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**Executive summary**

The dominant feature of Egypt’s Northern Coastal Zone is the low-lying delta of the River Nile, with its large cities, industry, agriculture and tourism. The Delta and the narrow valley of the Nile comprise 5.5% of the total area of Egypt but over 95% of its people of which 25% live in the Low Elevation Coastal Zone (LECZ) areas. The Nile Delta and Mediterranean Coast include 30-40% of Egypt’s agricultural production, half of Egypt’s industrial production, which is concentrated mainly in Alexandria, Damietta and Port Said.

The objective of the "Adaptation to Climate Change in the Nile Delta through Integrated Coastal Zone Management" project is to integrate the management of SLR risks into the development of Egypt’s Low Elevation Coastal Zone in the Nile delta by (1) strengthening the regulatory framework and institutional capacity to improve resilience of coastal settlements and development infrastructure, (2) implementing innovative and environmentally friendly measures that facilitate/promote adaptation in the Nile Delta, and (3) establishing a monitoring and assessment framework and knowledge management systems on adaptation. These are also the three major components of the project, to which the fourth one, the project management, is added.

The main purpose of MTE is to assess the progress made towards the attainment of objectives and planned results to date and to examine processes affecting attainment of results as a basis for lessons and recommendations. Evaluation will use the following criteria: relevance of the initiative and its consistency with the national and local policies and priorities; effectiveness of delivery of outputs; efficiency of use of economic resources; sustainability which will be the measure of continuation of project's benefits and outputs; and impact of changes or results the Nile Delta Project has made so far.

The MTE addresses the following issues: project relevance, which includes examination whether the project's strategy designed during its formulation phase and hitherto implementation is still relevant, i.e. consistent with national and local as well as global policies and priorities; project preparation and readiness, which includes examining the clarity and feasibility of its objective and components, and whether the planned implementation arrangements were based on properly conducted preliminary assessment of partners' resources; project ownership at the national and local levels; stakeholder participation, both in the project preparation and implementation stages; assessment of underlying factors and assumptions affecting the project's implementation, primarily of those originating outside the project's context, and measures to counteract them; project organization and management arrangements, both in the planning and implementation stages of the project, and an assessment whether these arrangements could still be considered as optimal in the current implementation context; assessment of the cost-effectiveness of the project budget and duration, and implementation of the financial aspect of the project including parallel funding; soundness of the Project Monitoring and Evaluation system; sustainability and replicability of the project’s achievements and impacts based on current project’s results; effectiveness of the application of adaptive management through monitoring and evaluation, risk management, work planning including regular updates and reporting; assessment of the UNDP contribution; and complementarity with other relevant on-going or past activities, establishment of partnerships in the future, and catalytic role the Nile Delta Project could play.

The evaluation concluded that the Nile Delta Project is still highly **relevant**, both with respect to its global importance, consistency with national policies and strategies for adaptation to climate change and ICZM, and project design. Its overall structure should remain unchanged. The continuous importance of Nile Delta Project is based on the fact that it is still belongs to a rare GEF group of projects dealing with the issue of adaptation to climate change in coastal areas. The speed of its implementation is not satisfactory, and it will have to be improved in order to keep the perception of the project's relevance and appropriateness active. The project is also relevant in the wider regional context, and synergies should be created with complementary projects and initiatives in Egypt, but also in other neighbouring countries. Finally, the SRF's indicators are still relevant because they are well designed and reflecting the relevance of the project, but also because the major outputs are still to be produced. Consequently, there is no need to propose any change in the indicator system.

The project has been marginally **effective** in achieving its objectives. The results, i.e. the outputs, produced so far are only the basic studies and preparatory reports for the most important outputs of the project, the pilot projects, which are aimed at showing that coastal adaptation measures can work in practice. Intensive implementation of the pilot projects is still waiting to happen. The location and contents of the initial pilot projects have been changed, following the discussion between two main project partners. The agreement on one new project has been reached, while the agreement on the remaining two is still pending. Reports produced have been of good quality but delivered with some delay. However, the full usefulness of these outputs could be assessed only when the pilot projects will be implemented, hence the element of risk associated with evaluation based on this criterion. The stakeholders' mobilisation process is still very slow, and those mobilised are mainly of the administrative/governmental provenance, i.e. the governorates representatives. Preparation of the integrated data base is progressing slowly, even if GIS has been established but its utilisation has been low. The Nile Delta Project has to reach out to other projects and initiatives in the Nile Delta area to achieve full regional synergy.

The project's **efficiency** is satisfactory. The project's management and decision-making structure, as well as the role played by UNDP, have proven to be effective, even if the implementation of the project has been taking place in politically very sensitive time for Egypt. Although slow and with delays, the project's rate of implementation has moved forward largely due to the highly motivated attitude of the Project Manager and the PMU. Its administrative arrangements are cost-effective and rational, and follow strictly the UNDP rules and regulations. The management structure, consisting of 4 layers of management, supervision and decision making is complicated and should be simplified. It should be reduced to two committees only: the Steering Committee and the Management Committee. The new project manager has been selected, and in order to avoid additional risk to the project, he should be assisted by all project implementing and executing partners. The use of financial resources is commensurate with the results achieved so far. Significant problems is the parallel funding both in the sense of actual delivery of committed parallel funding as well as reporting on it, which is practically non-existent.

The Nile Delta Project **results** are marginally satisfactory. While a number of outputs, mainly specific technical studies, have been delivered, primarily related to the analysis of various aspects of coastal sediment and natural dynamics, serious work is still expected to be carried out to produce major project's outputs (particularly in Component 2), which carries relatively high degree of risk. The project has been faced with a number of barriers, the most important being the disagreement between project executing partners (CoRI and SPA) on the concept of the coastal engineering and adaptation works, and the political situation in Egypt. The project's conceptual approach has been revised, and the initial Living Shoreline Approach (LSA), which is more appropriate for stable coastal environments than for the Egypt's Northern Coast, has been altered and renamed to Living with the Sea approach, which is more appropriate and allows for a better integration with ICZM. There has been some positive achievement recently, including the emerging understanding between SPA and CoRI that soft engineering can be combined with the hard one to produce equally positive results with less environmental damage. The above fact could be considered as one of the important achievements of the project, and it was made possible by the combined efforts of UNDP-CO, PMU and MWRI.

The **sustainability** of the project is moderately likely, primarily because thedecisions on all the pilot projects have not yet been finally made and the works have not actually started except modest activities in the Damietta port related to the one pilot project for which the decision has been made. The lack of concrete post-project mechanisms increases the risk to the project's sustainability. Although already started, the intensity of the capacity building activities should be increased. The sustainability strategy doesn't exist, while the replication strategy, although not envisaged in the PD, should be prepared. The participation of stakeholders is gradually increasing and the range of stakeholders groups involved should be expanded, notably with the national NGOs and users associations.

Based on the five evaluation criteria, the evaluation has found that, overall, progress has been made towards achievement of the Nile Delta Project objectives. However, having in mind that in some important aspects the project has achieved marginal results, in particular in the Component/Output 2 (implementation of concrete measures towards adaptation to climate change), which are critical for the attainment of major objective of the project, the overall rate of the project is set at **marginally satisfactory**. Keeping in mind that the Nile Delta Project is only mid-way through its implementation course, and that competent GEF implementing agency's task manager and PMU staff are actively involved in the implementation of the project, there is a possibility that the project's performance will be improved, leading to a better terminal mark, particularly if the MTE's recommendations will be fully taken into account.

The most important lesson learned is that the complex project like this one should have preparatory stage better organized. The consequences of the proposed technical concept (Living Shorelines Approach) were not properly assessed, which has caused its significant revision during the inception phase. The views and positions of two major executing partners were not properly analysed, and their differences on several issues came to the forefront of the project’s implementation, which has caused lengthy delays. The issue of ICZM was analysed from the “formal” perspective, and its importance for the proper assessment of concrete adaptation measures was not adequately presented. In addition, the concrete measures how to make the ICZM overall framework for shoreline management were not proposed.

The report includes 24 recommendations divided in 3 groups. The most important recommendations are: operation of thecoordination mechanism between CoRI and SPA, the two organizations that make the backbone of the project, i.e. the Executive Committee, should be continued; as the final selection of pilot projects is still pending, it is recommended to take a final decision very soon, as a matter of the highest priority for the entire project; conceptual clarification and hierarchisation of shore protection management and ICZM needs to be done in order to avoid future mixing of the two; the role of EEAA should be strengthened and it should be more profoundly integrated in the project’s implementation; consistent system of reporting on parallel funding needs to be established; management structure needs to be simplified and the management structure should be limited to the Steering Committee and to the Executive Committee; prepare the Replication Strategy; increase efforts towards capacity building; request a no-cost extension of minimally 18 months duration; and improve participation of regional and local stakeholders, in particular the governorates’ administration.

**1. Introduction**

**1.1. Brief description of the project**

1. The dominant feature of Egypt’s Northern Coastal Zone is the low-lying delta of the River Nile, with its large cities, industry, agriculture and tourism. The Delta and the narrow valley of the Nile comprise 5.5% of the total area of Egypt but over 95% of its people of which 25% live in the Low Elevation Coastal Zone (LECZ) areas. The Nile Delta and Mediterranean Coast include 30-40% of Egypt’s agricultural production, half of Egypt’s industrial production, which is concentrated mainly in Alexandria, Damietta and Port Said.
2. Due to the concentration of much of Egypt’s infrastructure and development along the low coastal lands and the reliance on the Nile delta for prime agricultural land, coastal inundation or saline intrusion caused by anthropogenic climate change induced sea-level rise will have a direct and critical impact on Egypt’s entire economy. Egypt’s social sensitivity to sea level rise is particularly high. It is expected that the climate change will produce varied impacts on the local lagoon population depending on how climate changes interact with, if not exacerbate, existing stresses e.g. population growth, poverty, poor nutrition, accumulating levels of air, land, and water pollution, ever growing gender and class inequalities. In addition to the current trends, Egypt’s Mediterranean coast and the Nile Delta have been identified as highly vulnerable to climate change induced Sea Level Rise (SLR).
3. The objective of the "Adaptation to Climate Change in the Nile Delta through Integrated Coastal Zone Management" project (in further text: the Nile Delta Project) is to integrate the management of SLR risks into the development of Egypt’s Low Elevation Coastal Zone in the Nile delta by (1) strengthening the regulatory framework and institutional capacity to improve resilience of coastal settlements and development infrastructure, (2) implementing innovative and environmentally friendly measures that facilitate/promote adaptation in the Nile Delta, and (3) establishing a monitoring and assessment framework and knowledge management systems on adaptation. These are also the three major components of the project, to which the fourth one, the project management, is added.

**1.2. Purpose and scope of the evaluation**

1. As this evaluation is performed at the midpoint of the Nile Delta Project's implementation, by necessity it is to be considered as a performance type of evaluation. Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) generally has a formativenature as it intends to improve performance of the project's implementation. Therefore, the main purpose of MTE is: i) to assess the progress made towards the attainment of objectives and planned results to date; and ii) to examine processes affecting attainment of results as a basis for lessons and recommendations. Evaluation will use the following criteria:
* **Relevance** of the initiative and its consistency with the national and local policies and priorities;
* **Effectiveness** of delivery of outputs;
* **Efficiency** of use of economic resources;
* **Sustainability** which will be the measure of continuation of project's benefits and outputs; and
* **Impact** of changes or results the Nile Delta Project has made so far.
1. The MTE TOR state that its main objectives are:
* To strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the Nile Delta Project;
* To ensure accountability for the achievement of the UNDP/GEF objective;
* To enhance organizational and development learning; and
* To enable informed decision-making.

MTE is also intended to identify strengths and weaknesses of the project's design and implementation, and to come up with recommendations for eventual changes in the overall design and orientation of the project and on the work plan for the remaining period of project's implementation. Finally, MTE is intended to become cognizant of the barriers hindering the project's implementation and to lay out a feasible strategy to prop the project's execution towards reaching its objective.

1. The scope of the MTE covers all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. This refers to:
* Status of the project's implementation by assessing its effectiveness by comparing the planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and actual results leading to attaining the project's objective, including the current monitoring procedures and methodologies used;
* Problems and necessary corrections and adjustments;
* Efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency;
* Funds spent at the time of evaluation against the total amount allocated, including the assessment of parallel funding and leveraged resources; and
* Likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the project.

**1.3. Key issues addressed**

1. The MTE will address the following issues:
* Project relevance, which includes examination whether the project's strategy designed during its formulation phase and hitherto implementation is still relevant, i.e. consistent with national and local as well as global policies and priorities;
* Project preparation and readiness, which includes examining the clarity and feasibility of its objective and components, and whether the planned implementation arrangements were based on properly conducted preliminary assessment of partners' resources;
* Project ownership at the national and local levels;
* Stakeholder participation, both in the project preparation and implementation stages;
* Assessment of underlying factors and assumptions affecting the project's implementation, primarily of those originating outside the project's context, and measures to counteract them;
* Project organization and management arrangements, both in the planning and implementation stages of the project, and an assessment whether these arrangements could still be considered as optimal in the current implementation context;
* Assessment of the cost-effectiveness of the project budget and duration, and implementation of the financial aspect of the project including parallel funding;
* Soundness of the Project Monitoring and Evaluation system;
* Sustainability and replicability of the project’s achievements and impacts based on current project’s results;
* Effectiveness of the application of adaptive management through monitoring and evaluation, risk management, work planning including regular updates and reporting;
* Assessment of the UNDP contribution;
* Complementarity with other relevant on-going or past activities, establishment of partnerships in the future, and catalytic role the Nile Delta Project could play.

**1.4. Methodology of the evaluation**

1. The MTE will be organised into overlapping phases focusing on:
* Document review and analysis (desktop study);
* Review of specific products;
* Interviews and meetings with key stakeholders and implementing and executing agencies, target beneficiaries, and project staff, both through face-to-face-interviews at their location and by telephone/skype/email; and
* Review of the development of selected tools used in the execution of the project.
1. Methods of data collection and data analysis will be the following:
* Data collection in the field (interviews, direct observations);
* Review of project preparation and approval documents (PIF, project document, logframe, GEF CEO endorsement);
* Analysis of project reports (annual reports, PIR);
* Analysis of meeting, workshops, conferences reports (steering committee, working groups, training courses, mission reports etc.);
* Review of financial records - to a limited degree (contracts, TORs, annual financial reports);
* Analysis of outputs (working group reports, thematic reports, guidelines); and
* Review of other relevant documents (newsletters, website, etc.).

**1.5. Structure of the evaluation**

1. The structure of the evaluation follows the outline as provided to the evaluator in the TOR. After the introduction, the Nile Delta Project is reviewed in its development context and in its design, as presented in the Project Document (Chapter 2), then the actual implementation and results achieved on the basis of produced reports and stakeholder interviews are assessed (Chapter 3), recommendations provided (Chapter 4) and, finally, the lessons learned are presented (Chapter 5).

**2. The project and its development context**

**2.1 Project start, duration, and implementation status**

1. The first PIF was submitted in September 2006, and re-submitted on 20 May 2008. The Request for GEF CEO Endorsement was sent on 25 June 2009. The Project Document was signed at end of September 2009. Following the project document signature, UNDP has met with MWRI to finalize agreement on implementation arrangements, including the office location and facilities that will be offered to the project as part of the Government’s in-kind contribution. After agreeing on the TOR for the PM, the position was advertised in early December 2009 and it took about three months to screen the CVs, hold interviews, finalize selection process, and allow the PM (Dr. Mohamed Borhan) a few weeks to move from Cairo to Alexandria. He started in full at the beginning of April 2010. Following the signature of the PD, UNDP has announced the position of the International Consultant to act as an Advisor to the project. It was advertised several times, and after a long contracting process the IC started work almost at the same time with the Project Manager, which allowed for a smooth start of the Inception Phase in April 2010. The Inception Workshop took place on 5-6 December 2010, while the Inception Report (IR), marking the end of the Inception Phase, was submitted on 15 May 2011. Therefore, the Inception Phase took more than one year to complete. This may be rather long, but that may be justified by the unprecedented political events in Egypt that took place in January and February 2011. With the duration of the project set at 5 years, its planned completion date is August 2014. At the time this MTE is being undertaken (April 2013), and with 16 months to go before the planned project's completion, no extension of the project's duration has yet been requested.
2. The Inception Phase was rather long but productive: the Project Management Unit (PMU) was established and the Project Team's TORs were drafted (according to IR, TORs for 7 positions were drafted), the Project Management Committee and a Project Steering Committee were established, and International Consultant was contracted. During the Inception Phase, three key reports were produced: the Inception Report, the Stakeholder Analysis, and Coastal Protection in the Nile Delta report. Sub-contracts for implementation of project activities were issued, and the International Consultant was hired.
3. The UNDP is the GEF Implementing Agency in this project, while the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation (MWRI), through the collaboration between Coastal Research Institute (CoRI) and Shore Protection Agency (SPA), executes the project. Under the UNDP National Execution modality, the UNDP Egypt's Country Office (CO) is an active partner in the project's implementation. The Project Management Unit (PMU) is located within CoRI in Alexandria. UNDP-CO supports the implementation of the project by contracting project personnel, experts and subcontractors, undertaking procurement, and providing other assistance upon request of the National Executing Agency. Meanwhile, it also monitors the project’s implementation and achievement of the project outcomes and outputs, and ensures the proper use of UNDP/GEF funds.
4. The project has just completed the third year of its implementation. The activities implemented so far are behind the planned course of implementation. The project has completed only the basic studies; the decision on demonstration (pilot) projects to be implemented (after projects initially planned in the PD were abandoned) has been taken for one project only (beach nourishment) while for the other two the decision is still pending; and linkage of the shore protection activities with ICZM has not yet been fully established.

**2.2. Problems that the project seek to address**

1. The Nile Delta Project is expected to address effectively the barriers that are hindering institutionalization of climate change related adaptation policies and measures in Egypt, and to set the basis for reversing present inefficient implementation of policies and measures to protect the Nile Delta area against the climate change driven sea level rise. The project is expected to address the following:
* Improvement of scientific understanding of the processes leading to climate change, in particular sea level rise, and of the impacts of climate change and SLR in the Nile Delta, with all the physical, socio-economic, and institutional implications;
* Uncovering institutional barriers that are preventing the Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) from becoming a more powerful tool to adapting the Nile Delta area to the expected climate change impacts;
* Defining concrete protection measures that will be cost effective and least damaging for the coastal area of the Nile Delta;
* Coordination of climate change adaptation management efforts between Egypt's institutions, and other projects, donors and international agencies;
* Consolidation of national and international support for climate change adaptation in Nile Delta area, which is considered to be the most critical Mediterranean climate change "hot spot"; and
* Public awareness and stakeholders’ participation in adaptation to climate change.

**2.3. Immediate and development objectives of the project**

1. The immediate and development objectives of the Nile Delta Project are not specifically distinguished as such in the Project Document. The overall project's goal is to "enhance Egypt's resilience and reduce vulnerability to Climate Change impacts", while the project's objective is "to integrate the management of SLR risks into the development of Egypt's Low Elevation Coastal Zone (LECZ) in the Nile Delta." The above is quite general and doesn't precisely indicate what would be the thematic focus of the project. However, the title of each component points clearly to the specific objective related to that component and, if they are taken together, one could get a clearer idea what real objectives of the Nile Delta Project are.
2. The project's objective leads to an overall strategy to reduce vulnerability to climate change through the implementation of an ICZM framework and to implement new and innovative pilot adaptation measures that complement existing protection structures. This approach in itself is widely a developmental one, because it links concrete and rather short term, measures that would reduce imminent impacts of the climate change, in particular the SLR, with the long term changes brought through implementation of development plans that are within the ICZM framework. The Project Document states that Nile Delta Project includes "upgrading protection through the introduction of environmentally-friendly ‘soft’ shoreline protection, as well as modifications in regulatory framework and institutional capacity to ensure land use planning, zoning, to account for climate risks."

**2.4. Main stakeholders**

1. Major stakeholders are at the national and regional (governorate) levels. Major one at the national level is the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation (MWRI), through its components: CoRI and SPA. The Coastal Research Institute (CoRI) is responsible for investigating the coastal processes along the Nile Delta as well as along the entire Egyptian coast. It monitors the evolution of the Egyptian coast, studies the dynamics of its shores in order to find out efficient and cost-effective control methods to protect valuable coastal infrastructure from erosion. The Shore Protection Authority (SPA) is responsible for physically managing the shoreline in coastal areas that have socioeconomic value or natural resource value, and that are threatened by erosion. It develops shore protection plans, designs projects for shore protection and prepares all studies for shore protection. It also issues license for projects located in the coastal zone area. The third major national stakeholder, in addition to CoRI and SPA, is the Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA), which is the national organisation responsible for development, promotion and implementation of ICZM. Housed in Egypt's Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs, it should be the “champion” for ICZM, as the coordinating organization for ICZM planning and activities. It houses the Secretariat of the National Committee for Integrated Coastal Zone Management (NCICZM). However, as the PD states, this agency has not been effective in leading the various state ministries to coalesce around efforts for a common and practical vision for integrated coastal zone management, let alone mainstreaming climate change considerations into this framework. This situation critically and adversely affects ongoing learning and the development of good coastal policy, reinforces chronic technical capacity and knowledge barriers, and is typified by the lack of an operational ICZM framework despite the passing of a dozen years since official enactment of the related statute. The project's ambition is to support the knowledge base of CoRI, to help integrate the increased knowledge into the SPA decision making process that underpins shore protection investments with a view to adapt to the impacts of climate change, and to mainstream these "on-the-ground" activities into the wider context of ICZM. Having that in mind, close linkage and collaboration between these major national stakeholders would create the most critical and important nexus of the project.
2. In addition to the central government level, another important stakeholder levels are the governorate administrations and local authorities. Unfortunately, during the implementation of the project, mainly because of the political events in Egypt, these administrations have been changing very often, and it seems that the project has made minimal impact on these stakeholders so far. This frequent turnover of the governorate administrations has, thus, prevented the stronger project’s presence at the local level, and in particular for timely obtaining the “green light” for on-the-ground implementation (pilot projects). The stakeholder analysis in the Project Document is rather rudimentary and it reduces itself, practically, to naming the major national level stakeholders only, without further expanding on their role to be played in the project. During the Inception Phase, a more thorough Stakeholder Analysis was prepared. But, the PMU has not yet been active enough to engage with the key stakeholders, particularly with those that have re-emerged after the 2011 political events.

**2.5. Results expected**

1. It is expected that the Nile Delta Project will result in better understanding of the process influencing the climate change in the area, and their expected impacts. Furthermore, the project is expected to contribute to the enhanced capacity to improve resilience of the coastal natural and manmade resources to expected climate change, and above all, to contribute to the integration of climate risk assessment into the ICZM. The project is expected to show how cost-effective concrete actions in the coastal zone can enhance its resilience and protect it from the impacts of expected change and, in particular, the SLR. However, the most important result expected is to remove barriers to better institutional coordination and cooperation through institutionalizing the ICZM as an element of coherence among these institutions and making it a standard practice at the national, regional and local levels.

**3. Findings and Conclusions**

**3.1 Project formulation**

1. The Nile Delta Project was formulated in accordance with standard GEF procedure and it was approved at all appropriate levels. The following paragraphs are concerned with the implementation approach adopted by the Nile Delta Project including the performance of the implementation arrangements, and overall performance of project management. This section also highlights some of the implementation challenges and the way in which the project management has adapted to these challenges.

**3.1.1. Implementation approach**

1. The implementation of this project is not an easy task because the issue of adaptation to climate change in coastal areas is very complex. It also turned out that the implementation of the project is taking place in a very difficult political time in Egypt. The project's design aims at enhancing the Egypt's resilience and reducing its vulnerability to climate change impacts in its most sensitive and threatened coastal area - the Nile Delta. The project envisages that engineering solutions to shore protection will not be implemented in isolation but will be brought into a wider Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) context. ICZM is emphasized as an appropriate envelope for adaptation to climate change, since it advocates a multi-sectoral, holistic approach, linked to the delivery of sustainable development and the need to embrace environmental, economic and societal aspects. ICZM tends to go beyond strictly engineering solutions to adaptation to climate change by recognising the complexity and inter-linkages between coastal processes, sectors and stakeholders. The holism of ICZM would allow the impacts of engineering measures to be spilled over to the wider strata of population living in the coastal zone.
2. The project's intervention strategy has gone through one major change during its inception Phase when the term Living Shorelines Approach (LSA) has been re-named into the term Living with the Sea (LS). The initial Living Shorelines Approach is based on the "soft" shoreline protection strategy, and it was meant to be achieved through installation of a set of innovative shoreline protection strategies modeled after the “Living Shorelines Approach” through a number of concrete "on-the-ground" coastal adaptation pilot projects within the ICZM framework (Idku, Burullus, and Manzala coastal lagoons). As the Project Document states, "...'Soft' shore protection corresponds to mechanisms used to mitigate and prepare for the effects of SLR by utilizing the ambient environment without strong human intervention". In the early stages of the project's implementation, several barriers to the implementation of this strategy emerged, namely: (1) the LSA started to be perceived as being not fully appropriate for the Nile Delta coastal environment because that coastal area is considered to be energy very active, while LSA is more appropriate for the lower energy situations, such as lakes; (2) concerns regarding this approach have surfaced within the SPA, which has been more in favour of the "hard" engineering approach, and which was not too open to implementing solutions that were not proven in practice, in particular in Egypt, and which were carrying, in their view, too much risk; and (3) the LSA-ICZM linkage was not fully developed in the Project Document, which has led to a certain "marginalization" of the ICZM in the early stages of the project's implementation. For that reason, in the Inception Report, which was adopted at the Inception Workshop, the LSA was renamed into the LS, in order to reflect better the reality of introducing the combination of "hard" and "soft" engineering techniques to achieve the outcomes of coastal adaptation in Nile Delta.
3. The above change also signified an effort to accommodate comments and concerns expressed by the SPA. As the Inception Report states, the LS strategy refers to a "...management practice that addresses coastal erosion by providing for an engineered approach to long-term protection, restoration or enhancement of shoreline landforms and habitats. The maintenance, enhancement or restoration of a vegetative buffer (green belt) should be part of implementation of any 'Living with the Sea' strategy. There are a variety of techniques to ensure that this concept is implemented. One technique is to implement a 'managed realignment' policy for specific coastal defenses (as opposed to 'holding the existing line' of a defense). Various adaptation techniques can be used which seek to maximize habitat and natural processes in a range of low to medium energy areas found along sheltered coastlines (estuarine and lagoon environments). They are not often (though not exclusively) appropriate for high energy open coast environments." However, it is important to say that these changes have not caused changes in the project outcomes. The evaluator considers these changes as appropriate and within the boundaries of the adaptive management approach.
4. One of the most important aspects of the project as a whole is mainstreaming the adaptation to climate change, including lessons learned from the on-the-ground activities, into ICZM. In this respect, two points have to be stressed:
* Clear understanding of the concepts, both of shoreline protection and of the ICZM, is critical both in terms of their substance and of the hierarchy between them. It seems that there is quite a bit of mixing of terminology and concepts in various institutions participating as partners in the project. This is particularly evident when some of them consider that shoreline protection and ICZM are practically the same. In a nutshell, the ICZM is an envelope where shoreline protection is integrated as one "sector", and shoreline protection cannot be a substitute for ICZM. Shoreline protection and management aims at, *inter alia*, achieving physical security of population, protecting natural values and minimising damage caused by direct negative impacts of climate change. ICZM integrates these physical together with other socio-economic, institutional and cultural considerations into a coastal sustainable development concept. Therefore, there is also a clear hierarchical distinction between the two concepts. Two workshops with a focus on ICZM were held: one on the legal and institutional aspects, the other on development of the Northern Coast's ICZM Plan. More than 100 participants from more than 30 institutions attended these events. However, they were of very short duration (less than one day) and it seems questionable whether the issues outlined above could be fully presented and discussed. Also, it seems that in terms of integration at operative level, in particular with regards to three major stakeholders (CoRI, SPA and EEAA) very little has been done. Until now, the project's activities have been much more concerned with the development of the appropriate shoreline management concept than either with fully understanding the ICZM or establishing the linkage between shoreline protection management and ICZM.
* At institutional level, the EEAA has not been fully involved yet in the implementation of the project. It is true that CoRI and SPA have much more direct role in the implementation of the project, as they together must generate the most acceptable shoreline management concept. The Project Document has placed adequately EEAA in the context of hitherto national development of ICZM, but failed to define more closely its role in the project. For example, in the section on Stakeholder Analysis, CoRI and SPA are mentioned as institutions being "heavily involved from the outset in the development and design of project activities", while EEAA is only listed among several national institutions that were only consulted. EEAA participates only in the work of the committees (Steering, Management and Follow-up, but not the Executive committee).
1. Based on the conceptual approach explained in the Project Document, the Nile Delta Project's relevance needs to be evaluated at two levels: global and national/local. Globally, it is still highly relevant, as it is dealing with a critical problem on one critical location (Nile Delta), and its results, if they will produce clear guidance on how to intervene in a highly vulnerable area on a sustainable basis, will be globally significant with a potential to be replicated elsewhere. Nationally, all the stakeholders interviewed confirmed their satisfaction with the manner the project is dealing with this issue, which they consider as still being high on their agenda. However, some of them are still expecting to see how the project will expand from the shore management/protection focused level to the wider ICZM one, and how it will be linked with the existing legal and institutional ICZM settings. The project's strategy and outcomes, and its revised design structure are still relevant as there has been no major change to the better in the physical circumstances existing at the time of its preparation. In fact, the relevance of the project and its expected outcomes and outputs has increased because of additional negative impacts of climate change in the Nile Delta area. Thus, for example, the high tides coupled with the impacts of exceptionally large storm surges have flooded large area, which has extended up to the International Coastal Road, which is something that has not happened before. Also, coastal erosion caused by the SLR is increasingly affecting near shore areas and the respective population.
2. The project's goal, stated in the PD to "...enhance Egypt's resilience and reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts" is quite general. The PD is also very scant on operational objectives. The project's objective is to "...integrate the management of SLR risks into the development of Egypt's Low Elevation Coastal Zone in the Nile Delta". The major emphasis of the Nile Delta Project is on the pilot projects (Component 2), which consume more than half of the grant (US$2,100,000 out of US$4,000,000). However, if we factor in the parallel funding, then this component utilises almost 2/3 of the available resources (the table on page 48-50 of the PD shows that the Component 2 takes US$9,525,001, out of the total of US$15,425,000 presented in that table).
3. The evaluation of the Projects Results Framework/Strategic Results Framework, which presents the logic and strategy of the project, has not found any relevant weaknesses. Outcomes indicate change, since each one of the three outcomes has as the target an altered future state. Results are measurable, as there is a whole set of clearly defined outputs. Outcomes are relevant, as Egypt still seems to be highly committed to the stated objectives of the project. Finally, all outputs are very clearly defined and are self-standing "products".
4. However, at an early stage of the project's implementation, the Outcome 2 targets/results, i.e. the contents and location of the three proposed pilot projects, have been brought into question and debate between CoRI and SPA started on the appropriateness of the contents of the initial set of 3 pilot projects. It is important to note that pilot projects, as a generic activity, were never brought into question. It has to be stated that the discussion on the new set of pilot projects is gradually being brought to an acceptable level of agreement between CoRI and SPA and, at this point, the results seem to be achievable if the decision on all new pilot projects will be made soon (so far, the decision has been made for one pilot project, while for the remaining two is still pending). Details on the debate and new pilot projects could be found in paragraphs 79-88 of this report.
5. The PD gives an extensive overview of the physical, climate change and socioeconomic situation in Egypt's Northern Coastal Zone and in the Nile Delta itself. The ICZM framework is presented in relative detail and with a fair degree of accuracy related to the current situation. The elaboration of the LSA is somewhat less convincing. First, although it may be considered as a backbone of the project, in the PD itself, the term "Living Shoreline Approach" is mentioned only 4 times. In the main body of the text, practically no explanation is given of what it really is. Confusingly, and out of the blue, the Annex B of the Project Document mixes the terms "Living Shoreline Approach" and the "Living Coasts" approach ("Living Coasts" is in the title!). While it may be considered as the same issue as the LSA, it is not clear why the author has used different terms. Second, the justification of the application of LSA to the specific Nile Delta conditions is almost non-existent, i.e. it could only be deduced from the explanation of the application of LSA in other, and markedly different, natural settings.
6. During the Inception Phase, all necessary activities for the project to start were carried out, in particular the appointment of the Project Coordinator and setting up of the PCU at CoRI in Alexandria, and nomination of the Nile Delta Project Steering Committee.

**3.1.2. Country ownership/Driveness**

1. The PD gives only a brief overview of the actions that preceded the start of the project preparation phase, and subsequent endorsement and start of the project’s implementation phase. The initiative for the project was born after Egypt's Initial National Communications on Climate Change was published, where the severity of the impacts of expected climate change on Nile Delta was fully exposed. This lead the Government of Egypt, represented by the MWRI, to apply for the project. It took almost 3 years to get the final endorsement and approval of GEF CEO. The first draft of the Project Document was presented at the stakeholders' consultation workshop. Major stakeholders, including SPA and CoRI as well as representatives of the Nile Delta governorates, attended the workshop. Participants endorsed the proposal and, as the PD states, there were no concerns regarding the project implementation. During the project preparation phase, several other studies were prepared, including the Feasibility study for Nile Delta Coastal Adaptation, and the Review of good practices of coastal adaptation and ICZM frameworks. There is no other available documentation for activities undertaken in the project preparatory phase. However, the content of the PD indicates that consultations with stakeholders during its preparation were moderate, and that consultant's efforts were mainly oriented to technical aspects of the project.
2. While it is not a GEF requirement to submit letters of support from all project stakeholders, most of them submitted these letters. EEAA sent its letter in 2008, while UNDP and SPA (actually representing the whole of MWRI) sent their letters in June 2009 (just before the GEF CEO endorsement). The interest of the country has been confirmed by the active participation of government representatives in all five meetings of the Steering Committee.

**3.1.3. Stakeholder participation**

1. There is very limited information on engagement of stakeholders in the Nile Delta Project. The participation of stakeholders at the preparatory workshop and steering committee meetings are mentioned in the above paragraphs. The PD contains the section "Stakeholders analysis", but it is essentially only the list of major stakeholders (ministries) with a description of their scope of work. No proper stakeholders’ analysis has been made during the PD preparation phase, but it was prepared afterwards. The PD also doesn't contain the stakeholders' involvement plan, which would be a minimum for a sensible involvement of stakeholders. Their involvement is essential in projects dealing with adaptation to climate change. The impacts of climate change, in particular sea level rise, may not be evident today but they will certainly take effect in the future. However, the actions, including the engineering works, have to be implemented today. The fact that investments and bold actions (like introduction of compulsory coastal setback) have to be taken when the impacts of climate change are not yet visible is often beyond the current focus of large strata of population. In this situation, the involvement of stakeholders, which would help raising the awareness on the need to take action today, is of critical importance.
2. During the hitherto implementation of the project, five workshops have been organised: Inception workshop; Legal and institutional workshop; Workshop for the exploration of possible means to utilise the area extending from the shoreline and International Coastal Road; Training workshop for the design of soft engineering techniques; and Workshop for the preparation of an ICZM Plan for Egypt's Northern Coast. According to the workshop reports, these events were an opportunity to sensitize various groups of national and local stakeholders to the issue of climate change. Web site was launched in 2011, but it is not being populated enough and not on a regular basis and, at the moment, it looks like being a forgone opportunity to raise the awareness on the project and the issue it is concerned with. Also, the project management has not developed a communication strategy, and has not explored possibility for the development of new, more sophisticated, communication products such as iPhone/ipad/android applications, videos, etc.
3. The co-executing partners were closely involved in the project development. The PD mentions that CoRI, in close consultation with the experts from SPA, agreed upon the identification and finalization of the preliminary design of the selected pilot projects. It is not clear, then, how it was possible that the impasse on making the final decision on the pilot project was created, if the SPA experts were consulted early.
4. Special problem for the implementation of the project seems to be the involvement of local and regional stakeholders, in particular the governorate authorities. It is true that since the start of the project's implementation, the political situation in Egypt has taken the dramatic turn to new changes, which has seriously impeded the implementation of the project. The governorates' leading politicians have been changed several times, which has seriously affected the continuity of their engagement in the project. However, there are signs that this situation has been improving recently, as the PMU has held contacts with Nile Delta Governorates, and had frequent meetings with them. The involvement of NGOs seems to have been more limited. Finally, the involvement of stakeholders in pilot projects could not be evaluated as the pilot projects' implementation hasn't started yet, but it seems that the discussion on these projects led between the project partners is leading to an acceptable solution to the impasse created.

**3.1.4. Replication approach**

1. From the replication perspective the project is very important because it is the first GEF project attempting to develop climate change adaptation strategy in Egypt. The PD neither has the replication strategy developed, nor the project's design envisages development of one, nor there is a budget line earmarked for replication. The words "replication" and "replicability" are mentioned only 5 times in the entire PD. The PD limits itself to the proposal which states that "Extension of similar projects (pilot projects, *com. IT*) to other locations will be done primarily by the State Government in collaboration with vulnerable groups". While "replication" is not mentioned in the above proposal, it may be considered that replication is implicit to it. Also, one could say that there is the basis for replication if the project creates an enabling environment, generates knowledge, raises awareness, and builds good practices via pilot projects that could be picked elsewhere in Egypt. However, in spite of that, the evaluator is of the opinion that the whole approach to replication in this project may be considered as very modest and that it doesn't subscribe to a replication strategy.

**3.1.5. Cost-effectiveness**

1. A grant of US$4,000,000 has been given by GEF for the Nile Delta Project's implementation in the period 2009-2014 (US$4,510,000 in total, including project preparation grant and Agency fee). The interest and commitment of the national project partners is reflected in the allocation of US$12,905,060 in-kind and in-cash parallel funding, which also includes funds for the project preparation phase. The total financing of the project reaches US$ 17,415,060. The parallel funding is more than 3 times the size of the GEF grant for the project’s implementation, which could be considered as a good ratio.
2. The critical point of the project financing lays in the Component 2 of the project (on-the-ground measures, i.e. pilot projects), which is supposed to consume US$ 9,500,000 (around 2/3 of the total; the GEF grant allocates US$2,100,000 to this component, or a little more than 50% of the grant). Considering that implementation of the pilot projects practically has not started yet, the risk of financial non-performance remains reasonably high.
3. The project management arrangement, in particular with the location of the PMU at CoRI premises is also cost-effective, because it allows Project Manager and its staff to use all the organizational, technical and research resources and facilities of CoRI. Although reputed professionals have been engaged to coordinate the project and execute its activities, the personnel and other management costs are comparably lower than in other projects of similar size.

**3.1.6. UNDP comparative advantage**

1. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the GEF Implementing Agency for the project. Its comparative advantage lies in the fact that it is well positioned to assist Egypt in design and implementation of the project. The PD correctly describes the UNDP advantages. It doesn't mention though, the UNDP GEF Regional Coordination Unit in Bratislava, which also has a role in the implementation of the project, none the least through its extensive experience in managing a score of coastal climate change adaptation projects in Eastern Europe and Mediterranean. That experience, coupled with the experience and extensive knowledge of ICZM globally through a series of GEF projects, makes UNDP well placed to implement this project.
2. The operational issues related to the implementation of the project are the responsibility of the PMU, which is well equipped to perform such function. The PD adequately describes the functions of the UNDP-CO, which have been carried out in full during the hitherto implementation of the Nile Delta Project.

**3.1.7. Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector**

1. There are four major on-going or planned interventions that the Nile Delta Project should be linked with: (1) WB/GEF Alexandria Integrated Coastal Zone Management Project, which aims at mainstreaming of ICZM and environmental objectives into coastal management and development plans; (2) the Framework ICZM Strategy for Egypt, which aims at promoting the basic ICZM principles in Egypt based on the Mediterranean ICZM Protocol of the Barcelona Convention, which Egypt signed but has yet to ratify it; (3) EU FP7 PEGASO project, which aims at building an ICZM platform for the Mediterranean countries; and (4) ICZM Plan for the Northern Coast of Egypt, which aims at preparing and disseminating an ICZM Plan for the northern coast of Egypt together with a shoreline management plan. The PD mentions only interventions under (1) and (2), but also states that it should link with the UN Climate Change Risk Management Programme and the Nile Basin Initiative. However, it should be noted that the intervention under (4) has been initiated by this project. This, as a matter of fact, could also be considered as the implementation of one of the aims of the project, which is to be a sort of a “hub” that should spark new ideas within this sector. In this respect, there has been several minor initiatives that have been generated under the aegis of this project (cooperation with the Netherlands on the preparation of the TOR for and to review the conceptual designs of the proposed pilot projects; EU/UNDP joint cooperation on the assessment of the Rashid Wall; and the study on the potential impacts of Climate Change in Egypt).
2. Linkage of the Nile Delta project with other initiatives is important, first, because it brings additional knowledge and experience and expands the range of stakeholders involved and, second, it allows creation of synergy and avoidance of duplication of work. The evaluator thinks that linkage of this project with the initiatives that promote and implement ICZM is of vital importance for the success of the project. The additional initiatives bring wider scope into the Nile Delta Project and allow for better linkage of shore management component of the project with coastal development in Nile Delta supported by ICZM. In this respect, it looks like the WB/GEF Alexandria ICZM project is of somewhat lesser importance of the project because its focus is on the Lake Mariout, which is not in the Nile Delta Project's area of intervention, and is aimed at building the appropriate infrastructure to reduce pollution of the lake. However, ultimately, the results of the Nile Delta Project could be integrated with the Lake Mariout project, because both projects could be part of a larger Nile Delta ICZM Plan. Other three initiative are sharing, practically the same objectives as the Nile Delta Project and could be easily linked. The TOR of the Northern Coast ICZM Plan is currently being reviewed to reflect better on the integrating role of ICZM.

**3.1.8. Indicators**

1. The project's concept transposed into Project Results Framework (PRF)/Strategic Results Framework (SRF), formerly called Logical Framework Analysis, shows that SMART indicators (i.e. the indicators that are **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**elevant, and **T**ime-bound) were largely used to measure the progress of implementation of the outcomes. The project's logframe and monitoring matrix includes eight indicators at objective level. It includes five process indicators (addressing capacity building, legal and planning measures, institutional strengthening and knowledge generation) and three stress reduction or impact indicators that are generalized or summed up from outcome level indicators. Most of the indicators/outputs are clear products whose finality, i.e. timeliness, could be easily established. The PRF/SLR and the indicators contained in it, including the milestones, have been used while performing the Project Implementation Review (PIR) in 2011 and 2012.
2. The process indicators at objective level in the project logframe describe the complementary strategies towards improved adaptation to climate change in Nile Delta: creation of the ICZM regulatory and institutional framework to accommodate coastal climate change adaptation; ICZM "friendly" data management system that will improve decision making and allow for easier linkages between concrete actions and wider ICZM framework, including development a set of indicators; and integration of LSA (LS!) and shoreline management plans in the ICZM framework. Related indicators at outcome level are quite ambitious. It has to be stated here that change in term from the "Living Shorelines Approach" to "Living with the Sea" approach has not required a change in the structure of SRF. During the Inception Workshop and in the Inception Report, no major alteration in SRF took place except for introducing the idea of creating coastal habitat plans (for dunes etc.). However, once the final decision on pilot projects will be taken it will have to be appropriately reflected in SRF.

**3.1.9. Management arrangements**

1. The Nile Delta Project's PD stipulates that it will be implemented by UNDP and executed following established UNDP national execution procedures. The executing partner is the MWRI through the collaboration of its research and technical arms: CoRI and SPA. The project staff envisaged by the PD has been appointed: the National Project Director, responsible for overall implementation of the project; the Project Manager, responsible for the successful implementation of project activities and the achievement of planned project outputs; and the Project Management Unit (PMU), responsible for the day-to-day implementation and management of the project. The PMU operates under the overall guidance of the Project Board (subsequently referred to as the Steering Committee), which is responsible for steering its activities and strategic decision-making. Thus, the PMU is composed of a full time PM, technical, administrative and financial staff. The PD proposed the composition of the Project Board. PD also elaborates in reasonable detail the TORs for the Project Manager, project accountant, project assistant, national technical specialist, team of experts to be hired on an ad-hoc basis, and an international expert on adaptation.
2. The PD document contains the section on management arrangement for the project. It describes the composition and major tasks of the Project Board (Steering Committee). Other decision-making layers of the project are not mentioned at all. Besides, the Project Board is not presented as the major decision-making body of the project, but as a body that oversees the work of the PMU only. During the evaluation, and interviews that the evaluator held with project partners, the management structure of the project was made clearer, and it is discussed below in section 3.2.3. Execution and implementation modalities.

The evaluator concludes that the project is still **relevant** in view of its global importance and consistency with the national policies and strategies for adaptation to climate change and for ICZM. The evaluator rates the overall project formulation as **marginally satisfactory**, as the conceptual approach, including on-the-ground pilot projects, was proposed with inadequate preliminary assessment of the natural and institutional context.

**3.2. Implementation**

1. The Nile Delta Project had a preparatory phase that lasted a little less than 3 years. GEF CEO endorsed it in June 2009, and the implementation started in April 2010. This rather lengthy mobilization period could be explained by the fact that this was the first UNDP-GEF project executed by MWRI; that there existed a limited number of specialists working in the area of ICZM and coastal engineering in Egypt; and the fact that the PM is located in Alexandria rather than in Cairo limiting, in early stages of the project's implementation, the effectiveness of “face-to-face” contacts between UNDP CO and PMU (however, having the PMU located in the vicinity of geographical location of project’s operation is, on the other hand, an advantage).
2. The hitherto implementation of the project has been largely affected by the political events in Egypt in early 2011, when most of the activities of the project were brought down to a bare minimum for a period of 3-4 months (even the simple act of travel between Cairo and Alexandria was affected by the events). The participation of major regional stakeholders – governorates - was practically impossible because of very frequent changes of the governorate leaderships, which resulted in very little contact between the PMU and the governorates in Nile Delta area for an extended period of time (this is particularly important for the pilot projects which need the "green light" from the governorates). While the existence of disagreement between CoRI and SPA on a number of conceptual issues related to the shore protection activities and resulting lack of coordination was reasonably well identified in the PD, which has stated as one of the project’s objectives the need to harmonize and improve their relationship, their current relationship, in spite of improvement, is still far from being ideal, as the disagreement between them on the type of concrete intervention along the coast still exists.

**3.2.1. Financial Planning**

1. The project's financial planning and management has been carried according to the UNDP rules. The total amount allocated for the project (grant and parallel funding) is US$16,838,060. The GEF grant amounts to US$4,000,000, while US$12,838,060 of the parallel funding is expected to be provided by the Government of Egypt (US$12,000,000 total; US$8,000,000 in cash for engineering works by SPA, and US$4,000,000 in kind), UNDP (US$200,000 in cash) and IDRC (US$638,060 in cash). The resulting ratio between grant and parallel funding is 3.21 (i.e. the amount of parallel funding is 3.21 times larger than the grant), which could be considered, if realized, as a very solid one. If we add the amount that was granted by GEF (US$100,000) and Egyptian Government (US$67,000) for the project preparation, and the Implementing Agency’s fee (US$400,000), the above ratio becomes even higher. Significant amount of the parallel funding is in cash, and it is almost exclusively tied to the Component 2 (pilot projects). Utilization of these funds will have to be closely monitored in order to establish whether they will be used for the intended purpose.
2. General distribution of funds (grant and parallel funding) is given in Table 7 of the PD (see table below). The distribution of funds for each component of the project, broken down to the level of outcomes, and using the standard budget lines, is given on page 43 of the PD (see table below). So far, the presentation of the budget has been clear and consistent. However, in the table on page 48-50 of the project document, in which funds are allocated to specific outputs, there are differences, and not all of the parallel funding funds are accounted for. The total of US$13,725,001 is allocated to the outputs related to the Outcomes 1, 2 and 3. If we add US$1,700,000 for the project management to that amount, the total allocated amounts to US$15,425,001. There is still US$1,413,059 of grant and parallel funding not accounted for. Explanation for this discrepancy has been given neither in the Project Document nor in the Inception Report.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 7: Project objective: Integrate the management of SLR risks into the development of Egypt’s Low Elevation Coastal Zone (LECZ) in the Nile Delta.** |
| Project Components | Indicative SCCF Financing | Indicative Parallel funding |   |
| (US$) | % | ($) | % | Total (US$) |
| 1. Regulatory Framework and Institutional Capacity | 930,000 | 29.7% | 2,200,000 | 70.3% | 3,130,000 |
| 2. On the ground measures | 2,100,000 | 20% | 8,400,000 | 80% |  10,500,000 |
| 3. Knowledge management | 570,000 | 37.8% | 938,060 | 62.2% | 1,508,060 |
| 4. Project management  | 400,000 | 23.5% | 1,300,000 | 76.5% | 1,700,000 |
| Total project costs | 4,000,000 | 0.24 % | 12,838,060 | 0.76% | 16,838,060 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |





1. The annual work and budgetary planning and actual expenditures in the period 2010-2012 show great discrepancies in comparison with the planned budget as presented in the Project Document, even if the latter budget is taken as an indicative one only. The table below has been compiled from the documents given to the evaluator during the mission. It presents the budget planned in PD, and the annual workplans’ budgets and actual expenditure of the GEF grant. All figures are in US$.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Comp** | **Planned - Annual Workplan (AW)** | **Actually Spent** | **% Spent of AW** | **Planned - Project Document (PD) \*** | **% AW of the PD** | **% Spent of PD** |
| 2010 | 1 | 20,183 | 142,794 | 77 | 672,500 | 27 | 21 |
| 2 | 55,596 |
| PMU | 108,830 |
| Total | 184,609 |
| 2011 | 1 | 96,000 | 233,953 | 44 | 789,000 | 68 | 30 |
| 2 | 242,404 |
| 3 | 155.496 |
| PMU | 38,838 |
| Total | 532,738 |
| 2012 | 1 | 193,729 | 115,784 | 14 | 918,500 | 91 | 13 |
| 2 | 422,034 |
| 3 | 116,407 |
| PMU | 101,695 |
| Total | 833,864 |
| 2010-12 | Total | 1,551,211 | 492,531 | 32 | 2,380,000 | 65 | 21 |

 \* Doesn't include UNDP's cash contribution to project implementation (US$200,000)

1. The annual financial planning and actual annual expenditures show great discrepancy with the budget presented in the PD. Overall, in the period 2010-2012 the PD planned expenditure was US$2,380,000, but actual annual budgets planned expenditure of only US$1,551,211 (65% of the amount planned in PD). However, during the 2010-2012 period only US$492,531 (21% of the planned amount, and 32% of annually budgeted) was actually spent. Even if major obstacles to the project's implementation are taken into account, the resulting expenditure is way below the planned one, both in PD and on the annual basis. This means that without an extension being granted, in 2 remaining years of the project’s implementation almost 80% of the planned GEF grant will have to be spent, which is not realistic.
2. It is considered that the political problems in Egypt are the major barrier to effective project's implementation and utilization of funds. This is particularly reflected in the implementation of pilot (demonstration) projects within Component 2, which have not practically started yet (after the initial proposals have been abandoned, the decision has been taken only for one new pilot project, while the decision for the remaining two is still pending). The budget adopted with the PD envisaged that total of US$2,100,000 of the GEF grant will be spent for that purpose. During the first three years the PD planned amount for Component 2 was set at US$1,212,000. The amount planned in annual budgets for the same period is US$720,034, i.e. 59% of the amount planned in the Project Document. The resulting financial records do not show exactly how much of the GEF grant was spent on Component 2 in the 2010-2012 period, but it is not difficult conclude that, having in mind the above statements, this amount is rather minimal and way below the amounts planned in the Project Document or in annual budgets.
3. The evaluator has found that financial reporting could be more detailed, even if the rules of the UNDP reporting system were followed. Thus, for example, in the budget lines related to the international and local consultants the distinction between the two is clear, but the description doesn’t tell us how many international and local consultants were actually contracted. To be more precise, the Combined Delivery Report by Activity with Encumbrance for 2010, 2011 and 2012 contains only the summary budget lines ("Intl Consultants-Sht Term-Tech" and "Service Contracts-Individuals"), but doesn't say how many contracts were signed, with whom, and what was the value of each individual contract. However, the procedure for hiring the consultants is clear and it is following fully the UNDP rules.
4. The amount of the parallel funding committed is considerable. However, none of the PIRs (2011 and 2012) so far submitted has reported how much of the parallel funding has actually materialized. However, it should be noted that additional US$500,000 of in-kind parallel funding has been leveraged through UNDP and EU. In the future, reporting on parallel funding should be on an annual basis, and a template for doing so should be prepared by PMU. Finally, it is the high time to assess whether the full amount of parallel funding will be actually delivered until the end of the project’s implementation.

The evaluator rates the financial planning as **marginally satisfactory**. While taking in consideration all the constraints and political barriers to the implementation of the project, the discrepancy between planned and actual expenditures is too large, budget revisions have not been carried out after 2011, and parallel funding did not materialize.

**3.2.2. Monitoring and evaluation**

1. Project Monitoring and Evaluation component is planned to be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures. The Strategic Results Framework provides clear indicators to monitor and measure the effectiveness of project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification, which form the basis on which the project's Monitoring and Evaluation system is built. In addition to the current independent Mid-Term Evaluation, which is undertaken at the end of the third year of implementation, an independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the terminal tripartite review meeting.
2. The M&E plan envisages an elaborate reporting schedule consisting of day-to-day monitoring, periodic monitoring, and annual monitoring. Project Monitoring Reporting will take place at regular intervals throughout the project's implementation. The Inception Report was prepared before, and adopted at the Project Inception Workshop. The Inception Workshop adopted the first Annual Workplan, as well as revised Strategic Results Framework (logframe). The revised framework proposed, *inter alia*, introduction of the Shoreline Management Framework within the context of ICZM, slightly revised the contents of the initially proposed pilot projects (however, the Appendix 8 of the IR describes techniques involving sand dune regeneration and foreshore recharge projects as most likely intervention measures to be adopted for new pilot projects instead of those initially proposed in the PD), and introduced the term "Living with the Sea" instead of "Living Shoreline Approach". Although envisaged, the Inception Report did not come up with the detailed schedule of project review meetings (tripartite reviews, steering committee meetings and other monitoring and evaluation activities). It proposed only the schedule of the steering committee meetings in 2011 (3 meetings) and mentioned that the project management committee meetings will be proposed by the steering committee.
3. Day-to-day monitoring is the responsibility of the Project Manager. The PM was watchful of all the activities related to the implementation of the project, and has kept very close relationship with the UNDP-CO Manager through regular meetings and communication, which has secured effective coordination of the project. However, the evaluator was not informed if the monthly reports were prepared by the PM, as stipulated by the Inception Report. Yearly visits of the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU to the field sites did not take place, as the pilot projects were not implemented.
4. Periodic monitoring was supposed to take place through quarterly meetings with the project proponent. There is no record that these meetings have taken place, as no reports of eventual meetings were presented to the evaluator.
5. Annual Project Report (APR)/Project Implementation Review (PIR) were prepared for 2011 and 2012, which is according to the reporting schedule. In 2011 PIR, the project was rated as satisfactory in both DO and IP categories by PM, UNDP-CO and UNEP GEF Regional Advisor. The PIR was prepared in mid-2011, a few months after the political difficulties in Egypt took place. The descriptive remarks related to the ratings given by all three parties, mention that fact, which has certainly affected the pace of the project's implementation.
6. The 2012 PIR's rating of the project is lower than for 2011. For DO, the PM and UNDP-CO gave the "satisfactory" mark, while the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor gave the "moderately satisfactory" mark. The latter remarked: "The project is marginally satisfactory in its delivery of results during the reporting year, as it has been constrained by the turbulent political situation in the country. Frequent changes of the key positions at the main partner institutions, including executing agency was a major reason of slowing down the progress. The project however, has delivered some important results, especially under outcome 1...“ For IP, all parties gave the "moderately satisfactory" mark, except the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor who gave it the "satisfactory" mark explaining: "The project implementation is rated as satisfactory as the project team demonstrated impressive ability for adaptive management under the extraordinary circumstances. Frequent changes have occurred at the Minister’s, governor’s and other key positions, at least four times over the reporting year...“ The evaluator finds the latter rate as inconsistent with the performance of the project. The rate of the performance must be objective one and should be based on the comparison of the results achieved to the activities planned, irrespective of the events that might have hindered the implementation progress. Therefore, even if the project team has shown impressive performance in light of the difficult circumstances (as has been the case in Egypt), it is the total amount of results achieved that should be taken as the basis for rating. It has to be stated here that the IP rating is not the rating of the team but of the results achieved.

The evaluator rates the Monitoring and Evaluation System as **satisfactory**, because only minor shortcomings are perceived, which do not affect the overall effectiveness of the system.

**3.2.3. Execution and implementation modalities**

1. The implementing and executing structure is divided between Cairo (implementing) and Alexandria (executing). The UNDP CO is located in Cairo, while the PMU is located in Alexandria. The different location of these two units seems to be a practical and good arrangement, particularly if we have in mind that PMU should be closer to the area of the project (Nile Delta). It has to be stated that regular communication between the PMU and UNDP-CO mostly has not been affected by physical dislocation, except during the period of political unrest in Egypt when travel between Cairo and Alexandria was affected. The facilities offered to the PMU at CoRI are generally satisfactory, although an extra room, in addition to two that have already been used, would be very useful, in particular to hold the meetings, because at present PMU doesn't have its own meeting room and the meetings are being held in the PM's office. The PMU seems to be well equipped with all the office, communication and transportation facilities needed.
2. The management structure of the Nile Delta Project consists of several layers of management. While the PD envisages only one committee (Project Board/Steering Committee), in reality the management structure consists of the following layers:
* Steering Committee composed of NWRC, SPA, CoRI, UNDP, Guy Jobbins representing IDRC Project (Substituted by Prof. Mustafa Guawish Ex-CoRI Director), Mohamed Farouk representing EEAA, Head of Agriculture Research Centre and Prof. El-Kassas (Substituted by Prof. El-Raey after the death of Prof. Kassas). The PMU acted as a Secretariat to this committee. Steering Committee meets every six months, and had 5 meetings so far.
* Executive Committee composed of NWRC, SPA, CoRI and UNDP. It deals with institutional problems and secures coordination between stakeholders. It had met four times so far.
* Follow-up Committee, composed of CoRI, SPA, EEAA, and Navy Survey Authority. The committee is meant to help in implementing pilot projects after SPA expressed some hesitance to be involved in committees proposed to formulate each pilot project. The committee hasn't made much impact so far.
* Management Committee, as an advisory body to help the PMU to perform its job. It is now discontinued and it was composed of CoRI, SPA, EEAA, Prof. Mahmoud Khamis, Prof. Aly Beltagui and Prof. Makram Guerges.
1. The above modality seems to be relatively complex for the project of such structure and budget as the Nile Delta Project. It is obvious that the initial execution structure was aimed at assisting SPA and CoRI in defining the most appropriate coastal engineering concept to be implemented for adaptation to climate change in the Nile Delta, but also, to a certain extent, to mediate between EEAA and MWRI over their roles in ICZM in general, including the definition of the role ICZM should play in shoreline protection (Executive and Follow-up Committees played major role in this). During the hitherto project’s implementation, the need for an additional coordination layer emerged and new management body was established (Management Committee, now discontinued). It is questionable whether, in this case, simple addition of a new committee, obviously on an ad-hoc basis, was the most rational solution, since no analysis of the functioning of the existing bodies was ever made. It seems that inability to solve problems has always been transferred to a new committee that was established for that purpose. This practice should be abandoned in the future.

**3.2.4. Management by the UNDP country office**

1. UNDP is the GEF implementing agency for the Nile Delta Project. It has been responsible for the preparation of the Project Document, in full coordination and consultation with MWRI. During the execution of the project, UNDP Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) is not providing operational support but has a supervising role only. Its main responsibility is monitoring and evaluation of the project's implementation. All reports (PIR and quarterly reports, in particular) are sent to UNDP RCU in Bratislava. Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) reviews the reports and gives final rate in the PIR. The UNDP-CO is an active partner in the project's implementation. The responsible officer for the project in the UNDP-CO is very actively involved in the implementation of the project. In addition to his role in supervising contracting, procurement and other assistance that is being carried out by the UNDP-CO, he is in regular contact with the PMU. He is also frequently visiting project's office in Alexandria, as well as potential sites of the pilot projects. He has very good understanding of the project's context and execution and is working actively towards removing barriers to its efficient implementation. Overall, the management of the project by the UNDP-CO is efficient, and all the interviewees expressed their satisfaction with their performance and swift response when it was needed.

 **3.2.5. Coordination and operational issues by the PMU**

1. PMU is located at CoRI in Alexandria. The facilities offered by the host are satisfactory, but a certain expansion, at least for one room, would bring an additional quality to the performance of the project's staff. This room could be used for the meetings, as they are now being held in the PM's office, which is quite small for that function. The PMU is staffed by the PM, technical advisor, financial and administrative assistant, and clerk/driver. All interviewees expressed their satisfaction with the performance of the PMU. The PM at the time of the visit left an impression of capable, experienced and technically competent person. He has shown great integrity and communication skills, which should be considered as a great asset for this position. The evaluator was informed that he is leaving soon. Finding his replacement will be a great responsibility for the implementing agency because it is taking place at a very critical moment of the project's implementation. All the qualities that have been shown by the current PM will have to be replicated with the new one.
2. Some interviewees expressed the view that the PM is doing too many administrative tasks and that he is overloaded by preparation of the meetings, writing the reports and similar, and cannot devote enough of his time and energy to the technical as well as proper managerial tasks. The evaluator fully subscribes to this view. The administrative/financial assistant is competent and shows integrity, which is very important for her line of work.
3. The evaluator finds that the management structure, composed of 4 committees (one discontinued now), is too complicated and it is questionable if such structure really contributes to the efficient management of the project. It is possible that some elements of this structure evolved as an ad-hoc response to the barriers that the project was facing, such as discussion on the coastal engineering approach and/or decision on the pilot projects. This structure needs to be simplified. It is not the number of management layers, or committees that secure the efficient implementation of the project, but timely and strict implementation of the decisions being taken. From this perspective, the view of the evaluator is that only 2 committees are needed: the Steering Committee (or Project Board), as the highest decision making and supervising body of the project, and the Executive Committee, which is needed to assist the PMU in day-to-day management (in terms of taking the decisions on the matters that PM cannot take, or decisions that cannot wait the next meeting of the Steering Committee) and/or mediate in matters that might still emerge between CoRI and SPA.

**3.2.6. Results**

1. The impact of the project is addressed here by the Outcomes recorded in the APR/PIR reports. Two reports submitted so far were examined, for 2011 and 2012. However, it is evident that the current state of the Nile Delta Project, having in mind its delayed start, allows only for an interim assessment of its results, and the MTE should be cautious with an evaluation how much the overall results will finally be attained.

3.2.6.1 Achievement of outputs and activities

1. Implementation of the Nile Delta Project fully started in April 2010 (after a 7-months mobilization period). The following paragraphs look at achievement of outcomes through realisation of outputs and activities during the first three years of this 5-year project. The PD lists 3 components and associated 3 outcomes, and 10 outputs. It does not systematically elaborate on the activities and one has to infer which activities would exactly be carried out in the project. The task of establishing the exact list of activities is left to the Inception Report, which was adopted at the Inception Workshop. The Inception Report lists the total of 36 activities divided among 3 outcomes, to be implemented throughout the entire duration of the project. However, the Inception Report mentions only 9, instead of 10, outputs. The output, originally mentioned in the PD, which is missing in the Inception Report, is the output 1.4. Budgetary planning of Shore Protection Agency enacted to reflect climate change risks. The idea behind this activity was to ensure that SPA had some budget allocation for internal training and skill development for soft engineering works. It was explained to the evaluator that the Inception Report covers only the first two years of the project’s activities, and that this activity is planned to be implemented at a later stage.
2. For the evaluation of the results, the outcomes, outputs and activities presented in the Inception Report will be taken as the basis, because they were adopted at the Inception Workshop and more adequately reflect the current state.

*Outcome 1*

1. According to the Inception Report, the Outcome 1 (Regulatory Framework and Institutional Capacity) has 3 outputs (1.1. Modified coastal development legislation and regulations modified focusing on ICZM and its links to existing EIA framework; 1.2 Strengthened institutional and technical capacity of NCZMC to support climate risk mainstreaming and tools of help to deliver the implementation of coastal adaptation measures; and 1.3 Information Management System reflecting climate change impacts on the coastal zones), which are implemented through 14 activities. Except for the omission of the Output 1.4. In the PD, the revised content and proposed activities of the Outcome 1, as presented in the Inception Report, do not alter the original objectives of this outcome.
2. Progress towards achievement of Output 1.1. includes completion of the Legal and Institutional Study on Existing Legislation Focusing on Development in the Coastal Zone, Shore Protection and ICZM (in Arabic only), and organisation of the Consultative Meeting “Towards A Legal and Institutional Framework for Integrated Coastal Zone Management” in Cairo, both during 2011. The project also supported the organisation and facilitation of the joint Egyptian-Dutch Workshop to assess the national need for an ICZM Plan for the Egypt's Northern Coast in 2012 (the organisation of this workshop has been largely supported through leveraged funding). The above activities were supposed to show that shore protection management is, actually, one component or “sector” of the ICZM. Looking at the issue only spatially, one easily concludes that shore protection management deals only with the narrow shoreline, while ICZM encompasses much larger area. Unfortunately, the PD is quite deficient on this explanation. The above activities were supposed to be the preparatory activities for the modification of the ICZM legal and institutional arrangements and drafting of a Code of Practice for building coastal structures, which has not yet taken place. Unless coastal land use and ICZM legislation will be reviewed and updated, all actions will be pointless without ICZM regulation and coastal land use planning.
3. Activities in Output 1.2. included finalisation of the Study to Identify Wind, Waves, and Current Patterns, Study on the Variability of the Sediment Budget along the Nile Delta Coast - Egypt, and a Study of the Sediment Budget along the Nile Delta Coast. The results of these studies contributed to better understanding of the sediment dynamics along the northern shore. It is not clear, however, whether all studies have already contributed to the strengthening the capacity of the NCZMC. The results will have to be presented to the NCZMC through appropriate capacity building exercises.
4. Progress towards achievement of the Output 1.3. included preparation of the Gap Analysis of Institutional Arrangements to Deliver ICZM, organisation of the meeting to assess the user needs to agree on SDI, whose results were used to create the spatial data management facility, including GIS and the design of the project's web site. Appropriate training on GIS was organised for SPA and CoRI staff, as well as training for design of soft engineering techniques and climate change adaptation techniques. The project's GIS is in operation, but it should be used more actively for analytical purposes. The web site is well designed, but it has not been populated regularly.

The rating for the achievement and outputs of Outcome 1 is **marginally** **satisfactory** reflecting steady delivery of outputs in spite of relatively lengthy mobilisation period of the project, and barriers present during the project's implementation.

*Outcome 2*

1. The Outcome 2 is supposed to produce 3 outputs, as adjusted during the Inception Workshop: 2.1. Introduction and implementation of innovative technologies and practices to improve the adaptive capacity of coastal management in pilot projects in appropriate coastal areas; 2.2. Socio-economic assessment and adaptation option appraisals; and 2.3. Introduction of climate risk assessment into an implementable ICZM framework for the Nile Delta. It has the total of 16 activities: output 2.1. nine, output 2.2. five, and output 2.3. two activities. The Outcome/Component 2 may be considered as the most critical component of the project, not only because it is financially the most demanding (in terms of GEF grant – more than 50% of available resources is allocated to this component; more than 60% when parallel funding is included), but also because successful implementation of this component would prove how the adaptation practically works on the ground. The Project Document proposes three locations for pilot projects (output 2.1.): Idku, Burullus and Manzalla, without elaborating too much which are the concrete activities that will be implemented in each location. The objective of this output is to “…pilot a set of innovative shore protection activities focusing on 'soft' measures/technologies that can sustain proper ecosystem functioning/productivity in each of the coastal lagoons through the preservation of existing wetlands and enhancement of their functionality.” The activities were also meant to be an important test of the suitability of “soft” protection measures given the geomorphologic, climatic and development characteristics of the Nile Delta area. The underlining objective was to implement the Living Shoreline Approach in the Nile Delta area.
2. Three issues marked the debate at the beginning of the project and affected the implementation of the activities. The issues debated have been of the conceptual nature and, to a certain extent, originated in the institutions making the Nile Delta Project's partnership. These issues are: (1) concern over the appropriateness of LSA in the energy dynamic Egypt's Northern Coast, and Nile Delta in particular; (2) debate on the appropriateness of three initial pilot project locations as a reflection of the debate under (1); and (3) discussion between SPA and CoRI on the coastal engineering approach. During the inception period, the LSA approach was amended and brought more in line with the characteristics of the Egypt's Northern Coast; the Inception Report went on assessing the suitability of the areas for the pilots and gave initial description of the new interventions; and the debate between CoRI and SPA turned out to be in itself an important activity (or even output) of the project as there was an agreement reached between them on the definition and importance of the proposed approach, actually something that never happened before. However, the debate on all three issues has taken a considerable amount of time.
3. Regarding the first issue, the Inception Report proposed, and participants of the Inception Workshop approved, the new Living with the Sea (LS) approach, instead of the Living Shoreline Approach (LSA). While the LSA techniques could be used when appropriate, the LS approach puts shoreline intervention into wider policy context for coastal adaptation, and allows for integration of shoreline protection management into ICZM framework, which in itself is one of major outputs to be achieved by the Nile Delta Project. The evaluator agrees with the justification for LS given in the Inception Report.
4. After a lot of debate and several studies produced, in 2011 discussion started on the new pilot projects, and the following was proposed: (1) Managed tidal wetland restoration scheme, with the objective of creating a buffer zone to absorb excesses of marine water due to storm and storm surges in the area between the shoreline and the International Coastal Road; the exact location is still being discussed; (2) Foreshore recharge using maintenance dredged material from ports, agreement reached that the material dredged from the Damietta port will be used; and (3) Sand dune restoration and management scheme, with the objective of managing future erosion threat to the dunes; proposed location is Burullus or Baltim, but final decision has not yet been taken. More detailed presentation of the three pilot project options is given in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pilot Project Technique** | **Location** | **Justification as a Technique** |
| Artificial Wetland Creation scheme | To be located to the east of the Rashid (Mohamed Aly) seawall. | The Project Document clearly outlines that the specific measures to be installed should include reduction of nutrient loads from agriculture, and the establishment of conservation zones to preserve essential coastal habitats. |
| Shore Nourishment scheme using dredged material  | Locations close to the approach channels of either Edku or Damietta ports. | The Project Document clearly outlines that the specific measures to be installed should include re-nourishing beaches. |
| Pilot Coastal Sand Dunes Management scheme  | Most likely to be implemented close to Burullus (El Burj) village | The Project Document clearly outlines that the specific measures to be installed should include planting suitable crops in coastal zone for coastal protection in a ‘vegetative buffer’ structure, and reinforcing sand dune systems as a defence mechanism. |

1. In addition to the prolonged debate between CoRI and SPA on the definition and importance of the proposed coastal engineering approach (see paragraph 81), an additional problem was that the top SPA management has been changing too often in recent years (apparently, 8 times since 2006). This fact has somehow hindered the continuity in the implementation of agreed actions. However, despite these changes and, additionally, the initial skepticism, the SPA management seemed to be open to test some of the soft solutions and this willingness was expressed at the Inception Workshop and evidenced by the fact that all stakeholders agreed on the Inception Report including SPA.
2. In addition to the activities for the preparation of the Inception Report and Inception Workshop (by some strange decision these are part of the Outcome/Component 2 although they refer to the project as a whole), which were completed in 2011, the concrete activities for output 2.1. related exclusively to the preparation of the decision on the new pilot projects. For the pilot project on utilizing the dredged materials from the approach canal to Damietta Port, the TOR were prepared for the design of the pilot and shared with the main stakeholders and afterwards and tendered for individual consultants. As the evaluation panel was not satisfied with the capacity of the applicants to undertake the assignment, the TOR was retendered for consulting firms and groups and three entities applied. While it was expected that design will start after contracting one of the bidders before the end of 2012 under the supervision and guidance of the project international advisor, nothing has happened yet.
3. The second project pilot addresses the development of a management plan for the coastal sand dunes system surrounding Burullus Lagoon or Baltim. The TOR for the study was prepared and the study upon which the management plan will be designed was completed. The proposed design will define the ownership of coastal sand dunes and how to manage its resources including guidelines on the practices needed to be avoided and on those which can be allowed.
4. The third pilot project was agreed to address the protection of section of the International Coastal Road that is very close to the sea from recurrent surge storms. International Coastal Road is protecting large area of low-lying lands in the Nile Delta. In 2010, the seawater has reached the International Road for the first time during one of storms. The workshop was agreed with APP to be held back to back with the annual Egyptian-Dutch Panel bi-annual meeting. This workshop has not yet taken place
5. While no specific activities were performed for the Outputs 2.2. and 2.3., some additional activities were carried out such as Training Course for the Design of soft engineering Techniques and Climate Change Adaptation Intervention Measures, and Land Uses maps for the Nile Delta Coastal Area.
6. Activities of the Output 2.3. have started recently. It is worth noting that their start was envisaged early in the third year of the project implementation. If we take the delayed start in consideration, it should have happened in second quarter of 2012. The fundamentals of risk assessment of SLR on coastal zones were introduced to the main project partners through the training provided by the University of Cantabria. The PMU has also been following up and coordinating closely the CORI/University of Alexandria/CDS project, financed through parallel funding provided by the Canadian International Development and Research Centre (IDRC) to develop and test methods and approaches for determining optimum and feasible options to adapt to SLR in the Nile Delta by integrating traditional modelling approaches with multi-stakeholder deliberation processes, to reduce vulnerability, and minimize the external cost of adaptation. However, two major activities, Training “Demonstrating the benefits of Shore Management Framework” and Review of the appropriate tools to evaluate policy options for climate proofing have not started yet.

The rating for the achievement of outputs and activities of Outcome 2 is **marginally satisfactory**. The implementing agency and PMU have been confronted with some obstacles in moving this outcome’s activities off the ground, which explains the delay in starting pilot projects. While more analysis may be needed to define the suitability of the selected pilots and likelihood of success, it is expected that the implementation of the two remaining pilot projects will start soon.

Outcome 3

1. Three outputs will have to be produced under Outcome 3: 3.1. M&E system with measureable indicators introduced; 3.2. Lessons codified and disseminated through the Adaptation Learning Mechanism (ALM); and 3.3. Lessons disseminated throughout Egyptian Institutions – monitoring and evaluation based on proper indicators are in place. The total of 6 activities was envisaged in the Inception Report: Output 3.1. three, output 3.2. one, and output 3.3. two activities. If the timetable is adjusted for the delayed start, the output 3.1. was supposed to start in early 2012, while the start of other two should be in early 2014.
2. Very little has been done for the implementation of activities under Outcome 3. The output 3.1. is linked to the pilot projects’ implementation. As only one has been approved only recently, while the decision on the remaining two is still pending, the respective activities are being delayed too. The only tangible output to be considered in relation to output 3.2. is the existence of the web site. It was mentioned above that it is not being populated regularly, and hence is not of much use neither to the practitioners nor the general public.

The rating for the achievement of outputs and activities of Outcome 3 is **marginally satisfactory**. In spite of the delays of related activities that are supposed to provide inputs for the activities of this outcome, it was expected that some activities might have already taken place.

3.2.6.2. Attainment of objectives

1. As stated earlier in this report (see paragraph 16), the PD gives only the overall goal of the project, while it is less clear on the objective. The goal of the project is to "... enhance Egypt’s resilience and reduce vulnerability to Climate Change impacts", while the objective of the "projects" (the plural is in the PD, hence it is not clear whether the author refers to the Nile Delta Project as a whole, or to the pilot projects; if the latter is the case, the reference looks meaningless and is probably *lapsus calami*) is to "... integrate the management of SLR risks into the development of Egypt’s Low Elevation Coastal Zone (LECZ) in the Nile Delta". The outcomes of the project are considered as a "contribution to the achievement of the objective" (not the goal!). Consequently, the PIRs, in the section on Progress towards Meeting Development Objective (DO), refer only to one objective (to integrate the management of SLR risks into the development of Egypt’s Low Elevation Coastal Zone (LECZ) in the Nile Delta), and the 3 outcomes, but not to the goal of the project. The evaluator concludes that the presentation of the goal and objective would greatly benefit the project's implementation if a clear distinction has been made between the two. If that was the case, the confusion whether outcomes are objectives or not could have been avoided.
2. The actual improvements on the ground cannot yet be seen because the decision has been made on one pilot project only, and the Nile Delta area is still greatly exposed to negative impacts of climate change. However, the activities of the project have started to show some results at the institutional level, particularly with the growing conviction among the SPA management that adaptation to climate change may include "soft" engineering solutions, in addition to the "hard" ones. The decision on one pilot project, and hopefully for the remaining two soon, opens the way for actual on-the-ground activities to take place and changes to be seen. That may bring improvement to the overall Egypt's resilience and reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts.
3. The attainment of the Outcome 1's objective (Strengthened regulatory framework and institutional capacity to improve resilience of coastal settlements and development infrastructure) has made a relatively good progress, in spite of the difficulties and barriers to the project's implementation, particularly the political instability in Egypt. Basic studies have been made, but real legal and institutional changes are still waiting to happen. Institutional resilience in the water sector in Egypt (where the Nile Delta Project is largely embedded), and difficulty in reaching out to other administrative stakeholders and institutions, in particular with regards to ICZM is still present, and it looks like ample time will be needed to break this mould. However, the project's design and activities still offer a good opportunity to do so.
4. Objective of the Outcome 2 (Strategies and measures that facilitate adaptation to climate change impacts, SLR in particular, are implemented on the ground in vulnerable coastal areas) focuses on the implementation of the pilot projects. While the overall progress towards reaching that objective was rather marginal, as the implementation of the pilot projects has not started yet, having in mind the obstacles staying in the way since the project has started, it may be stated that implementation of this outcome's activities is at the point where major breakthrough has yet to be made. The new approach to shoreline protection works has been, more or less, agreed upon, the three new pilot projects have been singled out as the most feasible, the decision on one of the pilot projects has been made, and good progress has been made towards ironing out difference in views on coastal engineering approach between two major executing partners: CoRI and SPA. However, the implementation of the pilot projects has to start soon if the project's timetable will be respected.
5. The attainment of the Outcome 3's objective (Knowledge management: M&E framework and knowledge management system in place) is progressing at a very slow rate. It is linked to the attainment of the objectives of Outcomes 1 and 2 and, as they have been delayed, the implementation of a number of activities in this component had to be delayed too. The only activity where progress has been made so far is the web site, which has been made available, but has been populated irregularly.

The evaluator rates the overall attainment of the project's objectives as **marginally satisfactory**. The rate of implementation of the project's activities has differed among components and has generally been beyond the timetable, because of the major, largely, exogenous barriers to the project's implementation.

**3.2.7. Sustainability**

1. As with any initiative of this type, results will only be sustainable if supported by the appropriate government's policies and practice at all levels. While the PD has not elaborated a fully-fledged sustainability strategy, nor has envisaged any post-project arrangements for its sustainability, it does present some elements that may be considered as leading to the Nile Delta Project's sustainability, namely: internal capacity development within government agencies that are responsible for implementing the ICZM policy and adaptation measures, as well as with stakeholders in the local fishing and farming communities; clear indications in the new ICZM policy framework of stakeholder roles that ensure the policy and adaptation measures are implemented; the need that the issue of shoreline protection management and ICZM becomes and remains the priority issue; synergies with parallel projects and other processes in the area; presence of UNDP in the region; public awareness and communication; international attention and donor's mobilization to provide further support for the climate change adaptation initiatives; continuous communication and dialogue with development partners; and replication activities.
2. Major internal sustainability ingredient of the project is the continuous cooperation among the current project execution partners in agreeing on and designing of technically effective and economically efficient solutions to the coastal climate change adaptation works, which will improve the resilience of the Nile Delta to future climate change impacts, in particular the SLR. For that purpose, it is of utmost importance that appropriate institutional and organizational arrangement at regional and national levels be made. Finally, chances for the project's sustainability will be strengthened if appropriate ICZM regional and national framework will be put in place as soon as possible. First step should be more direct involvement of EEAA in the implementation of the project, particularly through discussion and agreement with other project's implementing partners on the conceptual definition of ICZM in relation to the shoreline protection management.
3. The current situation still carries substantial risks with regards to the success of the project, as indicated in the 2012 PIR, which states that overall chances for the project's sustainability are not high. Such assessment of risk is the result of the impacts on the project's implementation of the recent political instability in Egypt. But, this risk was somehow reduced by the efforts of PMU to mitigate these negative impacts. PM and the PMU staff have assisted consultations among partners, worked towards making a solution on the pilot projects, and tried to maintain contact with the governorates in the Nile Delta, as much as it was possible when their leaderships were changing so often. The chances for the project's sustainability could be maintained if such efforts of the PMU could be continued in the future.

The evaluator finds that the prospect for the sustainability of the Nile Delta Project's is **moderately likely**, since there are indications that the project is moving in the right direction, but major outputs are still to be delivered.

**3.2.8. Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff**

1. The project has already made a contribution to the upgrading skills of the national staff. In addition to producing several important studies, which have dealt with various project related subjects and which had large dissemination, five thematic workshops and training courses have been organised. The events, including the inception workshop have dealt with the following subjects: legal and institutional framework for ICZM; possible means to utilise the area extending from the shoreline and the International Coastal Road; Design of the soft engineering techniques and climate change adaptation intervention measures; and preparation of an ICZM Plan for Egypt's Northern Coast. More than 200 participants attended the events. The institutions attended ranged from the project partners (MWRI, CoRI, SPA, EEAA, PMU), to government institutions (Navy Survey Authority, General Authority for Fish Resources Development, Egyptian General Petroleum Corporation, etc.), governorate representatives (Kafr El-Sheikh, Beheira large number of governorate and national experts involved in the coastal protection works. Future activities in this realm will have to be increased, as that would be one of the major ingredients of the project's long-term sustainability.
2. While the organisation of workshops and training courses of specific technical subjects can be carried out with relative ease, as there is substantial technical capacity within the staff of the project's two main executing partners (CoRI and SPA), the upgrade of skills on cross-cutting subjects, such as ICZM, social and economic impacts of climate change, communication and awareness raising, gender issues, etc., may require larger effort, as these subjects will be presented sometimes to an audience which will not fully grasp the basic concept of the subject being presented.

**3.3. Conclusions**

1. The Nile Delta Project Document was signed in September 2009. After a rather lengthy mobilisation period, the implementation of project's activities started in April 2010, some 8 months after approval by the GEF CEO. Its duration is planned for 60 months, and the projected closure date is, thus, August 2014. This completion date does not reflect the delayed start of implementation of activities, and the need for the extension of the project is evident. This mid-term evaluation was undertaken just over three years after a start of actual implementation of the project and one and half years (without extension) before its completion date. The table below presents summary of ratings based on performance criteria.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Summary assessment** | **Rating** |
| Relevance | In view of global importance and consistency with national policies and strategies for adaptation to climate change still relevant | **R** |
| Implementation approach | Mainly acceptable, but not adequate attention given to mainstreaming of adaptation to climate change to ICZM | **MS** |
| Implementation arrangements | Carried consequently | **S** |
| Overall project formulation | Concept and design satisfactory, but pilot projects were not adequately assessed  | **MS** |
| Financial planning | Discrepancy between planned and actual expenditures is too large, budget revisions have not been carried out after 2011, and parallel funding did not materialize | **MS** |
| M&E | Consequently carried out | **S** |
| Outcome 1 | Delayed start of the project, integration of shoreline management into ICZM not achieved yet | **MS** |
| Outcome 2 | Significant delays in starting the pilot projects because of political problems in Egypt; decision on one project reached, two other pending | **MS** |
| Outcome 3 | Few activities started because of the delay in other outcomes | **MS** |
| Attainment of objectives | Different among outcomes | **MS** |
| Sustainability | Project moving in right direction but risks exist | **ML** |

1. The conclusions, based on the findings of the MTE, are presented in the form of a brief consolidated assessment based on the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.
2. The Nile Delta Project is still highly **relevant**, both with respect to its global importance, consistency with national policies and strategies for adaptation to climate change and ICZM, and project design. Its overall structure should remain unchanged. The continuous importance of Nile Delta Project is based on the fact that it is still belongs to a rare GEF group of projects dealing with the issue of adaptation to climate change in coastal areas. The speed of its implementation is not satisfactory, and it will have to be improved in order to keep the perception of the project's relevance and appropriateness active. The project is also relevant in the wider regional context, and synergies should be created with complementary projects and initiatives in Egypt, but also in other neighbouring countries. Finally, the SRF's indicators are still relevant because they are well designed and reflecting the relevance of the project, but also because the major outputs are still to be produced. Consequently, there is no need to propose any change in the indicator system.
3. The project has been marginally **effective** in achieving its objectives. The results, i.e. the outputs, produced so far are only the basic studies and preparatory reports for the most important outputs of the project, the pilot projects, which are aimed at showing that coastal adaptation measures can work in practice. Intensive implementation of the pilot projects is still waiting to happen. The location and contents of the initial pilot projects have been changed, following the discussion between two main project partners. The agreement on one new project has been reached, while the agreement on the remaining two is still pending. Reports produced have been of good quality but delivered with some delay. However, the full usefulness of these outputs could be assessed only when the pilot projects will be implemented, hence the element of risk associated with evaluation based on this criterion. The stakeholders' mobilisation process is still very slow, and those mobilised are mainly of the administrative/governmental provenance, i.e. the governorates representatives. Preparation of the integrated data base is progressing slowly, even if GIS has been established but its utilisation has been low. The Nile Delta Project has to reach out to other projects and initiatives in the Nile Delta area to achieve full regional synergy.
4. The project's **efficiency** is satisfactory. The project's management and decision-making structure, as well as the role played by UNDP, have proven to be effective, even if the implementation of the project has been taking place in politically very sensitive time for Egypt. Although slow and with delays, the project's rate of implementation has moved forward largely due to the highly motivated attitude of the Project Manager and the PMU. Its administrative arrangements are cost-effective and rational, and follow strictly the UNDP rules and regulations. The management structure, consisting of 4 layers of management, supervision and decision making is complicated and should be simplified. It should be reduced to two committees only: the Steering Committee and the Management Committee. The new project manager has been selected, and in order to avoid additional risk to the project, he should be assisted by all project implementing and executing partners. The use of financial resources is commensurate with the results achieved so far. Significant problems is the parallel funding both in the sense of actual delivery of committed parallel funding as well as reporting on it, which is practically non-existent.
5. The Nile Delta Project **results** are marginally satisfactory. While a number of outputs, mainly specific technical studies, have been delivered, primarily related to the analysis of various aspects of coastal sediment and natural dynamics, serious work is still expected to be carried out to produce major project's outputs (particularly in Component 2), which carries relatively high degree of risk. The project has been faced with a number of barriers, the most important being the disagreement between project executing partners (CoRI and SPA) on the concept of the coastal engineering and adaptation works, and the political situation in Egypt. The project's conceptual approach has been revised, and the initial Living Shoreline Approach (LSA), which is more appropriate for stable coastal environments than for the Egypt's Northern Coast, has been altered and renamed to Living with the Sea approach, which is more appropriate and allows for a better integration with ICZM. There have been some positive achievements recently, including the emerging understanding between SPA and CoRI that soft engineering can be combined with the hard one to produce equally positive results with less environmental damage. The above fact could be considered as one of the important achievements of the project, and it was made possible by the combined efforts of UNDP-CO, PMU and MWRI.
6. The **sustainability** of the project is moderately likely, primarily because thedecisions on all the pilot projects have not yet been finally made and the works have not actually started except modest activities in the Damietta port related to the one pilot project for which the decision has been made. The lack of concrete post-project mechanisms increases the risk to the project's sustainability. Although already started, the intensity of the capacity building activities should be increased. The sustainability strategy doesn't exist, while the replication strategy, although not envisaged in the PD, should be prepared. The participation of stakeholders is gradually increasing and the range of stakeholders groups involved should be expanded, notably with the national NGOs and users associations.

Based on the abovementioned criteria, the evaluation has found that, overall, progress has been made towards achievement of the Nile Delta Project objectives. However, having in mind that in some important aspects the project has achieved marginal results, in particular in the Component/Output 2 (implementation of concrete measures towards adaptation to climate change), which are critical for the attainment of major objective of the project, the overall rate of the project is set at **marginally satisfactory**. Keeping in mind that the Nile Delta Project is only mid-way through its implementation course, and that competent GEF implementing agency's task manager and PMU staff are actively involved in the implementation of the project, there is a possibility that the project's performance will be improved, leading to a better terminal mark, particularly if the MTE's recommendations will be fully taken into account.

**4. Recommendations**

**4.1. Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project**

1. While the overall approach taken to the project's design has proven to be highly relevant, its implementation has faced several barriers that need to be removed to allow the satisfactory progress towards the finalization of the project. Some major recommendations are proposed to correct the course of the implementation of the project.
2. **Recommendation 1:** *The adaptive management approach taken by the project to-date needs to be continued as it permits adjustments to project activities in response to changing circumstances. Any adjustments should be based on clearly developed justification, but without losing sight of the objective of the project.* Responsibility: Project Management, UNDP-CO, Steering Committee.
3. **Recommendation 2:** *Operation of the**coordination mechanism between CoRI and SPA, the two organizations that make the backbone of the project, i.e. the Executive Committee, should be continued. It will help solving possible future disagreements on issues inherent to both organisations, such as short and middle term objectives for shore protection, which should be agreed upon as a matter of priority. Their formulation should be based on a more comprehensive and integrated consideration of multitude of causes, including those of climate change, and impacts, including those on wide range of population groups and in a wider coastal zone.* Responsibility: MRWI, NWRC, CoRI, SPA.
4. **Recommendation 3:** *As the final selection of pilot projects is still pending, it is recommended to take a final decision very soon, as a matter of the highest priority for the entire project. In the event of the project extension for 12-18 months, the remaining total of 3 to 3.5 years of project's duration (2 years currently remaining plus a minimum of one to 1.5. year of extension), should be enough for the projects' preparation, contracting, implementation and monitoring of results.* Responsibility: Project Management, CoRI, SPA, UNDP.
5. **Recommendation 4:** *The conceptual clarification and hierarchisation of shore protection management and ICZM needs to be done in order to avoid future mixing of the two. This should be done through improved communication between CoRI, SPA and EEAA but also with targeted awareness campaign towards governorates, local level administrations, NGOs and general population, as well as relevant national institutions.* Responsibility: Project Management, CoRI, SPA, EEAA, MWRI, governorates, local administrations, NGOs.
6. **Recommendation 5:** *Start implementing ICZM activities of the project by improving understanding at SPA and CoRI that ICZM is a legal, administrative and technical framework that widens the scope of climate change adaptation as well as makes shoreline protection management embedded within the larger development initiatives in the project area.* Responsibility: Project Management, EEAA, CoRI, SPA.
7. **Recommendation 6:** *Assist EEAA to re-activate NCZMC by developing the shoreline management policy and putting it in the context of ICZM. Special capacity building programme should be developed to assist members of the NCZMC to better understand the impacts of the project.* Responsibility: Project Management, EEAA.
8. **Recommendation 7:** *The role of EEAA should be strengthened and it should be more profoundly integrated in the project’s implementation. Its participation should go beyond activities of the Steering Committee. As the ICZM will become more important element of the project, the SC should consider its direct involvement in the implementation of some project activities, in particular within Components 1 and 3.* Responsibility: Project Management, EEAA, Steering Committee.
9. **Recommendation 8:** *Living with the Sea approach needs to be better communicated to all stakeholders, in particular through the creation of the Shore Management Framework, which will also emphasize the need of integration of shore management into ICZM.* Responsibility: Project Management.
10. **Recommendation 9:** *Disbursement of funds has to be increased by speeding up the implementation of the project's activities. The current rate of expenditure is very low, and it reflects difficulties the project’s implementation is going through.* Responsibility: Project Management, UNDP.
11. **Recommendation 10:** *Make financial reporting more detailed. Revision of the project’s budget should be made as a response to the annual expenditure rate. It is important that revised budget takes in consideration the dynamics of the future implementation of the project, in particular the need to avoid the expenditure of large funds during the last year of the project’s implementation. The budget revision should be detailed enough to show division of funds among components, outcomes, outputs and activities of the project. Eventual additional extension of the period of the project’s implementation should be followed by the respective budget revision.* Responsibility: Project Management, UNDP, Steering Committee.
12. **Recommendation 11:** *Consistent system of reporting on parallel funding needs to be established. The parallel funding report should provide minimum information such as the amount of yearly parallel funding by donor and/or partner, separately in cash and in kind; distribution of parallel funding per component; rate of parallel funding provided and the amount left for the remaining period of the project’s implementation; budgetary items parallel funding is referred to (experts, equipment, offices, other); perceived risk in provision of parallel funding by partner and/or donor and proposal for actions to be taken to mitigate risks; and other elements that PMU will propose and SC adopt as necessary. The parallel funding report should be presented to, discussed and adopted by the SC on a yearly basis.* Responsibility: Project Management, UNDP, Steering Committee.
13. **Recommendation 12:** *Report on the status of the parallel funding of the coastal engineering work that Project Document mentions as the SPA contribution in cash to the project implementation. As there is no record yet that these funds have been committed or spent, it has to be done as soon as possible. Any eventual expenditure needs to be justified and proofs have to be given that funds were directly utilized for the implementation of the project’s objectives.* Responsibility: Project management, UNDP, SPA.
14. **Recommendation 13:** *Management structure seems to have added new layers as soon as a certain problem emerges. It needs to be simplified as multiple layers only complicate management and ultimately contribute to its inefficiency. The management structure should be limited to the Steering Committee and to the Executive Committee. The latter should be given clearer decision-making mandates, in order to enable it to make decisions between two meetings of the Steering Committee.* Responsibility: Steering Committee, UNDP.
15. **Recommendation 14:** *The incoming Project Manager and the Project Executive Committee should undertake a forward looking review of staffing needs for the project spanning the current operational phase, reporting and closure period. The review should make a clear distinction between short-term technical deliverables and one-off tasks that can be assigned to consultants and on-going or core project management and representational roles that should be assigned to project staff. The review should be completed within one month after the adoption of the MTE report and should be clearly linked to the budget revision.* Responsibility: Project Management, UNDP.
16. **Recommendation 15:** *The Project Manager and the Executive Committee should undertake review of the equipment needed, and if justified, purchase it in line with UNDP procurement procedure.* Responsibility: Project management, UNDP.

**4.2. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project**

1. **Recommendation 16:** *Efforts to build the GIS as the basis for the project's Information System should be continued. While the majority of sectoral maps have been produced, efforts should be concentrated on producing the integrated maps, in particular the Coastal Sensitivity and Vulnerability Maps. The essence of GIS is integration of data, both physical and socio-economic, and it is an important instrument for the shoreline management and ICZM.* Responsibility: Project management.
2. **Recommendation 17:** *Improve the project web site. Efforts should be continued to have it regularly updated. It would be useful if the date were always placed when an update is being made. The access to the project documentation needs to be made easier by making the availability of documents as wide as possible. Page should be prepared to monitor the progress of implementation of the project’s activities per component.* Responsibility: Project management.
3. **Recommendation 18:** *Prepare the Replication Strategy. While the Project Document doesn’t request it, it may be necessary to prepare one with a view to making the sustainability of the project more likely. The strategy should be adopted by the PSC during its next meeting in 2013.* Responsibility: Project Management, Steering Committee.
4. **Recommendation 19:** *Improve existing and develop new communication products, such as popularly written annual reports, eventually pad/iPhone applications, etc. The communication products already produced are quite rudimentary and new ones have to be prepared with a view to presenting the project’s achievements.* Responsibility: Project management.
5. **Recommendation 20:** *Increase efforts towards capacity building. This is one of the most important components of the project, and crucial for the long-term sustainability of the project. Implementation of the planned training workshops should start as a matter of priority.* Responsibility: Project Management.

**4.3. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives**

1. **Recommendation 21:** *Improve linkages and partnerships and create synergies and partnerships with other projects and initiatives (PEGASO, Alexandria ICZM, and Northern Coast ICZM) as this may create opportunities for long-term project’s sustainability.* Responsibility: Project management.
2. **Recommendation 22:** *it is fully justified to request a no-cost extension of 18 months duration, at a minimum. The indications that it might be needed are the following: (1) start of the project was delayed for administrative purposes in order to fill up the posts of the PMU staff; (2) the debate on the most appropriate technical concept of shoreline management works between CoRI and SPA took a long time virtually halting many project activities; and (3) the political situation in Egypt affected the implementation of the project.* Responsibility: UNDP, Project management, Steering Committee, UNDP-GEF RTA.
3. **Recommendation 23:** *Improve participation of regional and local stakeholders, in particular the governorates’ administration. The current problems prevented their more active participation in the project, but they are critical partners for the implementation of the pilot projects. More frequent consultations with appropriate levels of administration should be taking place, while the communication strategy should take them as one of the most important focus groups.* Responsibility: Project management, CoRI, SPA.
4. **Recommendation 24:** *The gender strategy was not developed during the initial phase of the project and its importance has not been raised as an issue. However, the issue should be revisited and eventually followed by the development and implementation of a gender-mainstreaming plan.* Responsibility: Project management.

**5. Lessons learned**

1. The major lessons learned from the Nile Delta Project’s implementation to date are summarized below. As the project is only at its mid-term stage, these should be viewed as being preliminary, and subject to re-evaluation and confirmation at the project's closure. While not being large project in terms of financial resources employed, the Nile Delta Project could be considered as a complex one with regards to the subject it is tackling – the adaptation to climate change in coastal area of the Nile Delta, one of the Mediterranean climate change “hot spots”. The situation is made even more complex because the project is being implemented in very sensitive political, economic and societal situation in Egypt.
2. Complex project like this one should have preparatory stage better organized. The consequences of the proposed technical concept (Living Shorelines Approach) were not properly assessed, which has caused its significant revision during the inception phase. The views and positions of two major executing partners were not properly analysed, and their differences on several issues came to the forefront of the project’s implementation, which has caused lengthy delays. The issue of ICZM was analysed from the “formal” perspective, and its importance for the proper assessment of concrete adaptation measures was not adequately presented. In addition, the concrete measures how to make the ICZM overall framework for shoreline management were not proposed.
3. The project design is missing the replication and communication strategies, both very important for the long-term sustainability of the project.
4. The implementing agency has shown great responsibility in securing competent and efficient project management. The outgoing project manager has shown great integrity, competence and communication skills, badly needed for such complex project. It is expected that the new project manager will show the same qualities.
5. The advice to be given to similar projects in the future is certainly to try to make an attempt to start some activities as early as possible, and especially those that might require ample time to mobilise or to be implemented, such as implementation of pilot projects, capacity building activities, and communication and replication activities.
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Terms of Reference for Mid-term Evaluation

Adaptation to Climate Change in the Nile Delta

through Integrated Coastal Zone Management

# INTRODUCTION

The dominant feature of Egypt’s Northern Coastal Zone is the low lying delta of the River Nile, with its large cities, industry, agriculture and tourism. The Delta and the narrow valley of the Nile comprise 5.5% of the total area of Egypt but over 95% of its people of which 25% live in the Low Elevation Coastal Zone (LECZ) areas. Due to the concentration of much of Egypt’s infrastructure and development along the low coastal lands and the reliance on the Nile delta for prime agricultural land, coastal inundation or saline intrusion caused by anthropogenic climate change induced sea-level rise will have a direct and critical impact on Egypt’s entire economy. In addition to the current trends, Egypt’s Mediterranean coast and the Nile Delta have been identified as highly vulnerable to climate change induced Sea Level Rise (SLR). The proposed project aims to integrate the management of SLR risks into the development of Egypt’s Low Elevation Coastal Zone (LECZ) in the Nile Delta by strengthening the regulatory framework and institutional capacity to improve resilience of coastal settlements and development infrastructure, implement innovative and environmentally friendly measures that facilitate/promote adaptation in the Nile Delta, and establish a monitoring and assessment framework and knowledge management systems on adaptation

# OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

This mid-term evaluation is initiated by UNDP Egypt and will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP-GEF procedures.

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:

1. To strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the Project;
2. To ensure accountability for the achievement of the UNDP/GEF objective;
3. To enhance organizational and development learning;
4. 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.

1. **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.

1. **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, and Unsatisfactory *with an explanation of the rating.*

1. **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

1. **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, UNDP and key stakeholders. 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.

1. **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 with relevant project documentation and will accompany the evaluator in the meetings, as deemed necessary.

1. **TIMING AND DURATION**

In total the evaluation time frame is one month, incorporating circulation of initial reports for comments. The evaluation consultancy will be for 18 working days within the period of 45 days and the activities of the evaluator are broken down as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeframe**  |
| Desk review | 3 working days |
| Meetings with the stakeholders  | 7 working days |
| Writing draft report | 6 working days |
| Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft) | 2working days |

1. **REQUIRED QUALIFICATION**

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out by an independent 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 consultant will be responsible for drafting and finalizing the report.

General requirements:

* Advanced university degree in an environment, coastal zone management or natural resources management related subject;
* At least ten years of work experience in environmental policy implementation and five years’ work experience in climate change adaptation initiatives;
* Experience in coastal zones management is an asset
* Previous project evaluation experiences for international development agencies preferably with United Nations system and GEF
* Familiar with Results Based Management (RBM) approach
* Familiarity with issues related to UNFCCC;
* Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
* 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.
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**Annex II:. 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-lateralsDonors (mill US$) | Central Government(mill US$) | Local Government(mill US$) | Private Sector(mill US$) | NGOs(mill US$) | Other Sources\*(mill US$) | TotalFinancing(mill US$) | TotalDisbursement(mill US$) |
|  | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed  | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual |
| Grant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Credits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equity  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-kind  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-grant Instruments\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Types\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* “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.

**Annex II**

Itinerary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Day** | **Date** | **Hotel** | **Activity** | **Meetings** | **Time** |
| Wednesday | 20 March | Radisson Heliopolis |  Travel from Zagreb to Cairo |   |  04:15 PM-02:50 AM |
| Thursday | 21 March | Radisson Heliopolis | Cairo Meetings | Drs. Mohamed Bayoumi (UNDP) & Mohamed Borhan (PM) | 09:00-10:30 AM |
| Dr. Abd El-Moteleb, NWRC | 11:00 AM-12:00 PM |
| Eng. Osama Mustafa, SPA & SPA Staff | 12:30:PM-02:00 PM |
| Travel to Alexandria by car | 03:00 PM - 07:00 PM |
| Friday | 22 March | Mercure | Alexandria | Field trip to pilot sites | 09:00 AM-02:00 PM |
| Saturday | 23 March | Mercure | Alexandria Meetings | Dr. Shinawy & Dr. Bakre, CoRI Mr. Jonathan McCue, International Cnsultant (Skype) | 10:00 AM - 01:00 PM |
| Sunday | 24 March | Mercure | Alexandria Meetings | Dr. Mahmoud Khamis, Alex UniversityMr. Mohamed Seleim, Project Tec. Assistant, Dr. Samia El-Guindy (APP) - Skype | 09:00 AM-01:00 PM |
| Monday | 25 March | Radisson Heliopolis | Travel from Alexandria to CairoCairo Meetings | Dr. Mohamed Farouk, EEAADr. Mohamed El Raey, Cairo University | 06:00 AM - 01:00 PM |
| Tuesday | 26 March | Radisson Heliopolis | Cairo Meetings | Dr. Ahmed Badr, EU DelegationWrap up meeting with Drs. Bayoumi and Borhan | 10:00 AM - 02:00 PM |
| Wednesday | 27 March |  | Travel from Cairo to Split |   |  4:00 AM - 03:25 PM |

**Annex III**

List of Persons Interviewed

1. Ms Keti Chachibaia, UNDP Bangkok, former Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP RCU Bratislava (Skype)
2. Dr Mohamed Bayoumi, UNDP, Cairo
3. Dr Mohamed Borhan, Project Manager, Alexandria and Cairo
4. Prof Dr Mohamed Abdel Motaleb, President, National Water Research Center, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
5. Prof Dr Alaa El-Din Abdin, General Supervisor for NWRC President Office, National Water Research Center, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
6. Eng Osama Mostafa Mahmoud, Chairman, Shore Protection Agency, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
7. Eng Abd El-Moneim Heneiguel, Deputy Chairman, Shore Protection Agency, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
8. Eng Nahed Abd El-Fattah, head of Planning Sector, Shore Protection Agency, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
9. Eng Ahmed Osama, Head of Implementation and Maintenance, Shore Protection Agency, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
10. Eng Hassan Ebeid, Head of R&D Sector, Shore Protection Agency, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
11. Eng Salwa Abd El-Basit, Director General SPA Technical Office, Shore Protection Agency, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
12. Eng Abd El-Karim Fathy, Director General Design Department, Shore Protection Agency, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
13. Eng El-Araby El Keshawy, Design Department, Shore Protection Agency, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
14. Eng Mohamed Mohamed Hassan, Design Department, Shore Protection Agency, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
15. Eng Yaser Hussein, SPA Technical Office, Shore Protection Agency, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Cairo
16. Prof Dr. Ibrahim Abd El Magid El Shinnawy, Director, Coastal Research Institute (CORI), National Water Research Center, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Alexandria
17. Dr Omran E. Frihy, Coastal Research Institute (CORI), National Water Research Center, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Alexandria
18. Mr. Jonathan McCue, International Technical Advisor to the Project, CTL Consult Ltd (Skype)
19. Dr Suzan E. A Kholeif, Head of Scientific Documentation and Media Unit, National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Alexandria and PEGASO EU FP7 Project
20. Dr Samia El-Guindy, Secretary General of the Egyptian-Dutch Water Management Panel (Skype)
21. Dr Mohamed Seleim, Deputy Project Manaher, PMU, Alexandria
22. Ms Aya El-Din, Administrator, PMU, Alexandria
23. Dr Abou Bakr El-Seddik, CoRI, Alexandria
24. Dr Ahmed Badr, EU Delegation, Cairo
25. Dr Mohamed Farouk, EEAA, Cairo
26. Prof Mohamed El-Raey, Member of the Project's Steering Committee, Cairo

**Annex IV**

List of Documents Reviewed or Consulted

**Project Definition and Reporting**

* Project Identification Form (PIF)
* Project Document
* Project Inception Report
* Project Implementation Reviews (PIR) for 2011 and 2012
* Stakeholders Analysis Report

**Meeting and Workshop Reports**

* Report of the Inception Meeting
* Steering Committee Meeting Reports (5)
* Report from the meeting "Towards a Legal and Institutional Framework for ICZM"
* Report from the Workshop for the Exploration of Possible Means to Utilize the Area Extending from the Shoreline and the International Coastal Road
* Report on the Training Course for the Design of Soft Engineering Techniques and Climate Change Adaptation Intervention Measures
* Workshop for the Preparation of an Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan for Egypt's Northern Coast

**Selected Technical Outputs, Studies and Working Documents**

* Coastal Protection Works on Nile Delta
* Physical Parameters related to climate change along the Mediterranean coastal zone of Egypt
* Final Report: Saving the Nile Delta: Land Use Study on the Nile Delta Coastal Zone
* Variability of the Sediment Budget Along the Nile Delta Coast
* Initial Socioeconomic Valuation Study of Vulnerable Land to Sea Level Rise at the Nile Delta
* The Potential Economic Effects of Climate Change on Egypt
* Potential Impacts of Climate Change on the Egyptian Economy
* Selection of Pilot Project Techniques and Locations
* The Burullus and Baltim sand dune system and surrounding areas
* Dredged Material Placement to Support Sustainable Shoreline Management in the Nile Delta
* Dredged Material Placement to Support Sustainable Shoreline Management in the Nile Delta: Initial Compatibility Analysis
* Creation of a Green Buffer Zone Shoreline Storm Berm and the Coastal International Road
* Terms of Reference: Preparation of an integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan for the northern coast of Egypt
* Feasibility Study for the Nile Delta Coastal Adaptation
* Review of Good Practices of Coastal Adaptation and ICZM Frameworks
* Legal and Institutional Study on Existing Legislation Focusing on Development in the Coastal Zone, Shore Protection and ICZM
* Study to Identify Wind, Waves and Current Pattern

Questionnaire used during interviews

**QUESTIONAIRE FOR THE STAKEHOLDERS**

1. To what extent the project is consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries in your country?
2. How the project’s intended results have been achieved half way through its implementation?
3. Assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project. Is it a good value for money?
4. Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project preparation and execution?
5. Is the host country maintaining its financial commitment to the project?
6. Are the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?
7. Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
8. Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
9. Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project design?
10. Were the project roles properly assigned during the project design?
11. Can the management arrangement model employed in the project be considered as an optimum model?
12. Were the management arrangements implemented and how efficient they are?
13. What is the quality of your communication with PMU?
14. How is the role of the country’s Project Focal Point being executed? What is the quality of your communication and dissemination of results with project’s beneficiaries?
15. Assess the role of UNDP. Assess contribution to the project from UNDP “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination).
16. Assess whether or not local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making.
17. Do you perceive problems in the execution of the project? If yes, what are they?

**Annex VI**

Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co financing(Type/Source) | IA own Financing(mill US$) | Multi-lateral Agencies (Non-GEF)(mill US$)  |  Bi-lateralsDonors (mill US$) | Central Government(mill US$) | Local Government(mill US$) | Private Sector(mill US$) | NGOs(mill US$) | Other Sources\*(mill US$) | TotalFinancing(mill US$) | TotalDisbursement(mill US$) |
|  | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed  | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual |
| Grant | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |  |  |  | 8.00 | 8.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.64 | 0.64 | 8.84 | 8.84 |  |  |
| Credits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equity  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-kind  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.00 | 4.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.00 | 4.00 |  |  |
| Non-grant Instruments\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Types\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |  |  |  | 12.00 | 12.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.14 | 1.14 | 13.34 | 13.34 |  |  |