

Egypt Improvement Plan

Thematic window: Environment and Climate Change

Programme Title: Climate Change Risk Management Programme (CCRMP)





CCRMP Joint Programme Improvement Plan (November 11, 2010)

This improvement plan is based on the receipt of the draft Evaluation Report V. 3.0 received September 20, 2010 from the Director of the MDGF. It has been prepared in consultation with the NSC and PMC members.

The recommendations have been extracted from the Evaluation Report and for further clarifications, please refer to the report.

1						
Evaluation Recommend A work group could be component and other s remaining period of the well positioned to make Evaluation Recommend The work group will as using carbon trading so different mechanisms, expand the scope of the is still feasible to contin	k in the (UNEP is ucing GHGs ent of dation to					
Response from the Join These two recommendation			nerefore combin	ned.		
The validity of the curr the Kyoto Protocol. So f foreseen after 2012, alt carbon trading until 20 European schemes, as y conference. The CDM component ha since June 2010 and is o	far, there is n though Europ 20. Therefor well as any ac as started loc	o clear scheme u pe has other poli re, this program dapted UNFCC sc oking at other Ca	inder the UNFC cies in place to o will investigate heme in the Car rbon Trading so	C that is ensure the icun		
Key actions	Time	Person	Follow	v-up	Secreta	riat
1.1 Define other Stakeholders and Experts for APU work group.	frame June - November 2010	responsible CDM Focal Point	Comments	Status	Comments	Status
1.2 Make an assessment of different Carbon Trading mechanisms and explore utilizing in RFW	June - November 2010	CDM Focal Point				
1.3 Discuss Activities	November	CDM Focal				





group.				
1.4 APU to share results with Stakeholders in PMC and to finalize RFW	December 2010	CDM Focal Point		
1.5 APU to assess the status of Carbon Trading Mechanisms after the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Cancun - and to update the RFW as necessary.	January 2011	CDM Focal Point		

2 Evaluation Recommend The workgroup should activities after the end of	also recomn of the JP.	nend alternative	s to sustain the	APU		
Response from the Join The initial plan for APU Environmental Affairs A demonstrate its added activities to H.E Ministe satisfied with the Unit's some donors such as GT exploring opportunities APU is currently explor of the component to dat	sustainabili Agency (EEA value to the or of Environ performance TZ has alread s to support ing the susta	ity is to get it inte A) provided that agency. In the la ment in October ce and achieveme ly established lin it after phase ou	the Unit will be st presentation 2010, H.E was h ents so far. Mea nks with APU an t of the MDG-F.	able to of the unit highly nwhile d are Hence		
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow	y-up	Secreta	ariat
2.1 APU to explore the sustainability of the APU based on the achievements to date with the MSEA and other partners	October 2010 – end of project	CDM Focal Point	Comments	Status	Comments	Status

(2.1) It is plan the studies can on-farm water the same funct Response from	rried out under o resources". It is tion under this o n the Joint Progr	ternational consu component 2.2.2, precommended to utput. amme Manageme	ultant to analyze the results of deliverable 5 "Optimal use of o hire a consultant to perform ent ant to enhance the	
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up	Secretariat





3.1 TOR to be prepared by MALR to recruit an international consultant	Oct/Nov 2010	Agriculture component Focal Point	Comments	Status	Comments	Status
3.2 International consultant hired	February2011	Agriculture component Focal Point				
(2.1)This deliv		No. 161 ong under output 2.2.2) are interre				
Response from	Response from the Joint Programme Management					
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secret	ariat
4.1 The RFW to be modified	December 2010	Agriculture component Focal Point	Comments	Status	Comments	Status

5 Evaluation Rec (2.2.1) Transfe strategies is a MWRI. Evaluation Rec (2.2.1) Formin completing this Response from This recomme						
Partners and w	vill be further o	discussed in the se	econd half of the j	programme		
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follov	v-up	Secretariat	
5.1 Results of the RCM to be presented to other stakeholders at the Midterm Workshop	December 2010	Water Sector Focal Point	Comments	Status	Comments	Status
5.2 RFW to be modified based on the sharing of information	December 2010	Water Sector Focal Point				



6 Evaluation Recommendation No. 181 (2.2.1) Form a work group of the two UN agencies and other stakeholders to revise this deliverable and reallocate budget Response from the Joint Programme Management This recommendation is valid for the second half of the programme.						
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow	v-up	Secretariat	
6.1 Component partners will discuss in the next meeting and address this in the revised RFW	November / December 2010	Water Sector Focal Point	Comments	Status	Comments	Status

communication outside the MAI Evaluation Reco (2.2.2) Forming completing this	rming the outp strategy is a cl .R. ommendation M a work group deliverable. the Joint Progr	uts from the stres hallenging task. It No. 192 to draft a revised amme Manageme	involves other s Results Framewo	takeholders		
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follov	v-up	Secretariat	
7.1 Communication Strategy to be updated	December 2010	Agriculture component Focal Point	Comments	Status	Comments	Status
7.2 RFW to be modified	December 2010	Agriculture component Focal Point				

8	
Evaluation Recommendation No. 197	
(2.2.2) Limited coordination between activities performed in MWRI and	
activities performed in MALR.	
Evaluation Recommendation No. 198	
(2.2.2) Forming a work group to draft a revised Results Framework to	
achieve convergence of activities of the two ministries and to enhance	
coordination in developing adaptation polices and strategies of water	





MDG ACHIEVEMENT FUND								
	agriculture jo							
Response from the Joint Programme Management The MDG-F JP takes the credit to open the dialogue for the first time between MWRI and MALR on climate change expected impacts on the two sectors and to exchange information about the planned activities in the two Ministries. Nevertheless, further efforts will be exerted to synergize their activities and ensure bilateral coordination meetings between the two Ministries beyond the PMC.								
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follov	v-up	Secret	ariat		
8.1 Kick-off meeting to be held between the components to coordinate Work and Activities Jointly	November 2010	Water Sector Focal Point / Agriculture component Focal Point	Comments	Status	Comments	Status		
8.2 Regular Meetings to be agreed up in Kick Off meeting and held	Dec 2010- end of programme	Water Sector Focal Point / Agriculture component Focal Point						

9	
Evaluation Recommendation No. 218	
The original JP design has served its purpose in the short term. However, it is	
recommended to migrate from emergency design to sustainable	
development design that focuses on results.	
Evaluation Recommendation No. 219	
It is recommended to streamline the RFW of the JP to enhance the delivery of	
results at output and outcome levels. (See illustrative RFW in the MTE p29).	
Evaluation Recommendation No. 220	
This RFW is for demonstration and discussion purposes only. As discussed in	
detail earlier, each of the four components needs to revise the Results	
Framework (RFW) and focus on achieving outputs and outcomes and not	
only on performing activities. The revised RFW should follow the	
development frame work of Outcomes/Outputs/Deliverables/Activities.	
Each of the Deliverables is managed as a sub-project. It should have a clear	
start-finish time, budget, person(s) responsible, required resources	
(consultants, supplies, etc.)	
Evaluation Recommendation No. 221	
Reviewing the scope of each component will be based on progress in	
implementing activities achieved so far, and defining work packages	
(Deliverables) that are manageable within 6-12 weeks (A Maximum of one	
quarter to complete the deliverable. Large activities that take long time or	
budget are not recommended. It has to be broken down to manageable	
work packages). Streamline activities to indicate progress over time	
rorn puolingeo, streamine activities to maleate progress over time	





MDG ACHIEVEMENT FU	ND					8
Evaluation Re The Revised I enough time f groups. Evaluation Re It is recomme streamline co Evaluation Re The design of There is still a elaborated an Evaluation Re There are opp CDM compor Agriculture co revising the R Evaluation Re It is recomme streamlining to Based Manag	commendation RFW is suggest for implementa commendation ended that each mmunication v commendation outputs should room for innor d assessed over commendation portunities for ments and betwe omponents. The FW. commendation ended to recruin the Results Fra- ement. In the Joint Prog endation is valid be modified to ecember due to and the need to s	ed to be complete tion. It needs furt No. 223 deliverable is ma vith counterparts No. 224 consist of groups vative initiatives to r time under Outc No. 225 synergies at outco een adaptation to nose opportunities No. 226 t a facilitator to su mework and pro- gramme Managem d for the second h update the RFW. To o other critical act set up both NSC ar	of relevant deliverables hat will be progressively ome 3. ome level between SEC a Water Resources and s need to be exploited will upport the process of vide training on Results ent alf of the programme. The October 1 deadline to ivities taking place in the of PMC meeting for approx	ork cies to only. and hen		
	T		on of the new RWF		Cognet	oriet
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secret	ariat
9.1 Meeting with Component partners to discuss the RFW	Oct 2010	JP Manager + Component Managers	Com	pleted	Comments	Status
9.2 Proposed framework for the RFW prepared and shared with UNDP RFW specialist	Nov 2010	JP Manager				
9.3 Proposed RFW elaborated by Component Managers	Nov 2010	Component Managers				
9.4 RFW approved with PMC/NSC	Dec 2010	JP Manager				





10 Evaluation Recommendation No. 227 A request for extension to MDG-F global steering committee is highly advisable to realize expected results at output and outcome levels Response from the Joint Programme Management The June 24, 2010 NSC meeting has support the evaluator recommendation to request the extension of the project for one year until October 2012 while the implementation of activities to be completed by						
June 2012. Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follov	v-up	Secret	ariat
10.1 Request to be sent by the UNRC	Nov 2010	UNRC	Comments	Status	Comments	Status

11 Evaluation Recommendation No. 233 The design of the program should clearly define the five phases of a program life cycle. Evaluation Recommendation No. 234 Roles and responsibilities for implementing each phase should be clearly defined Evaluation Recommendation No. 235 Resources required to carry out each phase should be clearly defined (time,						
budget, staff, consultants, equipment, supplies, communication, transportation, etc.)						
Evaluation Recommendation No. 236						
A Project Management Plan is an indispensable tool for managing complex projects and should be considered when designing Joint Programs						
Response from the Joint Programme Management						
This is taken into consideration in the planning of each component, but the						
partners and the management were not aware that the shutdown of activities is 3 months before the end of the project. This will be taken into						
consideration in the RFW.						
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
11.1 RFW to be modified	December 2010	JP Manager	Comments	Status	Comments	Status

12	
Evaluation Recommendation No. 237	
Orientation/training should be planned and provide	d throughout the project
to project teams to familiarize them with the UN syst	em and to provide
necessary tools/templates/formats/guidelines to ca	rry out their tasks.



Response from the Joint Programme Management This has been done with some of the UN Agencies based on the requests of the partners.						
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up		Secretariat	
12.1 Identify the areas needed for training	Nov 2010 (PMC meeting)	Component Managers + UN members	Comments	Status	Comments	Status
12.2 Each UN partner to set time for needed training	Nov / Dec 2010	UN partners				
12.3 Implement training	Before June 2011	UN partners				





APU	Awareness and Promotion Unit
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
СОМ	Cabinet of Ministers
EEAA	Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
MALR	Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MSEA	Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs
RCM	Regional Circulation Model
RFW	Results Framework
SEC	Supreme Energy Council
UN RC	United Nations Resident Coordinator
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization