (FEI), and civil society organizations. The project has connections with this group via preparation of NSSD.

### Project Partners

Project partners are UNDP, GEF and EEAA. UNDP is the GEF implementing agency for the project. EEAA is the implementing partner, i.e. the national executing body. GEF is a trust fund.

### Project implementation bodies

A Project Management Unit (PMU), which the Project Manager heads, is established within EEAA. Project Management Unit (PMU) is based at EEAA responsible for day-to-day management of the project activities and reports directly to EEAA, CEO. A Project Board is responsible for executive management decisions, such as approving budget revisions; work plans, etc., and provides overall guidance to the Project Manager. This committee is also responsible for project assurance reviews. These implementation arrangements are poorly written in the project document, to the extent that it renders the GEF Committee as a body parallel or equivalent to the Project Board.

In reality, GEF National Steering Committee proved extremely useful. IT assures synergies between GEF projects. The committee assures efficient use of GEF resources streamlines any conflicts and maintains proper flow of inputs.

## Results expected

Specifically the project is designed to have the following three outcomes:

1. An operational monitoring and information management system for MEAs, with a primary emphasis on the three Rio Convention and the synergies between them is established. This is enhanced at the policy, institutional and individual levels.
2. Coordination mechanisms to comply with the reporting obligations under the global environmental conventions are established.
3. Installed funding procedures to achieve monitoring evaluation and reporting practice on a sustainable basis are established.

# Findings and Conclusions

## Project formulation

This project builds on the successful experience of the NCSA project[[3]](#footnote-3) by linking project activities global environmental issues to national environmental priorities. Accordingly, the design of the project rests infrastructures at EEAA. It seeks to synergize with ongoing national initiatives in achieving its objectives. For example, it anchors itself with both the GEF National Steering Committee and the National Sustainable Development Committee (NSDC). It also contributes to integrating the State of Environment (SoE) Reports with Environmental Indicators Data Year Book. Often SoE reports provide an assessment of the state of ecosystems in terms of pressures, state, impact and responses (Box 2). Environmental indicators reflect in a simple, straight forward form this information for non-specialists to understand and comprehend. Thus indicators are important tools for informing decision-makers, basis for awareness raising campaigns; and instruments for environmental education.

Box Driving Forces and Pressures; State; Impact, and Response (DPSIR) the Basis for Integrated Environmental Assessment (IEA)

***1***. ***What is happening to the environment and why?*** Answering this question identifies a) the driving forces, such as industrial production; b) pressures, such as discharges of waste water; and also defines c) the state, e.g. water quality in rivers and lakes.

***2***. ***What are the consequences for the environment and humanity?*** The answer to this question determines the impacts on population, economy, ecosystems, such as water unsuitable for drinking.

***3. What is being done and how effective is it?*** The answer to this question determines the response of the society, e.g. watershed protection.

***4. Where are we heading?*** Here the report has to offer the future outlook, i.e., scenarios based on various assumptions. What would be the result if the Business AS Usual (BAU) prevails? What would be the outcome if the society will adopt a market liberalization scheme for rapid economic growth hoping that the once the economy enters a stage of economic maturity, the society can afford to regenerate and conserve the environment? If the society chooses to reform policies to balance equity and efficiency in the economy, what are the implications for the environment?

***5. What actions could be taken for more sustainable future?*** Based on the future outlooks, the report lays out the various policy options for a sustainable future.

Source: Cities Environment Reports on the Internet (CEROI) Programme, Urban Environment Gateway, 8DPSIR Framework,8 UNEP, GRID Arendal, <http://ceroi.net/reports/arendal/dpsir.htm>

Aiming to increase the impacts of the project, avoid the implementation of a standalone initiative and to ensure the sustainability of the activities, the project implements joint training workshops for EEAA Staff with CIDA. Meanwhile, UNDP-CO facilitated engaging the project in several UNDP supported strategic initiatives. The PMU of the project capitalizes on these opportunities to promote global environment issues for the national development agenda and sustainable development plans to address.

The project, as it is spelled out in its objective, aims to induce transform and change in national policies to take into account the three Rio conventions. The links between project objective, outcomes and outputs, as presented in Table 1, are clear. However, the link between strengthening capacities on monitoring environmental data for the three conventions, and then mainstreaming global environment into national plans and policies is not bold. Obviously there are links, but the project document and the GEF CEO Endorsement document do not clearly show these connections; but as will be presented later, the PMU in collaboration with UNDP-CO and EEAA, was able to identify several entry points, such as elaborating the NSSD and transforming protectorates into income generating establishments instrumental in supporting local economies.

In Egypt the processes for policy and plan formulation are basically sectorial; while mitigating and adapting to climate change, protecting and regenerating biodiversity, and managing drought and combating desertification are all cross-cutting issues. It is of utmost importance to identify entry points to be able to convince those responsible for elaborating and executing Egypt’s development plan to mainstream the three Rio conventions in sectoral plans, programs and projects.

The design of the project does not show how it intends to induce transformations in the processes of elaborating policies, plans, programs and projects. The project document, GEF CEO Endorsement document, papers that national consultants prepared and reports on events, such as training and workshops fall short on rendering how exactly the project and its activities and outputs really will change the sectoral planning processes, and thus is able to attain the outcomes already specified in the project document. The project is contributing to the preparation of Egypt’s National Strategy for Sustainable Development (NSSD), which, in this case, can make the linkages that the project document missed.

Almost all of the reviewed documents and reports, which the project produced, examine how to monitor and report ecosystems. These monitoring activities are useful for collecting data used for estimating pressures on ecosystems, useful for purposes of assessing the state of ecosystems, but how this data is transformed into information and knowledge for decision-making, raising awareness and education for an enabling environment that permits mainstreaming global environmental issues in national plans and policies seem need more attention. Future reports need to show how to induce change in various economic sectors.

Once more, the contribution of the project to formulating a NSSD[[4]](#footnote-4) seems to be the solution. First, the process of elaborating NSSD is not purely sectoral, as it acknowledges the linkages between economic sectors. Second, this process offers an opportunity to identify entry points for mainstreaming the issues related to the three conventions into national policies and plans.

### Implementation approach

The implementation arrangements, as described in the project document, seem cumbersome. Yet, as a result of the interviews, the implementation arrangements look more organized and simple.

The CEO of EEAA is the Project Director, who overlooks the project and its links to other public bodies. Ms. Yasmine Abdul-Aziz, the Project Manager is paid by UNDP. She has two persons working with her on the project: an officer for Finance and Administration; and Information, Communication Technology (ICT) expert. Both are paid by UNDP. Ms. Abdul-Aziz has the institutional memory of EEAA donor assistance as she was the project manager of the NCSA.

The project has a Project Board consisting of:

1. CEO of EEAA
2. President of DRC
3. Head of Nature Conservation Sector, EEAA
4. Head of Climate Change Unit, EEAA
5. Director General Division for Following-Up on Donor-Sponsored projects, EEAA
6. Central Administration for Information and Computers, EEAA
7. The Central Administration for Legal Affairs
8. UNDP

The Project Board also includes the following divisions related to CB2:

1. Central Administration for International Cooperation and Relations, and Technical Support, EEAA
2. Unit for Environmental Indicators and Reporting, EEAA
3. Division for Follow-up, EEAA

The formulation of the Project Board is more inclusive, and assures participatory decision making, unlike that described in the project document (Section Two). The project Board performs its duties according to UNDP regulations. It reviews and approves project work plans, progress reports, and overviews project inputs and outputs. Decisions are made on consensus.

The GEF National Steering Committee seems from the project document as another management layer. In reality, this committee proved to be instrumental in:

1. Assuring the technical quality of proposals for projects that Egypt submits to the GEF for financing; and
2. Guarantees synergies between various GEF initiatives in the country.
3. It serves as an advisory body for CB2

Based on the interviews and reviewed documents, it seems that the strategy and implementation arrangement presently in place are the best for smooth execution. The PMU and GEF Unit are under the same person and report to the CEO of EEAA. The Project Board evolved to be an example for participatory decision-making that assures the flow of inputs, the implementation of activities, the realization of outputs and assure the attainment of outcomes.

### Country ownership/Driven-ness

As mentioned earlier, to meet her obligations, Egypt faces the following capacity constraints: a) involving the public in decision-making and implementation of actions; b) a financial mechanism to allocate resources for activities in the sphere of conserving biodiversity; measures for mitigation and adaptation to climate change; and combating desertification and managing drought.

Box 2 Proposed approach for mainstreaming climate change national policies

According to the Situation Analysis report of the Cairo Agenda for Action, declaring protected areas is among the measures Egypt takes to maintain biodiversity. However, the report acknowledges “there are current institutional, financial, and technical challenges facing the management of already declared protected areas. Thus, it would be very difficult to assume the availability of resources to manage the new ones.”[[5]](#footnote-5)

For mainstreaming climate change in all sectors’ plans, there is a need to develop a national strategy for adaptation to climate change and national strategy for low-carbon economy through a multi-stakeholders approach with national and international representation. There is a current opportunity to include a section on climate change in the upcoming national sustainable development strategy that is expected to be produced by 2011.

Source: Handoussa, Heba et. al. Situation Analysis: Key Development Challenges Facing Egypt, p. 104, UNDP, Cairo, 2010.

Egypt is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. The report argues that “despite Egypt’s relatively limited greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions,[[6]](#footnote-6) it is subject to potential impacts of climate change, including sea level rise, inundation of the Nile Delta and associated social and economic effects… There are number of general challenges associated with climate change in Egypt. Mainstreaming of climate change actions in national development plans is the primary challenge in Egypt. Moreover, the country lacks an integrated carbon finance program which is essential to move the country to a low carbon economy. Adding to that, there is lack of financial resources for implementation of climate change actions in different sectors…The main challenge facing this sector is that there is no adaptation strategy for Egypt to cope with the different direct and indirect impact of climate change…Moreover, the lack of institutional capacity to apply adaptation and mitigation measures may worsen the situation, leaving the country with a strategy but no available trained capacity for its implementation. It is expected that climate change impacts will change the distribution map for poverty and for vulnerability to food insecurity.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

The gross area of Egypt is almost one million square kilometers. Desert areas represent about 95 percent of the total area of the country; arid and semi-arid land represent 95 and one percent, respectively, of the total area of Egypt, thus ranking the first hyper arid country among Arab countries. Egypt, therefore, is a severe case of desertification.

Egypt is the fourth country to sign on UNCCD, May 1994. The country elaborated the Egyptian National Program to Combat Desertification, May 1999; three years later, Egypt had her National Action Plan for Combating Desertification. The first National Report for Combating Desertification was in 2004.[[8]](#footnote-8)

The NAP divided Egypt into the following four distinct agro-environmental regions: a) North Coastal Belts;[[9]](#footnote-9) b) the Nile Valley;[[10]](#footnote-10) c) the Inland Sinai and the Eastern Desert; and last but not least, d) the Western Desert, oases and southern remote areas.[[11]](#footnote-11) This taxonomy enables plan formulation to address causes and effects of desertification, and thus proposes suitable interventions. This approach also assist in identifying appropriate techniques, capacity building needs, participating stakeholders , required legislation, economic tools, incentives, finance, social implications, and defining institutional setups and responsible parties. Accordingly, it is possible to compute indicators for desertification processes, as well as, appropriate techniques for monitoring ongoing and future desertification processes in each of these agro-ecological zones.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Both loss of biodiversity and climate change are among the causes for desertification, which in turn has negative impact on Egypt’s ability to secure food for a growing population. DRC has an electronic library, a remote sensing unit, and trained, qualified scholars, yet the effectiveness of the institution is limited. First, the institution just recently had a unit for international relations and technical support[[13]](#footnote-13) that will be instrumental in resource mobilization. Establishing this unit within DRC is an institutional development that is a direct output of the CB2 project. The Board of the Directors of DRC approved establishing this unit May 2011, which is another assurance for the sustainability of the outcomes of CB2. Second, DRC was subject to loot as a result of security vacuum associated with the chaos amid the 25th of January 2011 revolution. The remote control unit lost its equipment including servers, laptops, etc. Fortunately, a copy of the data and information is at the dispose of the Technical Office of the President of DRC.

To sum up this discussion, Egypt is in need to observe the three Rio conventions and meet her obligations. There are actions gaining momentum in terms of institutional development and scaling up pilot projects into policies and plans. However, Egypt will need more time and assistance to be capable to full meet her obligations. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting are three crucial activities to enable Egypt to be on path for sustainable development. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting are central for other capacity constraints: a) public participation; b) coordinated mechanisms and synergies; and c) mechanisms for financing activities within the sphere of the three Rio conventions.

### Stakeholder participation

The heads of Climate Change Unit[[14]](#footnote-14) and NCS of EEAA, in addition to DRC, are the focal points of the three Rio conventions: UNFCCC, UNCBD and UNCCD, respectively. They are partners in this project, and direct target groups, who receive technical assistance and training. Furthermore, other departments of EEAA, such as Planning, Monitoring, also receive assistance. For example, the Head of the Division for Following-up, and acting in-charge Head of the Planning and Monitoring, said that CB2 supported the planning processes of EEAA, including the formulation of the five-year plans, the annual fiscal plan, and monitoring the execution of EEAA plans.[[15]](#footnote-15) She claimed that CB2 was instrumental in avoiding mistakes in the past, and was of use to establish synergies within divisions of EEAA. The Head of the Division for Indicators and Environmental Reports, stated in an interview that CB2 supported her Division in organizing training workshop with the Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN), of the Earth Institute at Columbia University. This initiative aimed to assist EEAA to calculate Environmental Performance Indicators (EPI).[[16]](#footnote-16)

### Replication approach

DRC has 10 research stations in the four agro-ecological regions. Establishing a specialized unit for international cooperation at DRC is bound to help in mobilizing resources for pilot projects to combat desertification. During the interviews held at DRC, the interviewees discussed with the consultant number of initiatives, such as working with Community-Based Organization (CBO) in the various agro-ecological regions. The idea was to give women in these communities technical assistance on fixing sand dunes; preserving, conserving and regenerating range lands; and growing salt and drought resistant crops to gain cash, and feed their families and animals; and providing the locals with veterinarian assistance for health animals. DRC can prepare the technical proposal with the CBO, and will be able to document success stories to be scaled up to the level of national policies and plans.

If the project is able to achieve its outcomes, then there is a potential to replicate this success story. In 1994, EEAA was established, and UNDP sponsored the Technical Cooperation Office for Environment (TCOE),[[17]](#footnote-17) which developed into divisions for planning, monitoring and international cooperation. Today, cadres of TCOE are in key positions within the World Bank, UN organizations, and the Egyptian Government, which has its positive impacts on the Egyptian economy. Ms. Abdul-Aziz herself was a TCOE member.

The success of NCS in the protectorate of St. Katherine, which is a GEF project, is another success story to be replicated. The indicators of St. Katherine, in terms of Pressures, State, Impact and Response, are applicable to other areas within Sinai and other protected areas within Egypt. This information can support in convincing decision-makers that environmental management is not a financial burden, rather an opportunity for local development.

**Cost-effectiveness analysis** (**CEA**) is a form of economic [analysis](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Financial_analysis) that compares the relative costs and outcomes (effects) of two or more courses of action. Cost-effectiveness analysis is distinct from cost-benefit analysis, which assigns a monetary value to the measure of effect.[[1]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cost-effectiveness_analysis#cite_note-CEAvCBA-0) Cost-effectiveness analysis is often used in the field of health services, where it may be inappropriate to monetize health effect. Typically the CEA is expressed in terms of a ratio where the denominator is a gain in health from a measure (years of life, premature births averted, sight-years gained) and the numerator is the cost associated with the health gain. The most commonly used outcome measure is Quality-Adjusted Life Years (QALY). Cost-utility analysis is similar to cost-effectiveness analysis.

Source: Wikipedia <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cost-effectiveness_analysis>

Box 3 Cost-effectiveness analysis

### Cost-effectiveness

Cost-effectiveness analysis helps identify neglected opportunities. It highlights interventions that are relatively inexpensive, yet have the potential to substantially reduce the burdens of a problem. “Cost-effectiveness analysis helps identify ways to redirect resources to achieve more. It demonstrates not only the utility of allocating resources from ineffective to effective interventions, but also the utility of allocating resources from less to more cost-effective interventions.”[[18]](#footnote-18)

The project document does not contain information concerning the cost and effect of current practice versus the cost and effect of expected practices in the future after CB2 closes. For this reason, the economic analysis is difficult in quantitative terms to compute the Cost/Effectiveness (C/E) ratio.

Within the aforementioned context, this report attempts to conduct a more qualitative analysis of both costs and effects of CB2. The project is about building capacities, specifically in the sphere of monitoring, evaluation and reporting on the three Rio conventions.

Capacity building of human resources into sustainable human development is one of the key concepts that evolved from sustainable development. Sustainable human development rests on expanding people’s choices and capabilities by forming social capital.[[19]](#footnote-19) Sustainable development, therefore, starts with people, and will occur only when people are in charge of their destiny. It is the outcome of forms of collective action, as individuals attempt to forgo their immediate self-interest and act in the interest of the community as whole.

The capacity of the people and institutions of the community as well as its ecological and geographical conditions determines to a large extent the ability of the community to adopt a sustainable development path. The fundamental goal of capacity building is to enhance the ability to evaluate and address the crucial questions related to policy choices and modes of implementation among development options.

Within the above framework, CB2 aims to have a mechanism and synergies for data generation and information sharing, particularly knowledge concerning the three Rio conventions, through the three specified outcomes: databases, reporting and funding mechanisms. Delivering training, providing technical assistance and holding consultative workshops are the means to induce institutional transformations essential for generating and sharing information for proper decision-making that eventually will put global environmental issues on the agenda for national development, facilitate reporting on achieved progress, and secure funds needed for sustaining the outcomes of CB2.

### UNDP comparative advantage

In Egypt, Government Institutions view UNDP as a trust-worth institution, and operator of funds. UNDP comes with no hidden agendas. The elaboration of the UNDAF is often an exercise that includes GoE institutions. In many cases UNDP projects received finance from the GoE and other donor agencies.

UNDP is an umbrella for number of initiatives. UNDP enables the processes of resource mobilization. UNDP also is able to influence policy and plan formulation. UNDP sponsors the production of reports, such as the Human Development, the achievements of MDGs, etc. Many of the issues these reports raise are often mainstreamed into national policies, plans, programs and projects. UNDP enables scaling-up success initiatives, and assists South-South cooperation, through UNDP headquarters and regional offices. Moreover, UNDP can support the involvement of other specialized UN organizations and programs, such as FAO, IFAD, UNIDO, UNESCO, UNICEF and UNEP.

In this project UNDP CO has proven to support EEAA and DRC in all phases of project starting formulation of project proposal and into project implementation. UNDP CO has been instrumental in following-up on project activities, outputs and outcomes. UNDP CO will play a pivotal role in the future of this project.

### Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

There are linkages between the three Rio Conventions. Also there are linkages to other conventions, such as RAMSAR and CITES. The impact of climate change on wetlands is known, and thus achieving progress through CB2 will have an impact on Egypt’s efforts to maintain her wetlands. Successful monitoring and reporting on desertification, biodiversity and climate change can also serve Egypt’s efforts to develop an inventory of endangered species, and control their international trade.

CB2 is a step towards better planning for national natural resources. When the project phases out, Egypt will have a functional database accounting for the inventory on climate change, biodiversity and desertification. These inventory lists will be of use to the formulation of the National Strategy for Sustainable Development (NSSD), which is in itself an opportunity to bring other partners and stakeholders on board

### Indicators

In addition to the need to strengthen and render the linkages between objectives, outputs and outcomes, there is a need to revisit the indicators of the project itself as stated in the log-frame and summarized in Table 2.

An indicator should be substantial, reflecting an essential aspect of an objective in precise terms. An indicator should be independent at different levels, i.e., an indicator cannot be used for more than one objective. It should be factual reflecting than subjective impression; plausible, changes recorded can be directly attributed to UNDP-GEF project; and last but not least, obtainable data that are readily available or collected with reasonable extra effort as part of the administration of the project. To summarize, indicators should be "objectively verifiable" when different persons using the same measuring process independently of one another obtain the same measurement; they are guiding values to analyze project concept, and then reviewed when the project becomes operational where they could be replaced by specific indicators.

Put abovementioned definition side by side indicators shown both in Table 2 and the log-frame, most of the seven indicators miss at least one of the parameters to qualify to be an indicator. For example, the indicators for project objective are a) National communication on the three Rio conventions responding accurately and timely on Egypt’s obligation; and b) State of Environment report produced yearly and accurately. The baseline indicator, as stated in the log-frame states that Information is inadequate and reports are not responding to the Government requirements, including its international obligations un the MEAs. There are number of observations to be made. First, the three indicators are not timed. Second, the baseline indicator is used to measure progress on both indicators, and then it does not seem to be independent. Third, according to the Egyptian law, EEAA has to prepare annual State of Environment report, submitted to the President and kept at the People’s Council (the Parliament). For years EEAA has been active in producing those SoEs, and publishing in both digital and hardcopies. The website of EEAA on the Internet has SoEs since 2004.[[20]](#footnote-20) However, these SoEs fall short of giving a comprehensive overview of the state of Egyptian Environment. These reports document achievements, and do not follow the guidelines for Integrated Environmental Assessment (IEA)[[21]](#footnote-21) that UNEP uses in elaborating reports such as Global Environmental Outlook (GEO), Africa Environmental Outlook (AEO) and the Environmental Outlook for Arab Region (EOAR).

### Management arrangements

UNDP Egypt is the GEF Implementing Agency for this project, which is nationally executed. The Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA) is the implementing partner.

EEAA set up a Project Management Unit (PMU), which a Project Manager heads. UNDP and EEAA jointly recruited the Project Manager, i.e., Ms. Yasmine F. Abdul-Aziz. She is responsible for recruiting two project staff, i.e., Khaled Roushdi for finance and administration, and Ahmed Saeed, for ICT. Ms. Abdul-Aziz is also in charge of 1) coordinating execution of all the project activities, 2) developing action plans and reporting progress to UNDP, 3) coordinating, networking and soliciting the participation of all concerned, 4) regular progress reports, 5) identifying bottlenecks and 6) suggesting corrective measures when necessary.

The project has a Project Board consisting of EEAA, UNDP, and the national focal points for the three Rio conventions. The Project Manager acts as a secretariat for the Project Board. She is responsible for 1) convening the meetings, 2) preparing the agenda, 3) overseeing preparation of the materials for presentation, and 4) for preparing and distributing minutes of the meetings.

The Project Board is responsible for 1) executive management decisions, 2) providing guidance to the Project Manager, 3) approving project revisions and annual work plans. In short, this board is responsible for project assurance reviews in terms of inputs, outputs and activities.

Since CB2 is one of the GEF projects of Egypt, the GEF National Committee over views it and its activities. The committee provides CB2 with directives and assures synvergies between GEF initiatives in Egypt.

In addition to the three focal points, the General Department for Planning and Follow-up at EEAA is involved in CB2. The project contributes to build the capacity of the staff of the department on reporting process and integrating global environmental issues in the national environmental plans during the preparation of the annual work plan. In addition to supporting the process to initiate the formulation of the National Strategy for Sustainable Development, which might be an opportunity to mainstream global environmental concerning in national policies and plans by inviting other stakeholders, such as line ministries, private sector companies and NGOs to the process of formulating the National Strategy for Sustainable development, CB2 provided the support to mainstream systemic global environmental issues in projects of EEAA that the State budget finances.

## Implementation

### Execution and implementation modalities

#### Project Status and Management

Most of the interviewees seem to hold a positive view of the status of the project and where it is right now. Figure 1 shows that only three out of 18 interviewees think that the current status of the project is marginally satisfactory. To the contrary, 10 and five interviewees think that the current status of the project is satisfactory and highly satisfactory, respectively.

The efforts of Ms. Abdul-Aziz and her colleagues, coordination with UNDP and close supervision of the CEO of EEAA, as well as members of the Project Board are all factors that contribute to the positive attitude that the interviewees expressed. Figure 2 is frequency distribution of the responses of interviewees expressing their opinion in project management. According to the figure, seven out of 18 interviewees think that the project management of CB2 is highly satisfactory. Another 10 interviewees think that the set-up and performance of project management is satisfactory. The remaining interviewee thinks that the performance of project management is marginally satisfactory.

Figure Frequency distribution of responses on the current status of the project

Figure Frequency distribution of responses concerning project management

#### Outcome 1

The first outcome, as stated in the project document, is an operational monitoring and information management system for MEAs enhanced at the policy, institutional and individual levels. This result will be achieved via: 1) a database and its management system developed to include all data categories for global environmental management; 2) necessary legislative and regulatory changes developed for streamlining integrated monitoring and evaluation for global environmental management; and 3) capacity of the MSEA and other institutions strengthened for monitoring and evaluation through necessary technical assistance and targeted training.

The project will soon phase out. Given the current situation in Egypt, it is not expected that EEAA will be able to prepare legislation for streamlining integrated monitoring and evaluation for global environmental management, which requires a consultation with the Ministry of Justice and its Division for Legislation; the Parliament to approve it in a form of a law; then a President to sign it, and finally the Prime Minister to sign its Executive Regulations to be applicable. All of these steps require time and negotiations that EEAA and CB2 do not have. The alternative is: CB2 hires a consultant to prepare study and draft the memo outlining the intended framework for monitoring, evaluation and reporting on global environmental management, and then The Minister of State for Environmental Affairs, in collaboration with the Minister for Justice,[[22]](#footnote-22) presents it to the Cabinet of Ministers. Once the Cabinet of Ministers approves this framework, the Prime Minister can issue an executive decree for all public bodies to follow.

The frequency distribution that Figure 3 presents is negatively skewed. Five interviewees have no opinion, thus their votes did not count. Presently six out of 13 interviewees think that CB2 is achieving outcome 1 ; and four interviewees see that CB2 achievement of Outcome 1 is marginally satisfactory. Only one out of the remaining 13 interviewees thinks that achievement towards Outcome 1 is unsatisfactory.

Reasons for these opinions are numerous. DRC, as mentioned earlier was subject to robbery, and lost their servers. EEAA had some problems concerning the net. Also the personal at the IT department at EEAA lack leadership, and need training and education to be able to continue operating the system once CB2 phases out. Furthermore, the department needs updated licensed software and new machines to handle the system. The system needs more time for testing, and solving bugs that may emerge.[[23]](#footnote-23) NCS has a functional database.

EEAA and DRC have a wealth of experience in the form of scientific information to feed the database. In addition to administrative database that CB2 supported in both institutions, EEAA received assistance from CIDA and other donors. According to Egypt Status Progress of AEIN Implementation (Phase II), November 2008,[[24]](#footnote-24) EEAA has a comprehensive data compendium of environmental data. The compendium contains 1) statistics and satellite data at city, sub-national and national levels; 2) an inventory and a comprehensive listing on the environmental data and indicators for integrated environmental assessment and reporting in Egypt; 3) a comprehensive data compendium of environmental data; and 4) a functional national EIN implementation structure established. In the meantime, there are other former initiatives outside EEAA, such as DATA project that USAID financed at the Ministry of Planning. Hecht’s study covers two distinct but closely related issues. The first is the Egyptian system of environmental statistics; and second, the potential for building environmental accounts in Egypt.[[25]](#footnote-25) Hecht’s study is in line with the National Environmental Action Plan 2002-2017 that UNDP-Capacity 21 sponsored.[[26]](#footnote-26)

Figure Frequency distribution of responses concerning Outcome 1

However, there are number of challenges that can be risks towards fully attaining this outcome. First on the list ids the infrastructure in the form of old machines, and software that is either complex or its license has expired. Furthermore, there is a need to protect the system and the data with proper firewalls, antivirus, etc. The second and most important challenge is to retain trained cadres. Once trained, these cadres often leave public institutions to donor-sponsored projects, private sector companies or abroad for a a higher paying job. The resultant is the need to hire and train new cadres. This vicious circle is a serious weakness and a real risk to CB2 and its outcomes.

Thus, CB2 can achieve this outcome if there is 1) an extension to train the persons at the IT department within EEAA and those responsible cadres at DRC; 2) avail them with new machines and licensed software, and 3) there is an approval from the Cabinet of Ministers and a Prime Minister’s executive decree establishing a system for coordination, monitoring, evaluation and reporting on global environmental issues. CB2 might be able to help both EEAA and DRC in mobilizing resources for procuring the machines and software. To sustain this outcome, both institutions, i.e., EEAA and DRC, need a mechanism to 1) retain trained cadres – it is the experience that many Egyptian public bodies lose their trained, qualified cadres to private sector companies and Arab oil producing countries because of wage differentials; and 2) recover the costs of running, administrative and updating the databases. Once more, CB2 might be able to prepare a study outlining a framework for this mechanism.

#### Outcome 2

Outcome 2 is about establishing coordination mechanisms to comply with the reporting obligations under the global environmental conventions. The design of CB2 envisions attaining the outcome through 1) developing necessary legislative and regulatory changes for involving sectorial agencies in national reporting to the global environmental conventions in a consistent manner; and 2) establishing communication and feedback mechanisms for the reporting process to contribute to national policy development and decision making.

The majority of the interviewees think the performance of CB2 to achieve Outcome 2 is satisfactory, Figure 4. Five out of 18 interviewees think the progress of the project towards achieving the second outcome is satisfactory. In addition, another four interviewees think the progress of the project towards achieving Outcome 2 is highly satisfactory. Three interviewees think that the progress of the project toward accomplishing Outcome 2 is marginally satisfactory. The remaining five interviewees had no opinion on this question, probably they know little on the matter – an issue to which PMU needs to pay more attention.

Due, in part, to the current conditions in Egypt, it is not expected that CB2 will be able to attain Outcome 2-Output 1. The solution is to revisit the output and re-write it to be more realistic. Even during normal conditions, there is no need for a legislation to establish synergies between relevant public bodies and a reporting mechanism. Legislation is, often, to regulate relationships between individuals, and individuals and the State; but not public bodies who affiliate to the same government.

Without those individuals who voted “no opinion,” the frequency distribution seems skewed towards to positive, right side, i.e., satisfactory and highly satisfactory. CB2 has linked DRC and EEAA closer, and DRC was able to produce the first, and only, national report on desertification. DRC has elaborated two proposals for projects that GEF National Steering Committee approved to be presented to GEF for finance. Notice that the success in achieving Outcome 2 is, to great extent, depending on accomplishing Outcome 1. Thus, CB2 can achieve Outcome 2, only if Outcome One is accomplished, and a decree from the Prime Minister establishes a mechanism for coordination. This is possible if CB2 has the time and resources. Thus it is expected that if CB2 extends at no cost, then attaining Outcome 2 is possible.

Figure Frequency distribution of responses concerning Outcome 2

#### Outcome 3

Installed funding procedure to achieve monitoring evaluation and reporting practice on a sustainable basis is the third outcome of CB2. The project needs 1) funding scenarios developed for monitoring, evaluation and reporting; and 2) necessary legislative and procedural changes developed for operationalizing funding mechanisms for sustainable monitoring, evaluation and reporting to achieve the outcome.

According to EEAA CEO, the agency has a scheme for sustaining the gains of CB2. First is to fully develop the GEF Unit under the CEO of EEAA, and institutionalize the Unit for International Cooperation at DRC, under the President of DRC. The latest Board of Directors of DRC that the Minister of Agriculture and Land Reclamation heads held May 2011 approved establishing the unit. Second is to allocate funds from the State budget to these two units to continue the successful endeavor that CB2 started, just as CB2 evolved from NCSA. Third is to replicate the success of NCS to be self-sufficient, and transform solutions for global environmental issues into solutions for local development.

The frequency distribution that Figure 5 exhibits suggests that CB2 can attain Outcome 3. There are five and four out of 13 interviewees think that CB2 accomplishment of Outcome 3 is highly satisfactory and satisfactory, respectively. Two interviewees think that the accomplishment of Outcome 3 is marginally satisfactory; and another two interviewees think the accomplishment of the Outcome is unsatisfactory. The five of the interviewees continue to have no opinion on the matter.

As in the case of the previous two outcomes, legislation is not possible, even if the project gets an extension. Once more, the solution is a memo to the Cabinet of Ministers outlining the mechanisms needed for the successful attainment of Outcomes 1, 2 and 3, and an executive decree by the Prime Minister.

Figure Frequency distribution of responses concerning Outcome 3

#### Overall Project Performance

The overall opinion of the 18 interviewees about the project is satisfactory (11 interviewees voted that CB2 is satisfactory. Another fie interviewees think that CB2 is highly satisfactory. Only two interviewees think that the project is marginally satisfactory.

This result reflects the opinions expressed earlier on the status of the project, performance of PMU, and the achievements of the three outcomes. Once there is progress on Outcome One, the overall opinion on the project will improve considerably.

Figure Frequency distribution of responses assessing overall project implementation and achievements

#### Risk assessment

The first foreseen risk is the current situation in Egypt amid the revolution. The country is heading into a phase of transition. Many social strata are raising their voices to get their fair share of national wealth. The global economy is also heading into a recession as a result of the American debt crisis and the Euro zone problems. Given the internal and external environments, the Egyptian economy might not be able to achieve enough dividends to finance projects for environmental protection, regeneration and conservation, i.e., the environment, among others, might not be atop the list of priorities. Fortunately, EEAA and DRC already prepared their five-year plans and are awaiting People’s Council to approve. These plans were prepared with the support of CB2 on a participatory and consultative basis at the local level, which means the possibility of approving the plan and its programs and projects is high to internalize this risk.

The other risk is the capacities of development partners particularly at the local level. The elaboration of the NSSD is in itself an opportunity to build and develop these capacities. NSSD is elaborated using issue-specific, multi-stakeholder forums that ensure ownership and commitments for implementation. Also it is an opportunity for building and developing capacities particularly at the local levels.

#### Proposed Indicators

The project can use the following proposed re-formulated indicators, Table 3.

Table Proposed indicators

| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | | | **Sources of verification** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Baseline value** | **Target value and date** |
| **Project objective**: To strengthen monitoring, evaluation and reporting for Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) in Egypt. | Three accurate, with updated information, and periodically produced reports developed to meet requirements of the three conventions | Inadequate information and reports are not responding to the government requirements; including its international obligations under the MEAs | By end of project the National Communications on the Rio Conventions will be up-to-date and reflect accurately the state of implementation of these Conventions  By end of project, the yearly State of Environment report includes up-to-date monitoring information on the implementation of the MEAs | National communications on the Rio Conventions issued by the Government of Egypt  Environmental reports such as the yearly State of Environment  Mid-term and final evaluation reports |
| **Outcome 1**: An operational monitoring and information management system for MEAs, with a primary emphasis on the 3 Rio Convention and the synergies between them is established. This is enhanced at the policy, institutional and individual levels. | Two databases (administrative and scientific) within the two partners (EEAA and DRC) to host information and data gathered from the field and relevant institutions to assist in measuring Egypt’s progress in observing the three MEAs | The current approach does not have an unified methodological framework and data collection and management is not standardized  The existing set of environmental indicators is not comprehensive and does not respond to the information requirements | By end of project the officials standards, norms and procedures are in place and use by the relevant institutions  By end of project the set of environmental indicators in place will respond to the MEAs obligations | NCSA reports  Official Standards, Norms and Procedures  Official environmental indicators monitored by the relevant institutions |
| **Outcome 2**: Coordination mechanisms to comply with the reporting obligations under the global environmental conventions are established. | PM Executive Decree, based on the resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers, establishing coordination mechanisms for reporting on the three MEAs | Available monitoring data is not shared among the Agencies, no coordination and cooperation occur among the relevant institutions resulting in gaps and duplications | By end of project the institutional framework is revised with clear mandates reflected in the statutes of the relevant institutions | Coordination mechanisms in place at MSEA, EEAA and related Agencies  Statutes of relevant institutions |
| **Outcome 3**: Installed funding procedures to achieve monitoring evaluation and reporting practice on a sustainable basis are established. | PM Executive Decree, based on the resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers, establishing a funding mechanisms for reporting on the three MEAs in a sustainable fashion | Inadequate funding level to carry out monitoring, evaluation and reporting of the Egyptian’s environment | Level of funding covering the need for an adequate and operational environmental monitoring and reporting system | Budget allocated for monitoring, evaluation and reporting  Final Evaluation report |

### Financial Planning

According to interviewees, all members of the Project Board have full information on the finances of the project. Funds are allocated according to approved work plans. As other UNDP projects, CB2 is subject to annual financial and administrative auditing.

The beneficiaries, such as the Unit for preparing Environmental Indicators and Report, and Division for Planning, had information on the amount of money allocated for their activities including consultants, workshop, etc.

The majority of the interviewees (12 out of 18), most of them from DRC Unit for International Cooperation, had no information on the financial matters of the project, probably including the five who had no opinions on Outcomes 1, 2 and 3.

Figure Frequency distribution of responses assessing financial matters of CB2

It seems that project management is frugal. They hold their meetings in Cairo House, which is part of the EEAA premises; or in a three star hotels, which explains how they are doing so much activities with little amount of money, Annex 6.5. Also they are clever in bringing other donors to contribute to events they organize, For example, they brought CENACT, a project for NGOs the CIDA sponsors, to participate in a workshop for NGOs.

CB2 held 14 events including workshops, training, working groups, etc. The number of attendants of these events reached 474 individuals.. The total cost for these events mounted to EGP 189,221. This cost includes: hospitality, accommodation, consultant fees, transportation, and Daily Support Allowance (DSA). Miscellaneous, printing, communication are not included as they are computed as part of the project budget. Thus, on average cost per individual is EGP 399.

The interviewees of DRC had very limited information on the project and its structures, outcomes, outputs and activities. In the future, it seems that the PMU will pay more attention to the needs of the people at DRC by providing on-job training. They hold very high opinion about the consultant that CB2 sent to train them on proposal writing, and of Ahmed Saeed, the IT expert within PMU, who provided them training on operating systems and databases.

### Monitoring and evaluation

Based on the reviewed reports and documents, it is clear that the PMU and UNDP-CO conducted project monitoring and evaluation in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures. The PMU is responsible for preparing the project reports in UNDP-GEF cycle including inception report, baseline report, annual work plans, Annual Progress Reports (APRs), Project Implementation Report (PIR), quarterly progress reports, technical reports, publications, etc. The Project Board and the GEF National Steering Committee review these reports.

PMU prepared PIRs for the years 2009[[27]](#footnote-27) and 2010. The reviewer of the 2010 made valuable comments, which enhance the reporting process. The project has end-of-event reports that also keep track to deduce lessons learnt. All reports on events that the project sponsored included a sub-section on performance and opinion on the event. Reports on training, stakeholder workshops, etc. often ended with a kind of an evaluation. In the future, PMU needs to document best practices and lessons learnt and how to replicate successful stories and avoid mistakes. Table 4 shows the project implementation to day of mid-term evaluation.

Table Achievements of CB2

|  | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target Level at end of project** | | **Present Situation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **National Communications on the 3 Rio Conventions responding accurately and timely to Egypt’s obligations** | Inadequate information and reports are not responding to the government requirements; including its international obligations under the MEAs | | By end of project the National Communications on the Rio Conventions will be up-to-date and reflect accurately the state of implementation of these Conventions | EEAA was able to submit number of national reports on climate change and biodiversity. DRC submitted the first national report. It seems that Egypt is on the correct path towards meeting her obligations. CB2 contributed this capacity development. CB2 was able to mainstream global environmental issues within the national report on key development challenges produced Jan. 2011.. |
|  | **State of the Environment report produced yearly and accurately** |  | By end of project, the yearly State of Environment report includes up-to-date monitoring information on the implementation of the MEAs | | EEAA is currently preparing and publishing SoE reports in both English and Arabic. The agency also published two reports on environmental indicators. However, there is need to observe global convention and methodologies of IEA as UNEP devised for Egypt to be in conformity with regional reports that UNEP produces, i.e., AEO and EOAR. |
|  | **Monitoring information is being incorporated in new related plans and policies** |  | By end of project the new policies and plans will integrate information from these National Communications on the Rio Conventions | | UNDP is preparing its UNDAF. The national report on key development challenges is now published in both Arabic and English. The Government of Egypt is putting together the five years plans 2012-2017 given the transformations in priorities following the January 25th, 2011 revolution. CB2 has contributed to preparing the five year plan of EEAA through multi-stakeholder consultation to assure synergies and ownership of projects at the Governorate level. CB2 sponsored 24 consultative workshops The plan includes a specific program for M&E funded by the State budget. The five year plan is not endorsed yet. It is expected once a new People’s Council is in place to endorse the formulated plan. The tone is to maintain free market economy, but to drop neo-liberal policies of the past, where the Government will play the role of regulator, and catalyst for economic growth. More attention will be paid to social and environmental concerns. |
| **Outcome 1** | **An integrated monitoring, evaluation and reporting system for the MEAs created and used to monitor and report the implementation of MEAs in Egypt** | Limited environmental information is produced currently and it is not fed into the planning and policy making process | By end of project the new policies and plans will integrate information from these National Communications on the Rio Conventions | | The problem is not the limited produced information, rather the quality, reliability and validity of the data and the information based on these data. |
|  |  | The existing set of environmental indicators is not comprehensive and does not respond to the information requirements | By end of project the set of environmental indicators in place will respond to the MEAs obligations | | EEAA produced two reports of environmental indicators. Presently the agency is producing the third edition. EEAA seems on track. |
|  |  | The current approach does not have an unified methodological framework and data collection and management is not standardized | By end of project the official standards, norms and procedures are in place and use by the relevant institutions | | EEAA achieved progress in this area. There is a unit responsible for producing environmental indicators and reports within EEAA. CB2 sponsored number of activities to build the capacities of this unit, such as inviting CIESIN to elaborate indicators for environmental performance and sustainability. The unit produced so far two reports as mentioned above. The method of computation, analysis and other technicalities of constructing the indicator need revision. However, there is progress toward the intended outcome. CB2 has to concentrate more on this issue in the upcoming period. |
|  | **Adequate regulations enacted for the use of this system; stating roles and responsibilities of relevant agencies** | The current regulation is not comprehensive for the implementation of an adequate national environmental monitoring system | By end of project a set of Regulations stipulating R&R of all relevant agencies in monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Rio Conventions | | Legislation as proposed in the project document is not possible because there is no people’s council to approve it. Approaching the Cabinet of Ministers with a proposed mechanism, and then the Prime Minister issues an executive decree might be the answer. |
| **Outcome 2** | **Institutionalized coordination mechanisms in place to fulfill reporting obligations of the signed/ratified global environmental conventions** | Available monitoring data is not shared among the Agencies, no coordination and cooperation occur among the relevant institutions resulting in gaps and duplications | By end of project the institutional framework is revised with clear mandates reflected in the statutes of the relevant institutions | | The project conducted a stocktaking of the existing sectoral committees that could serve as a coordination mechanism for global environmental issues and assessing its effectiveness using SWOT analysis.  The elaboration of NSSD is one of the solutions. Another solution is approaching the Cabinet of Ministers with a proposed mechanism, and then the Prime Minister issues an executive decree because the People’s Council is not in place. |
| **Outcome 3** | **An increased financial allocations for environmental monitoring, evaluation and reporting over the long run** | The current regulation is not comprehensive for the implementation of an adequate national environmental monitoring system | By end of project a set of Regulations stipulating R&R of all relevant agencies in monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Rio Conventions | | Legislation as proposed in the project document is not possible. Approaching the Cabinet of Ministers with a proposed mechanism, and then the Prime Minister issues an executive decree might be the answer. |

Note: All proposed executive decrees for mechanisms are seed for a legislation to pass once the internal political situation in Egypt is stable and functioning following the elections this fall.

Thus, according to the above table, the progress of the project so far seems satisfactory.

According to the frequency distribution that Figure 8 exhibits, monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation, as per log-frame and M&E plan and budget, seem satisfactory. It seems that progress reports, Project Board meetings, GEF National Steering Committee, and other means of M&E are all instrumental in maintaining an internal M&E system.

Figure Frequency distribution of responses concerning M&E, learning and adaptive feedback

### Management by the UNDP country office

Based on the interviews, it seems that UNDP-CO and EEAA are in full understanding, and the Egyptian Government appreciates the support that UNDP-CO provides. The project is nationally executed, and the Assistant to UNDP-Resident Representative, Dr. Mohamed Bayoumi, is Egyptian. He is able to understand where EEAA comes from, and sees the UNDP and GEF requirements and regulations, and his inter-subjective skills and competences are central to efficient, effective and proper communication between the UNDP and the GoE institutions, i.e., EEAA and DRC.

### Coordination and operational issues

Based on the interviews and the group discussions, the implementation arrangements take care of the all coordination and operational issues. It seems these implementation arrangements are contributing to a smooth execution of the project and its activities.

## Results

### Attainment of objectives

The overall assessment of the project based on the document review and interviews suggest that the performance of the project so far is ***satisfactory***. The project enabled institutional transformations by building the capacities of the individuals at the Departments of Planning, Monitoring, and Environmental Indicators and Reports; and those at the DRC Unit for Remote Sensing; Electronic Library; and the Unit for International Cooperation.

The project will need to concentrate on the issues pertaining to database. Without functional administrative and scientific databases of the three conventions, the contribution of CB2 will be minimal. EEAA and DRC have to figure out resources for procuring machines and licensed software that has to be simple and adequate to the purpose. There is no need for cumbersome databases that turn to be a burden on the machine, and in need for well-trained persons that the Government might not afford their salaries.

The project will maintain relationships with the constituents to avoid responses of “no opinion.” The project is participating in the elaboration of the NSSD, which was not within the design of the project, but an action to attain the development objective, i.e., to mainstream global environmental issues into national policies and plans. EEAA and the project will need to set a roadmap for elaborating the NSSD, mobilize resources for the process of elaboration, and most important, is to build partnerships for its execution.

Many of the reports and documents that the project reviewed did not include terms of reference of the consultant annexed to the report. Furthermore, many recommendations can in the form of “should” and “ought to” without saying how to implement these recommendations. CB2 may need to consider hiring peer reviewers to approve the delivered output.

DRC needs to get its newly established Unit for International Cooperation in direct linkage with the Division for International Relations within Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR). This division reports directly to the Minister, and has specialized departments for donors, south-south cooperation, regional and international relations, etc. and has links to the Agricultural Attachés of the Egyptian Embassies abroad.

### Sustainability

The CEO of EEAA has a plan for phasing out and sustainability. EEAA will start the process of handing over the project by seconding number of its staff member to work closely on a daily basis with the PMU to gain experience and knowledge. Furthermore, EEAA and DRC will allocate funds from their budgets to continue sponsoring upcoming activities once the project phases out. The PMU will re-assure the commitments of its two main implementing partners (EEAA and DRC) to achieve appropriate phase out and sustainability of the project. It is important that the project has these two schemes, i.e., for phasing out and for sustainability within the coming months. A Project Board meeting has to approve these schemes, and the annual work plan(s) have to reflect these two schemes.

### Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

No doubt that the project has contributed to upgrading the skills of national staff. At DRC, the individuals at the Unit for International Cooperation had training on project development, and mobilizing resources. Their colleagues at the Electronic Library and the Unit for Remote Sensing also received training on database development and maintenance. Both groups will need on-job training to put the acquired skills and competences.

CB2 provided the staff of divisions and departments of EEAA and RBOs with training and technical assistance to enhance their performance. Based on the available material, it seems that the project provided cadres from both EEAA and DRC with training and assistance to better serve their organization, perform their duties efficiently and effectively, and to gain skills that contribute to their career.

# Recommendations

In terms of project design, it is recommended that:

* PMU re-formulate the indicators as defined in the log-frame.
* Revise the outputs of the project.
* The Minister for Environmental Affairs has to present the Cabinet of Ministers with a request for

1. A mechanism of data collection, information generation and sharing knowledge;
2. A mechanism for coordinated action on monitoring and reporting; and last but not least,
3. A mechanism for financing the process of information generation. Elaborating the NSSD is an opportunity for extending CB2 outcomes to ultimately have global environmental issues on the national agenda for development.

It is important to complete the database, both administrative and scientific where:

* DRC has to procure servers instead of those lost
* EEAA and DRC need to mobilize resources for up-to-date machines and licensed software. There is no need for fancy packages, it is recommended to procure inexpensive hard and software that can get the job done; i.e., efficient and effective.
* Both DRC and EEAA have to establish a system to retain trained cadres
* Both DRC and EEAA have to build their scientific databases as they already built their administrative databases. Both institutions have bits and pieces of information that need to be within a framework to enable information generation and sharing.
* Both institutions have to seek to produce information kits conducive to the needs of various users, such as media, private sector companies, etc. -- probably this might be one of the solutions to recover the costs of data gathering.

With respect to CB2, the PMU, in collaboration with EEAA, DRC and UNDP, has to:

* Prepare a plan for sustainability
* Prepare a plan for phasing out.

These two schemes need to be elaborated immediately following this mid-term evaluation; and then presented to the Project Board for adoption.

It is not possible for CB2 to execute the remaining activities, produce the intended outputs and attain the expected outcomes by the closing date. Since the budget of the project shows surplus monies resulting from the conscious spending pattern the PMU adopts; then it is recommended, first, to have an extension of 18 months at no cost, and then followed by the schemes for sustainability and phasing out.

CB2 can be replicated on other conventions, such as RAMSAR and CITES. The success of NCS at EEAA in using the protectorates as assets and resources for community development can be replicated in the case of managing drought to avoid desertification. By the same token, those responsible for the Climate Change Unit, which is developing into a Directorate, can find opportunities to developing local areas through actions for adaptation and mitigation. The GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) in Egypt has been successful in encouraging NGOs to spread the use of solar heaters, for example. Now, EEAA can scale up these successful experiences to the national development agenda within the overall framework of the NSSD.

To assure validity and reliability of the produced documents, it is recommended to have a system of peer reviewers before accepting outputs from consultants. Local consultants from universities and research institutions can serve as a pool of experts to review produce reports and assure the quality of the work.

# Lessons learned

The project was able to bring the Divisions< Departments, Sectors and Units of EEAA to set together and discuss planning, monitoring, follow-up and reporting. Those responsible for planning and follow-up, EEAA activities communicated with those working for the Central Administration for International Cooperation and Relations, and Technical Support. Both were able to communicate and synchronize their efforts with those working for the Division for following-up on donor assisted initiatives. The collaboration extended to include technical departments, such as NCS and Unit for Climate Change. The project was able to go beyond the boundaries of EEAA to include DRC on board -- an institution that was put of the project as per the project document.

CB2 provides support to the GEF National Steering Committee that emerged from the NCSA. This committee is a participatory, multi-stakeholders forum for decision-making. CB2 provides the committee with technical support, thus strengthening the national policy, planning, and follow-up and monitoring processes of GEF projects in Egypt. This will be sustained through close on job training to the EEAA staff to be seconded to the project during the phase of handing over the project by working vlosely with the PMU.

CB2 availed resources for collaborating with research institutions abroad. The support of CIESIN to the Unit for Environmental Indicators is an example. Today, EEAA is able to produce indicators on the performance of the Egyptian environment. However, there is still need for EEAA to use the international convention of IEA as UNEP uses it for GEO, AEO and EOAR reports.

CB2 extended itself to other initiatives, such as CENACT. This proactive approach assisted in networking and maintaining synergies to use limited resources and achieve the utmost outcomes efficiently and effectively.

# Annexes

## Terms of Reference for Mid-term Evaluation

**INTRODUCTION**

Egypt ratified most of the international agreements, including the 3 Rio Conventions (UNCBD) in 1994, UNFCCC in 1994, and UNCCD in 1995). From 2005 to 2007, under the leadership of the Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs (MSEA) and funded by GEF, a National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) for Egypt was conducted to assess the thematic and cross-cutting capacity building issues hindering the synergistic implementation of the 3 Rio Conventions: Biodiversity, Climate Change and Desertification.

The assessment revealed a number of priority cross-cutting capacity constraints concerned with public participation, technology transfer and cooperation, monitoring, evaluation and reporting, financial mechanisms/economic valuation, legislation formulation/enforcement, and the development of scientific research capacities. In addition, the analysis indicated that monitoring, evaluation and reporting represents a cause for a number of these other constraints. Without effective monitoring, evaluation and reporting, the development of integrated national policies cannot take place adequately, even if the necessary capacity developments for policy and strategy formulation were addressed. Addressing the issue of environmental monitoring, evaluation and reporting is a necessity not only for its own sake, but also for the other identified constraints which can be considered as directly dependent on it.

Thus the main objective of this project is to strengthen monitoring, evaluation and reporting for Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) in Egypt, in order to promote the mainstreaming of Global Environment in national plans and policies. The project aims to accomplish this by 1) improving data management (including acquisition, processing, exchange and utilization); 2) delineating the monitoring and reporting roles and responsibilities of different concerned entities; 3) ensuring the financial sustainability for environmental monitoring, evaluation and reporting. This project will focus on the three Rio conventions (UNCBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD) in coordination with the overall environmental monitoring and reporting mechanisms in Egypt. This Terms of Reference outlines the mid-term evaluation process of this project. The UNDP-GEF Project is implemented by the Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA) as host entity for the National UNCBD and UNFCCC focal points in collaboration with the Desert Research Center (DRC) which is the host of UNCCD focal point.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods (e.g. over 5 or 6 years) are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

This mid-term evaluation is initiated by UNDP Egypt and will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP-GEF procedures two years into the project process.

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess the efficiency of the project, identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned and to make recommendations to improve the project.

The Mid-term Evaluation serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability. Its main objectives are:

* To strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the Project;
* To ensure accountability for the achievement of the UNDP/GEF objective;
* To enhance organizational and development learning;
* To enable informed decision-making;

The mid-term review will assess the overall performance of the project against the baseline data set in the beginning of the project. The evaluation will cover the work carried within the different departments in EEAA and DRC

**Evaluation Audience**

This Mid-term Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course corrective actions, if needed.

It aims to provide managers with strategy and policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project’s expected results and for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

The Evaluation will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.

**Scope of the Evaluation**

The scope of the evaluation is expected to cover the following:

* Review of the status of the project activities and the possibility of achieving all the outcomes in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding. Review of the effectiveness of the project implementation and the use of its financial resources, including adaptive management applied for the revision of the project implementation mechanisms and other actions to overcome the obstacles identified during the implementation of the project,
* Review the current monitoring procedures and methodologies in place,
* Assessment of co-financing and leveraged resources
* Provide recommendations for actions necessary for the long term sustainability and replicability of the achievements
* Provide recommendations on any changes needed, including the finalization of a concrete action plan to address the eventual pending needs or possible corrective action;

Project concept and design

The evaluators will assess the project design. He/she should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, outcomes, outputs, planned activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be assessed. In particular the evaluation is to assess the Project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass the following:

*Attainment of objectives and planned results:*

* Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives are being achieved; taking into account the “achievement indicators”. In addition, the team will assess the indicators matrix as to its utility for determining sustainability and replicability impact.

*Achievement of outputs and activities:*

* Assess the scope, quality and usefulness of the project outputs produced so far in relation to its expected results.
* Assess the feasibility and effectiveness of the work plan in implementing the components of the project.
* Assess the quality, appropriateness and timeliness of the project concepts, project proposals, progress reports with regard to:

*In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria should be rated using the following divisions:* Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory *wit****h an explanation of the rating.***

**DELIVERABLES**

The main product expected from the mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive report following the structure in Annex I and including the Table attached in Annex II on the assessment of co-financing

**EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluator is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards. They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The mid-term evaluation will be based on information obtained from reviewing relevant documents to the project such as the project document, project brief, Annual Project Reports /Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR), minutes of Project Board Meetings, Project Technical Reports and minutes from relevant meetings.

The evaluator should also rely on information gathered through meetings and interviews with target beneficiaries and project staff including government officials, and/or consultants. Interviews should include Egyptian Environment Affairs Agency, Focal Points for the three Rio Conventions, and UNDP. The methodology that will be used by the evaluator should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include scrupulous information on documentation review, interviews held; field visits; participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

* Documentation reviewed;
* Interviews;
* Field visits;
* Questionnaires;
* Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

Although the Evaluator should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.

**IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

UNDP Egypt will contract the consultant and be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, and coordinate meetings with the Government Officials. The Project Management Unit will provide the evaluator will relevant project documentation and will accompany the evaluator in the meetings, as deemed necessary.

**TIMING AND DURATION**

In total the evaluation time frame is one month, incorporating circulation of initial reports for comments. The evaluation consultancy will be a lump sum payment.

**REQUIRED QUALIFICATION**

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out by an independent national consultant that has not participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and does not have any conflict of interest with project related activities. This may apply equally to evaluators who are associated with organizations, or entities that are, or have been, involved in the delivery of the project. Any previous association with the project, the Executing of national implementing Agency or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

The independent national consultant will be responsible for drafting and finalizing the report.

**General requirements:**

University degree in a subject related to governance, public policy, environment or other relevant field;

Experience in implementing environmental policy and familiarity with global environmental agreements;

Recent experience in capacity building as well as monitoring and reporting at national government level;

Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven projects;

Familiarity with issues related to multinational environmental agreements;

Work experience in relevant areas for at least 8 years;

Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;

Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

Excellent English communication skills; Strong writing and analytical skills coupled with experience in monitoring and evaluation techniques;

Computer literacy

Previous involvement in and understanding of UNDP and GEF procedures is an advantage and extensive international experience in the fields of project formulation, execution, and evaluation is required.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

Applicants are requested to send in electronic versions:

* current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact
* price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including the daily fee, per diem and travel costs) by 17th March 2011, to:

Ms. Riina Hynninen

Environment Officer

UNDP Egypt

[riina.hynninen@undp.org](mailto:riina.hynninen@undp.org)

Due to the large number of applicants, UNDP regrets that it is unable to inform unsuccessful candidates about the outcome or status of the recruitment process.

UNDP is an equal opportunity employer and all qualified candidates are encouraged to apply

## Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

(For projects that have undergone a mid-term, phase or a terminal evaluation)

A. Co-financing

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co financing (Type/**  **Source)** | **IA own  Financing (mill US$)** | | **Multi-lateral Agencies (Non-GEF)**  **(mill US$)** | | **Bi-laterals**  **Donors (mill US$)** | | **Central Government (mill US$)** | | **Local Government (mill US$)** | | **Private Sector (mill US$)** | | **NGOs (mill US$)** | | **Other Sources\***  **(mill US$)** | | **Total Financing (mill US$)** | | **Total**  **Disbursement (mill US$)** | |
|  | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** |
| Grant |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.012 |
| Credits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-kind |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.812 | 0.735 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.812 | 0.735 |
| Non-grant Instruments**\*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Types**\*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.012 | 0.812 | 0.735 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

“Proposed” co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.

Please describe “Non-grant Instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Please explain “Other Types of Co-financing”: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Please explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Projects that have not realized expected co-financing levels must provide explanations. Please describe in 50 words the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s global environmental objective.

## List of persons interviewed

(Alphabetic Order)

Ahmed Al-Kholy Deputy to the President of DRC

Ahmed M. A. Youssef Head, Unit for Remote Sensing, DRC

Ahmed M. Diab Research Assistant, Social and Economic Studies, Unit for International Relations, DRC

Ahmed Saeed IT Specialist, PMU

Areej M. Sayed Public Relations, Division for Recording and Information, Unit for International Relations, DRC

El-Sayed Sabry Advisor to the Minister on Climate Change

Ezzat Lewis Director, Central Division for Climate Change

Hoda Omar GEF Unit Officer

Hossam A. Mohamed Modeling Unit and Electronic Library, DRC

Ihab A. Mohamed Translator, Technical Office, Unit for International Relations, DRC

Jehan M. El-Saqqa Unit for Environmental Indicators and Reporting

Khaled Roushdi Financial and Administrative Officer, PMU

Lamia T. Sobhy Egyptian Desertification Observatory, DRC

Mohamed Bayoumi Assistant to UNDP Egypt Resident Reprehensive

Mohamed Derraz Former President, DRC

Mostafa Fouda Former Head of NCS, and Advisor to the Minister of Environmental Affairs

Rabab M. Sadeq Egyptian Desertification Observatory, DRC

Saber Othman Researcher, Central Division for Climate Change

Samah Saleh Department for Planning and Monitoring Department, EEAA

Tarek Salah Youssef Assistant to the National Project Manager, PMU

Yasmine F. Abdul-Aziz National Project Manager

## List of documents reviewed

Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN),Gap analysis of Global and National Environmental Performance Measurement in Egypt, The Earth Institute at Columbia University, February 7th, 2011

Egypt Status Progress of AEIN Implementation (Phase II), November 2008

Handoussa, Heba et. al. Situation Analysis: Key Development Challenges Facing Egypt, UNDP, Cairo, 2010.

Hecht, Joy E. “Environmental Statistics and Accounting in Egypt: Challenges and Opportunities,” Study carried out for the USAID DATA Project, Ministry of Planning, Cairo, Egypt, 2004

Hegazi, Abdel Moneim and El Bagouri, Ismail H. (Coordinating Authors), National Action Plan for Combating Desertification, Cairo, Egypt, 2002

Information System (MEAIS), 11 Oct 2009

MEAIS Development Team, “GAP Analysis Report,” Multilateral Environmental Agreements Information System (MEAIS), 11 Aug 2009

Medium-Sized Project Proposal Request for Funding Under UNDP-GEF Trust Fund, March 2008

Mostafa, Medhat, “Detailed Analysis Report,” Multilateral Environmental Agreements

Ramadan, Adham, “Development of Environmental Indicators,” Interim Report, Strengthening the Monitoring and Reporting System for MEAs in Egypt (CB2), Cairo, Egypt, November 2009

Ramadan, Adham, “Development of Environmental Indicators,” Strengthening the Monitoring and Reporting System for MEAs in Egypt (CB2), Cairo, Egypt, December 2009

Ramadan, Adham, “Improved Communication and Coordination between Relevant Follow-Up Departments in EEAA, “ Strengthening the Monitoring and Reporting System for MEAs in Egypt (CB2), Cairo, Egypt, May 2010

Sabry, Hoda, “A Proposed Coordination Mechanism for the Three Rio Conventions,” Strengthening the Monitoring and Reporting System for MEAs in Egypt (CB2), Cairo, Egypt, August 2009

Salem, Ossama, “Assessment of Environment Mainstreaming in Planning, Budgeting and reporting in MEAs,” Strengthening the Monitoring and Reporting System for MEAs in Egypt (CB2), EEAA, UNDP and GEF, Cairo, Egypt, January 2010

Strengthening the Monitoring and Reporting System for MEAs in Egypt (CB2), Operational Work plan January – June 2009, EEAA, UNDP and GEF, Cairo, Egypt, (undated)

Strengthening the Monitoring and Reporting System for MEAs in Egypt (CB2), Operational Work plan 2010, EEAA, UNDP, and GEF, Cairo, Egypt, (undated)

Strengthening the Monitoring and Reporting System for MEAs in Egypt (CB2), Methodology of Work for Establishing the Institutional Memory for EEAA, (Undated)

UNDP, Project Document

**Documents in Arabic**

أحمد، أحمد سعيد (مهندس) "التوثيق الرقمى الالكترونى لارشيف جهاز شئون البيئة،" فرع القاهرة الكبرى، القاهرة، جمهورية مصر العربية، 17 ديسمبر 2009

أحمد، أحمد سعيد (مهندس) "التوثيق الرقمى الالكترونى لارشيف جهاز شئون البيئة،" فرع القاهرة الكبرى، القاهرة، جمهورية مصر العربية، 17 ديسمبر 2009) عرض PowerPoint)

رمضان، أدهم (دكتور) تقديم الدعم الفنى لتطوير الخطة الخمسية لجهاز شئون البيئة، التقرير الاول، تحديد نقاط القوة ومقترحات للدعم لعملية تطوير الخطة الخمسية القادمة لجهاز شئون البيئة، القاهرة جمهورية مصر العربية، أكتوبر 2009

رمضان، أدهم (دكتور) وحدة إدارة المشروع، تعزيز نظم الرصد والإبلاغ وإعداد التقارير للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، تقديم الدعم الفني لتطوير الخطة الخمسية لجهاز شئون البيئة، التقرير الأول، تحديد نقاط القوة ومقترحات للدعم لعملية تطويرالخطة الخمسية القادمة لجهاز شئون البيئة، د/أدهم رمضان، أكتوبر 2010

رمضان، أدهم (دكتور) وحدة إدارة المشروع، تعزيز نظم الرصد والإبلاغ وإعداد التقارير للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، تقديم الدعم الفني لتطوير الخطة الخمسية لجهاز شئون البيئة، تقييم المكونات المقترحة للخطة الخمسية 2012-2017 لجهاز شئون البيئة وتحديد فرص التكامل بينها، ، مارس 2011

مركز بحوث الصحراء، وزارة الزراعة، الدليل التشغيلى لوحدة العلاقات الدولية والتعاون الفنى، مقترح عمل إدارة وتنظيم وحدة، 2010، القاهرة، جمهورية مصر العربية، (بدون تاريخ)

وحدة إدارة المشروع، متابعة وتقييم الإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، حول تقييم قاعدة بيانات الإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية الحالية، فندق المعادى، 8 ابريل 2009

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، محضر إجتماع الامانة الفنية للتنمية المستدامة، جهاز شئون البيئة، القاهرة، جمهورية مصر العربية، 8 ابريل 2009

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، محضر إجتماع الامانة الفنية للتنمية المستدامة، جهاز شئون البيئة، القاهرة، جمهورية مصر العربية، 23 فبراير 2010

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، محضر إجتماع الامانة الفنية للتنمية المستدامة، جهاز شئون البيئة، القاهرة، جمهورية مصر العربية، 22 مارس 2010

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، محضر إجتماع الامانة الفنية للتنمية المستدامة، جهاز شئون البيئة، القاهرة، جمهورية مصر العربية، 26 ابريل 2010

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، أنشطة ومخرجات المشروع 2009-ديسمبر 2010، برنامج الامم المتحدة الانمائى، مرفق البيئة العالمى، جهاز شئون البيئة، القاهرة جمهورية مصر العربية (بدون تاريخ)

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، "مقترح خطة العمل التشغيلية لاعداد الاستراتيجية الوطنية للتنمية المستدامة،" برنامج الامم المتحدة الانمائى، مرفق البيئة العالمى، جهاز شئون البيئة، القاهرة جمهورية مصر العربية، (بدون تاريخ)

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، ورشة العمل المصغرة لمشروع

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، مقترح خطة العمل التشغيلية لاعداد الاستراتيجية الوطنية للتنمية المستدامة، 2010

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية،

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ، "تقرير ورشة العمل التشاورية حول تقييم التخطيط وتخصيص الموارد لموضوعات البيئة، (مكون 3): سيناريوهات التمويل،" فندق المعادى ، 14 يناير 2010

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ، "ورشة العمل المصغرة لمشروع متابعة و تقييم الاتفاقيات البيئية الدولية حول تقييم عملية التخطيط و تخصيص التمويل للمشروعات البيئية،" فندق كايروتيل بالمعادى، 23 مارس 2009

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ، تقرير تقييم ورشة العمل التدريبية حول رصد وتقييم المشروعات، 6- 8 ديسمبر 2009

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ، تقرير عن تقييم ورشة العمل التشاورية حول رصد موقف اتفاقية التصحر فى مصر، 6- 8 ديسمبر 2009

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ، تقرير عـن ورشــة عمــل "معاً من أجل دور أكثر فاعلية للجمعيات الأهلية في حماية البيئة والحفاظ على الموارد الطبيعية لتحقيق التنمية المستدامة" بيت القاهرة، فندق المعادي 4–6 مايو 2009

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ، محضر إجتماع اللجنة الوطنية لتسيير مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والإبلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية الاجتماع الرابع فندق سوفيتيل، 27 أكتوبر 2010

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ، محضر إجتماع اللجنة الوطنية لتسيير مشروع الرصد والإبلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية قاعة الإجتماعات بمبنى جهاز شئون البيئة، 16 فبراير 2009

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ، محضر إجتماع اللجنة الوطنية لتسيير مشروع الرصد والإبلاغ للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية قاعة الإجتماعات بمبنى جهاز شئون البيئة، 21 يناير 2010

وحدة إدارة المشروع، مشروع تعزيز نظم الرصد والابلاغ، ورشة العمل التشاورية حول رصد حالة التصحر فى مصر للإتفاقيات البيئية الدولية، فندق رومانس – العين السخنة، 6-8 ديسمبر 2009

## Questionnaire used and summary of results

**Mainstreaming Global Environment in National Plans and Policies by Strengthening the Monitoring and Reporting System for Multilateral Environmental Agreements in Egypt Project -- Mid-term Evaluation Report**

**The information collected using this questionnaire is secret and will be used for evaluation purpose only**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |

**Code of Questionnaire**

1. **Information:**
2. Date and Place of Interview: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
3. Name of Interviewee: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
4. Affiliation/Agency/Institution: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
5. Position: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
6. Relation to the Project: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
7. **Status/Progress of Project:**
8. What is the status of the project activities?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding, what is the possibility of achieving all the Outputs/Outcomes within the current timeframe?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. So far, in your opinion, how effective has the implementation of project activities?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. To what extent, have project objectives been achieved?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. .In your opinion, have the scope, quality and usefulness of the project outputs produced so far contribute to achieving the expected results?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. In your own words, assess the feasibility and effectiveness of implementation arrangements, work plans, budget and internal M&E mecahnisms in implementing the components of the project?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. To what extent will the project be able to achieve its immediate objective? And overall development objective? Why? What are your recommendations?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Based on the above, what is your opinion concerning status of the project

Highly Satisfactory ⎕ Satisfactory ⎕ Marginally Satisfactory ⎕ Unsatisfactory ⎕

1. Why?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Project Management:**
2. How is project management responsive and/or adaptive to the project implementation mechanisms that constraints and opportunities shape?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. What are the actions project management considered/implemented to overcome the obstacles and address challenges identified during the implementation of the project?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. What are the current monitoring procedures and methodologies applied to assure that the project is on the correct path?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. In case of need to re-align project in response to specific challenge and/or opportunity, what was the response of project management?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How? Why?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Are you in-charge of/familiar with financial matters of the project?

Yes ⎕ No ⎕

1. If yes, then explain in your own words, how effective is the use of financial resources of the project?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. If yes, then in your own words, assess co-financing and leveraged resources?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How would you assess project management?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How would you strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the Project?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How would you ensure accountability for the achievement of the UNDP/GEF objective?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How would you enhance organizational and development learning?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How would you enable informed decision-making?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Based on the above, what is your opinion concerning project management?

Highly Satisfactory ⎕ Satisfactory ⎕ Marginally Satisfactory ⎕ Unsatisfactory ⎕

1. Why?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Evaluating Project Outcomes:**

Outcome 1: An Operational Monitoring and information management system for MEAs with a primary emphasis on the three Rio Conventions and the synergies between them is established. This is enhanced at the policy, institutional and individual levels

1. What is your opinion concerning achieving Outcome 1?

Highly Satisfactory ⎕ Satisfactory ⎕ Marginally Satisfactory ⎕ Unsatisfactory ⎕

1. Why?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Outcome 2: Coordination mechanisms established to comply with the reporting obligations under the global environmental conventions

1. Based on the above, what is your opinion concerning achieving Outcome 2?

Highly Satisfactory ⎕ Satisfactory ⎕ Marginally Satisfactory ⎕ Unsatisfactory ⎕

1. Why?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Outcome 3: Installed funding procedures to achieve monitoring, evaluation and reporting practice on sustainable basis

1. Based on the above, what is your opinion concerning achieving Outcome 3?

Highly Satisfactory ⎕ Satisfactory ⎕ Marginally Satisfactory ⎕ Unsatisfactory ⎕

1. Why?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation (as per log-frame and M&E plan and budget)

1. Based on the above, what is your opinion concerning achieving Outcome 3?

Highly Satisfactory ⎕ Satisfactory ⎕ Marginally Satisfactory ⎕ Unsatisfactory ⎕

1. Why?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Overall assessment of the project:

1. Based on the above, what is your overall all assessment of the project so far?

Highly Satisfactory ⎕ Satisfactory ⎕ Marginally Satisfactory ⎕ Unsatisfactory ⎕

1. Why?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. What are your main recommendations to?

UNDP \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

GEF \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

EEAA \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

DRC \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Project Management \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How are these recommendations implemented?

UNDP \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

GEF \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

EEAA \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

DRC \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Project Management \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you foryour time and effort.

## Analysis of the use of Project Funds

**Details of Activities (EGP)**

|  | **Activity Title** | **# of Participants** | **Date** | **Detailed F&B** | **Facilities** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Inception workshop | 70 | 1/27/2009 | 2 Coffee Break + 1 Lunch | Data show, Screen, Sound system, wireless microphone |
| 2 | Data base assessment workshop | 25 | 4/8/2009 | 1 coffee break + 1 lunch | Data show, Screen, Sound system, wirless mic |
| 3 | Planning & financial | 65 | 3/23/2009 | 1 coffee break + 1 lunch | Data show, Screen, Sound system, wirless mic |
| 4 | Joint workshop with the Canadian project "CENACT" | 78 | 4-6/5/2009 | 1 coffee break + 1 lunch | Data show, Screen, Sound system, wirless mic |
| 5 | Assessment of proposed data base | 20 | 7/15/2009 | 1 coffee break | Data show, Screen, Sound system, meeting room rental |
| 6 | Assessment of proposed coordination mechanism | 10 | 9/9/2009 | Ramadan | Data show, Screen, Sound system, meeting room rental |
| 7 | holding 2 workshop s at Romance hotel (training courses for EEAA staff on M&E + national workshop for monitoring the status of Desertification in Egypt) | 59 | 6-8/12/2009 | Full board accomodation with 2 coffee breaks per day | 2 Data shows, 2 Screens, 2 Sound systems, 2 wirless mics |
| 8 | Consultation workshop on assessment of mainstreaming environment in planning, budgeting & reporting in MEAs | 25 | 1/14/2010 | 1 coffee break + 1 lunch | Data show, Screen, Sound system, wirless mic |
| 9 | Training course on the use of data base for BD, CC, Intl. affairs departments at EEAA | 6 | 17-21/1/2010 | 1 coffee break + 1 lunch box | data show, screen & 3 desktop computers |
| 10 | Training course on the use of data base for DRC staff at EEAA | 6 | 31/1-4/2/2010 | 1 coffee break + 1 lunch box | data show, screen & 3 desktop computers |
| 11 | National sustainable development committee meeting | 30 | 2/23/2010 | - | Data show, Screen, Sound system, wirless mic |
| 12 | National sustainable development committee meeting | 25 | 3/21/2010 | - | Data show, Screen, Sound system, wirless mic |
| 13 | Follow up meeting on the M&E training held at romance hotel (El-Sokhna) | 25 | 4/22/2010 | 1 coffee break | Data show, Screen, Sound system, wirless mic |
| 14 | Project Management training | 30 | 31/5-3/6/2010 | BB accomodation with 2 coffee breaks + 1 lunch/ day | Data show, Screen, Sound system, wirless mic |
| **Totals** | |  | **474** |  |  |  |

**Activities and Offers for Implementation (EGP)**

|  | **Activity Title** | **Offer** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Accepted** | | | | | **2nd** | | | | | **3rd** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | **Venue** | **Cost** | | **Accommodation** | | **Venue** | | | **Cost** | **Accommodation** | **Venue** | | | **Cost** | | | | **Accommodation** | | | |
| 1 | Inception Workshop | Cairo house/ EEAA (without any rental fees) | 9,100 | | 0 | |  | | |  |  |  | |  | | | |  | | | |
|  | Maadi hotel | 2,975 | 0 | | Grand Hyatt Hotel | | | 20,725 | | 0 | Sofitel El-Gezera | | 24,040 | | | 0 | | | |
| 2 | Data base assessment workshop | Cairotel | 7,500 | | 0 | | Sofitel Maadi | 6,675 | | | 0 | Grand Hyatt | | 7,675 | | | | 0 | | | |
| 3 | Planning & financial | Maadi hotel | 10,380 | | 10,970 | | Sofitel Maadi | 14,675 | | | 0 | Sofitel El-Gezera | | 17,725 | | | | 0 | | | |
| 4 | Joint workshop with the Canadian project "CENACT" | Maadi hotel | 1,650 | | 0 | | Sofitel Maadi | 17,275 | | | 21,610 | Sofitel El-Gezera | | 21,105 | | | | 22,990 | | | |
| 5 | Assessment of proposed data base | Maadi hotel | 1,250 | | 0 | | Sofitel Maadi | 3,500 | | | 0 | Grand Hyatt | | 4,900 | | | | 0 | | | |
| 6 | Assessment of proposed coordination mechanism | Romance hotel - El-Sokhna | 2,535 | | 49,980 | | Sofitel Maadi | 2,200 | | | 0 | Grand Hyatt | | 3,000 | | | | 0 | | | |
| 7 | holding 2 workshops at Romance hotel (training courses for EEAA staff on M&E + national workshop for monitoring the status of Desertification in Egypt) | Maadi hotel | 3,705 | | 0 | | Stella di Mari hotel | 4,800 | | | 84,910 | Palmira hotel | | 3,600 | | | | 54,560 | | | |
| 8 | Consultation workshop on assessment of mainstreaming environment in planning, budgeting & reporting in MEAs | EEAA Premises | 1,116 | | 0 | | Sofitel Maadi | 6,675 | | | 0 | Sofitel El-Gezera | | 7,325 | | | | 0 | | | |
| 9 | Training course on the use of data base for BD, CC, Intl. affairs departments at EEAA | EEAA Premises | 1,296 | | 0 | | Maadi hotel | 6,250 | | | 0 | Sofitel Maadi | | 9,650 | | | | 0 | | | |
| 10 | Training course on the use of data base for DRC staff at EEAA | EEAA Premises | 0 | | 0 | | Maadi hotel | 6,250 | | | 0 | Sofitel Maadi | | 9,650 | | | | 0 | | | |
| 11 | National sustainable development committee meeting | EEAA Premises | 0 | | 0 | | Maadi hotel | 2,450 | | | 0 | Sofitel Maadi | | 3,450 | | | | 0 | | | |
| 12 | National sustainable development committee meeting | Maadi hotel | 1,614 | | 0 | | Maadi hotel | 2,275 | | | 0 | Sofitel Maadi | | 3,225 | | | | 0 | | | |
| 13 | Follow up meeting on the M&E training held at romance hotel (El-Sokhna) | Maadi hotel | 13,650 | | 10,250 | | Sofitel Maadi | 6,675 | | | 0 | Sofitel El-Gezera | | 7,325 | | | | 0 | | | |
| 14 | Project Management training |  | **56,771** | | **71,200** | | Grand Hyatt Hotel | 29,355 | | | 30,810 | Sofitel El-Gezera | | 27,270 | | | | 32,175 | | | |
|  | **Totals** |  | **56,771** | | **71,200** | |  | | | **129,780** | **137,330** | |  | | | **149,940** | | | | **109,725** | | | |

**Activity and Fixed Expenses (Consultants, Transportation and DSA) in EGP**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Activity Title** | **Consultant fees** | **Transpiration** | **DSA** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Inception workshop | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Data base assessment workshop | 2,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Planning & financial | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Joint workshop with the Canadian project "CENACT" | 0 | 0 | 2,600 |
| 5 | Assessment of proposed data base | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Assessment of proposed coordination mechanism | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | holding 2 workshops at Romance hotel (training courses for EEAA staff on M&E national workshop for monitoring the status of Desertification in Egypt) | 16,350 | 5,000 | 0 |
| 8 | Consultation workshop on assessment of env. Mainstreaming in planning, budgeting & reporting in MEAs | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | Training course on the use of data base for BD, CC, Intl. affairs departments at EEAA | 1,500 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Training course on the use of data base for DRC staff at EEAA | 1,500 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | National sustainable development committee meeting | 0 | 0 | 4,050 |
| 12 | National sustainable development committee meeting | 0 | 0 | 3,450 |
| 13 | Follow up meeting on the M&E training held at romance hotel (El-Sokhna) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | Project Management training | 20,000 | 0 | 4,800 |
| **Totals** | | **41,350** | **5,000** | **14,900** |

**Comparing costs of events and offers (EGP)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Activity Title** | **Total Cost** | | | **Cost per Capita** | | |
|  |  | **Implementation** | **2nd Offer** | **3rd Offer** | **Implementation** | **2nd Offer** | **3rd Offer** |
| 1 | Inception workshop | 9,100 | 20,725 | 24,040 | 130 | 296 | 343 |
| 2 | Data base assessment workshop | 4,975 | 8,675 | 9,675 | 199 | 347 | 387 |
| 3 | Planning & financial | 7,500 | 14,675 | 17,725 | 115 | 226 | 273 |
| 4 | Joint workshop with the Canadian project "CENACT" | 23,950 | 41,485 | 46,695 | 307 | 532 | 599 |
| 5 | Assessment of proposed data base | 1,650 | 3,500 | 4,900 | 83 | 175 | 245 |
| 6 | Assessment of proposed coordination mechanism | 1,250 | 2,200 | 3,000 | 125 | 220 | 300 |
| 7 | holding 2 workshop at Romance hotel (training courses for EEAA staff on M&E + national workshop for monitoring the status of Desertification in Egypt) | 73,865 | 111,060 | 79,510 | 1,252 | 1,882 | 1,348 |
| 8 | Consultation workshop on assessment of mainstreaming environment in planning, budgeting & reporting in MEAs | 3,705 | 6,675 | 7,325 | 148 | 267 | 293 |
| 9 | Training course on the use of data base for BD, CC, Intl. affairs departments at EEAA | 2,616 | 7,750 | 11,150 | 436 | 1,292 | 1,858 |
| 10 | Training course on the use of data base for DRC staff at EEAA | 2,796 | 7,750 | 11,150 | 466 | 1,292 | 1,858 |
| 11 | National sustainable development committee meeting | 4,050 | 6,500 | 7,500 | 135 | 217 | 250 |
| 12 | National sustainable development committee meeting | 3,450 | 5,725 | 6,675 | 138 | 229 | 267 |
| 13 | Follow up meeting on the M&E training held at romance hotel (El-Sokhna) | 1,614 | 6,675 | 7,325 | 65 | 267 | 293 |
| 14 | Project Management training | 48,700 | 84,965 | 84,245 | 1,623 | 2,832 | 2,808 |
| **Totals** | | **189,221** | **328,360** | **320,915** | **399** | **693** | **677** |

1. A Likert scale, or more accurately a Likert-type scale, is a psychometric scale commonly used in questionnaires, and is the most widely used scale in survey research, such that the term is often used interchangeably with rating scale even though the two are not synonymous. When responding to a Likert questionnaire item, respondents specify their level of agreement or disagreement on a symmetric agree-disagree scale for a series of statements. Thus the scale captures the intensity of their feelings. (Source: Wikipedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Likert_scale> accessed 8th of June 2011: 16:34) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. . EEAA, MSP - Mainstreaming Global Environment in national plans and policies by strengthening the monitoring and reporting system for Multilateral Environmental Agreements in Egypt, p. 19 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. NCSA – Egypt was a success story. It was presented in number of UNDP-GEF international events to share lessons learned with other countries. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. EEAA is currently mobilizing resources for the process of elaborating this NSSD [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Handoussa, Heba et. al. Situation Analysis: Key Development Challenges Facing Egypt, p. 100, UNDP, Cairo, 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 0.7% of global GHG [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Handoussa, Heba et. al. Situation Analysis: Key Development Challenges Facing Egypt, p. 10-102, UNDP, Cairo, 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Osman, Yasser Adel Hanfi, Desertification in Egypt, Status, NAP, Success Stories, PowerPoint Presentation, 2008, <http://www.authorstream.com/Presentation/Goldenphero-257616-desertification-egypt-environmental-science-education-ppt-powerpoint/> (accessed Wed. 25th May, 2011: 13:55) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
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12. Hegazi, Abdel Moneim and El Bagouri, Ismail H. (Coordinating Authors), National Action Plan for Combating Desertification, Cairo, Egypt, 2002. <http://www.unccd.int/cop/reports/africa/national/2002/egypt-eng.pdf> (accessed Wed. 25 May 2011, 14:10) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
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15. Interview 8th May, 2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN),Gap analysis of Global and National Environmental Performance Measurement in Egypt, The Earth Institute at Columbia University, February 7th, 2011 [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. TCOE was an office affiliated to the CEO of EEAA. It was responsible for planning, programming, and monitoring the environmental donors funded projects as well as providing technical backstopping to EEAA CEO and later the Minister in formulating national environmental policies. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. <http://files.dcp2.org/pdf/PIH/PIH03.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
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21. For a complete understanding of IEA methodology, please visit UNEP IEA website <http://hqweb.unep.org/ieacp/iea/> [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Before being appointed as Minister of Justice, he was the Chairperson of an environmental NGO in Alexandria, and member of the Board of Directors of EEAA. He also was responsible for drafting Law 4/1994, and Law 9/2009 for protecting the environment. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Interviews with Ahmed Saeed (16th May, 2011; and Ezzat Lewis and Saber Othman (8th May, 2011). [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. <http://www.eeaa.gov.eg/english/main/pdf/aein/Egypt%20Status%20Progress%20of%20AEIN%20implementation_phase2_EG.pdf> (accessed 26th May, 2011: 15:45) [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Hecht, Joy E. “Environmental Statistics and Accounting in Egypt: Challenges and Opportunities,” Study carried out for the USAID DATA Project, Ministry of Planning, Cairo, Egypt, 2004 [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Section 5.4 Environmental Information and Statistics, pp. 58-59; and Section Seven: Financing the NEAP. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
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