

Egypt

Mid-Term Evaluation

Thematic window: Environment and Climate Change

**Programme Title: Climate Change Risk Management
Programme (CCRMP)**

Author: Nader Metwalli, Consultant

Prologue

The current mid-term evaluation report is part of the efforts being implemented by the Millennium Development Goal Secretariat (MDG-F), as part of its monitoring and evaluation strategy, to promote learning and to improve the quality of the 128 joint programs in 8 development thematic windows according to the basic evaluation criteria inherent to evaluation; relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

The aforementioned mid-term evaluations have been carried out amidst the backdrop of an institutional context that is both rich and varied, and where several UN organizations, working hand in hand with governmental agencies and civil society, cooperate in an attempt to achieve priority development objectives at the local, regional, and national levels. Thus the mid-term evaluations have been conducted in line with the principles outlined in the Evaluation network of the Development Assistant Committee (DAC) - as well as those of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). In this respect, the evaluation process included a reference group comprising the main stakeholders involved in the joint programme, who were active participants in decisions making during all stages of the evaluation; design, implementation, dissemination and improvement phase.

The analysis contained in the mid-term evaluation focuses on the joint program at its mid-term point of implementation- approximately 18 months after it was launched. Bearing in mind the limited time period for implementation of the programs (3 years at most), the mid-term evaluations have been devised to serve as short-term evaluation exercises. This has limited the scope and depth of the evaluation in comparison to a more standard evaluation exercise that would take much longer time and resources to be conducted. Yet it is clearly focusing on the utility and use of the evaluation as a learning tool to improve the joint programs and widely disseminating lessons learnt.

This exercise is both a first opportunity to constitute an independent 'snapshot' of progress made and the challenges posed by initiatives of this nature as regards the 3 objectives being pursued by the MDG-F; the change in living conditions for the various populations vis-à-vis the Millennium Development Goals, the improved quality in terms of assistance provided in line with the terms and conditions outlined by the Declaration of Paris as well as progress made regarding the reform of the United Nations system following the "Delivering as One" initiative.

As a direct result of such mid-term evaluation processes, plans aimed at improving each joint program have been drafted and as such, the recommendations contained in the report have now become specific initiatives, seeking to improve upon implementation of all joint programs evaluated, which are closely monitored by the MDG-F Secretariat.

Conscious of the individual and collective efforts deployed to successfully perform this mid-term evaluation, we would like to thank all partners involved and to dedicate this current document to all those who have contributed to the drafting of the same and who have helped it become a reality (members of the reference group, the teams comprising the governmental agencies, the joint program team, consultants, beneficiaries, local authorities, the team from the Secretariat as well as a wide range of institutions and individuals from the public and private sectors). Once again, our heartfelt thanks.

The analysis and recommendations of this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views of the MDG-F Secretariat.



Climate Change Risk Management Programme (CCRMP), Egypt

Mid Term Review – Draft Evaluation Report V.3.0

Submitted for review and approval of
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)/
MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F)

By: Nader Metwalli

August 11, 2010

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Back ground	1
1.2	Country Context.....	1
2	Midterm Evaluation	2
2.1	Scope	2
2.2	Objectives.....	2
3	Evaluation framework.....	3
3.1	Methodology.....	3
3.2	Evaluation matrix	3
3.3	Evaluation Scale	4
3.4	Constraints and limitations on the study conducted.....	4
4	Joint Program description	6
5	Key Stakeholders.....	8
5.1.1	Oversight bodies	8
5.1.2	Government Agencies.....	10
5.1.3	UN Agencies	10
5.1.4	Coordination with other projects	10
5.1.5	Geographical coverage.....	11
6	Data Analysis	11
6.1	Analysis of the Project Life Cycle	12
6.1.1	Analysis of JP phases.....	12
6.2	Analysis of Evaluation Criteria	13
6.2.1	Design level	13
6.2.2	Process level.....	14

6.2.3	Results level	14
7	CCRM JP Progress at Outcome/Output/Deliverable level till end/May 2010	15
7.1	Outcome 1: Mainstreaming GHG Mitigation and CDM into National Policy and Expanding Access to Finance Frameworks	15
7.1.1	Output 1.1: National Policy Reform for a more sustainable energy economy achieved ...	15
7.1.2	Output 1.2 Expanded CDM Market.....	17
7.2	Outcome 2: Enhanced capacity to adapt to climate change	21
7.2.1	Output 2.1: Adaptation strategies and practices integrated into climate sensitive development policies, plans, and Programmes.....	21
7.2.2	Output 2.2: Pilot measures implemented and scaled up in support of adaptation mainstreaming and policymaking.....	23
7.2.3	Output 2.2.1: Adaptation of water resources sector.....	23
7.2.4	Output 2.2.2: Adaptation of Agriculture Sector.....	25
8	Advocacy and Communications	27
9	Conclusions and Recommendations	27
9.1	JP Design	27
9.1.1	Conclusions	27
9.1.2	Recommendations	29
9.2	Program Management.....	30
9.2.1	Conclusions	30
9.2.2	Recommendations	31
10	Annexes.....	1
10.1	Annex 1: Terms of Reference (ToR) – As approved by the JP Reference Group	1
10.2	Annex 2: List of documents reviewed.....	i
10.3	Annex 3: Field Visit schedule	v
10.4	Annex 4: List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and site visits	ix

10.5	Annex 5: Procurement Procedures	xiv
10.6	Annex 6: List of studies prepared by Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR)/ Agriculture Research Center (ARC)	xv
10.7	Annex 7: Analysis of Progress of CCRM until May 2010	xvii

List of Acronyms

APU	Awareness and Promotion Unit
ARC	Agriculture Research Center
CBO	Community Based Organization
CCRMP	Climate Change and Risk Mitigation JP
CDM	Clean Development Management
CLAC	Central Laboratory for Agricultural Climate
COM	Cabinet of Ministers
CRM	Climate Risk Management
DNA	Designated National Authority
EEAA	Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency
EEU	Energy Efficiency Unit
EPAP II	Environmental Pollution Abatement Project II
F&IWRM	Forecasting and Integrated Water Resources Management
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GAFI	General Authority For Investment
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GOE	Government of Egypt
ICZM	Integrated Coastal Zone Management
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labor Organization
INC	Initial National Communication
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MALR	Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation
MALR	Ministry of Agriculture and Land Resources
MDG-F	UNDP/Spain MDG Achievement Fund
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MOFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MOIC	Ministry of International Cooperation
MSEA	Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs
MWRI	Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation
NBI	Nile Basin Initiative
NEPAD	New Partnership for African Development
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NSC	National Steering Committee
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee
PMC	Programme Management Committee
PMT	Program Management Team
RCM	Regional Circulation Model

SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
SEC	Supreme Energy Council
SLR	Sea Level Rise
SNC	State Nature Conservancy
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDAF	United Nation Development Assistance Framework
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNRC	Resident Coordinator of the United Nations
V&A	Vulnerability and Adaptation

1 Introduction

- 1 This report presents a Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) of the Joint Program “Climate Change Risk Management in Egypt” funded by MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F). The JP started in October 2008 and will be concluded in October 2011. The MTE includes review of progress achieved in the period from October 2008 to March 2010. The Terms of Reference of this assignment were prepared by the MDG-F secretariat and adapted by the MTE Reference Group in Egypt who is the primary audience of this report.
- 2 The Midterm Evaluation report includes 9 sections in addition to annexes: Introduction: This section provides a background for the reasons to start the JP and the country context. Midterm Evaluation: This section describes the objective of the Midterm evaluation and the scope of the evaluation. Evaluation Framework: this section describes the methodology applied to the evaluation, the evaluation criteria definitions, evaluation scale and the constraints and limitations of this evaluation. JP description: This section outlines the JP description as outlined in the JP document. Data analysis: This section includes analysis of the JP following two approaches; the project life cycle approach and the evaluation criteria approach. Conclusions and recommendations: This section presents conclusions and recommendations; JP design, and Project Management.

1.1 Back ground

- 3 The average rate of increase of GHG emissions in Egypt was 5.1% between 1990 and 2000. The share of Egypt in the total world GHG emissions in 1990 was 0.4% and was still limited to 0.58% in 2000
- 4 Egypt total fresh water yearly budget is estimated at about 58 billion m³, consisting of 55.5 billion m³ from River Nile, 1.0 billion m³ from deep aquifers, and 1.2 billion m³ from rain. The share of fresh water per capita in the early nineties was 1000 m³; It dropped to 900 m³ in 2000 and it is estimated to reach 554 m³ by 2020 (below the water poverty line of 1000 m³ per capita)
- 5 While mitigation is necessary, adaptation to current and future climate change is inevitable. Indeed, Egypt proves to be highly vulnerable to climate change impacts according to IPCC reports. Current and future changes in climatic conditions constitute a major environmental risk that may jeopardize Egypt’s development gains and efforts for poverty reduction.

1.2 Country Context

- 6 The total Egyptian population (2006) amounted to 76.5 million; and is estimated to reach 100 million by 2020 (assuming the population growth rate remains unchanged). The recorded average rate of growth of population was about 2.3% per year, stable for the past 10 years
- 7 The Gross National Product (GNP) was 82.65 billion US\$ in 1997, and grow at an average rate of 3.7% to 112.94 billion US\$ in 2006 (at market price). During the same period, the GNP per capita grew at an average rate of 1.18% to \$1,556.¹
- 8 In the past decade, Egypt has taken important steps towards attaining the MDGs. However, in 2006, the CCA pointed out that reaching the MDGs and ensuring economic growth, poverty reduction and social protection is not possible without protecting natural resources from the increased pressures resulting from rapid population growth. In response, UNCT has included two

¹ adapted from Egypt Second National Communication, May 2010

UNDAF Outcomes 1 and 3 in Egypt's UNDAF 2007-2011, which address promoting sustainable development concepts including climate change issues.

- 9 In April 2007, the RC initiated brainstorming meetings with UN Agencies, national experts and relevant government authorities to formulate a UN climate change initiative that includes mitigation and adaptation. Introducing the UNDP-Spain MDG Achievement Fund is another building block to support the already established alliance in responding to the needs of the Government of Egypt in addressing climate change challenges. The consultative approach employed in elaborating and designing this JP assures national ownership, and of course, affirms falling within the national framework.
- 10 Egypt's contribution to the world CO₂ emission is currently less than the world's average but much more than Africa's average. Oil is the major source of energy supply. Egypt can move towards a less GHG intensive path, mainly by becoming a more energy efficient economy and by making greater use of its large renewable energy potential. The Government embraced several measures to promote the rational use of energy, culminating recently by activating SEC to revise national energy policies. CDM proved to be relevant to support such sector-wide efforts and promote increased "decarbonisation" of Egypt's economy.

2 Midterm Evaluation

2.1 Scope

- 11 This mid-term evaluation assesses progress of implementation of the JP from its inception until its mid point. The JP officially started on 15 October 2008 when the first year funds were transferred to the UN agencies. The evaluation includes 6 quarters from the beginning of October 2008 to the end of March 2010. (Because data was available either until end of first year in December 2009 or until May 2010, the second point was selected for evaluation purposes)
- 12 Accordingly, for the purpose of the midterm evaluation, the first year of the JP includes the first five quarters that started in October 2008 and ended in December 2009. The second year is defined as January 2010 to December 2010 and the third year is defined as January 2011 to October 2011.

2.2 Objectives

- 13 This mid-term evaluation has the following specific objectives as stated in the Terms of Reference (*See Annex 1 for ToR*) :
 - To discover the Programme's design quality and internal coherence (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the Millennium Development Goals, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
 - To understand how the joint Programme operates and assess the efficiency of its management model in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the One UN framework.

- To identify the Programme's degree of effectiveness among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the Environment and Climate Change thematic window, and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

3 Evaluation framework

3.1 Methodology

- 14 Desk study - The largest part of the work during the desk study phase is to review information available at JP concerning components, outcomes, outputs, activities, and indicators. JP document, annual work plans, progress and monitoring reports are some of the documents that were reviewed. (*See Annex 2 for documents reviewed*)
- 15 Field visit - Country visit took place from 6 to 24 June 2010. The main objective of the country visit is to validate and enrich the desk review and to generate new information that confirms or refute the conclusions of the desk review. The JP coordinator has undertaken to assist in identifying relevant officials and key stakeholders. A reference group was formed consisting of representatives of participating UN agencies, and the Government of Egypt. The reference group has adapted the ToR to local conditions and has identified priorities for interviewing key stakeholders. The reference group will review findings and conclusions of the MTE. (*See Annex 3 for field visit schedule*)
- 16 Interviews and meetings- Interviews with JP team, counterparts, partners and focal points formed an important part of the country visit. Many will be done on a semi structured basis to pursue specific lines of enquiry about policies, strategies and progress of the Joint Program. There were, in addition, a variety of focus group meetings to increase participation of beneficiaries. (*See Annex 4 for list of key informants and groups interviewed*)
- 17 Program Beneficiaries – people the JP aim to reach and who have been involved in program activities to date. The consultant explored perceptions of changes in living conditions and satisfaction with physical, social and economic services; effects of changes in institutions, regulations and services. Discussions were held with groups and individuals.
- 18 Partners – those who have knowledge of JP and/or its projects and beneficiaries but who are not directly involved in project implementation such as consultants and NGOs.

3.2 Evaluation matrix

- 19 The Midterm evaluation follows OECD/DAC criteria of Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Sustainability. The definitions of those criteria have been adapted to Joint Program context. Specific questions related to each criterion has been defined by the MDG-F secretariat and refined by the JP reference group at national level. Evaluation questions are described in details in the attached matrix (Appendix 2). Triangulation of data sources are used as much as applicable. The data sources mentioned below are only indicative and not comprehensive. The following Evaluation matrix describes briefly data sources for each evaluation criterion and the method for collecting data.

Evaluation criteria	Data Sources	Method
Relevance The extent to how coherent the objectives of the	Relevant Documents, Key Informants, Program	Desk Review, Interviews,

development intervention are with regards to the beneficiaries' problems, the needs of the country, the global priorities and the other partners and donors	Management	field visits, focus groups
Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, etc.) have been turned into results	Relevant Documents, Key Informants, Program Management	Desk Review, Interviews, field visits, focus groups
Effectiveness- Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, bearing in mind their relative importance.	Relevant Documents, Key Informants, Program Management	Desk Review, Interviews, field visits, focus groups
Sustainability- Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.	Relevant Documents, Key Informants, Program Management	Desk Review, Interviews, field visits, focus groups
Country level- Lessons learnt, good practices, progress toward achieving MDGs, One UN, and influencing public policies	Relevant Documents, Key Informants, Program Management	Desk Review, Interviews, field visits, focus groups

3.3 Evaluation Scale

- 20 Originally in the inception report, A four point scale of 4-High, 3-Substantial, 2-Modest, and 1-Negligible was recommended for assessing progress towards achieving JP outcomes. A Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) method used to link program activities/outputs/deliverables on annual basis to the Joint Program Outcomes. However, during the evaluation, using the evaluation scale proved to be difficult for the reasons mentioned below under Constraints and Limitations.

3.4 Constraints and limitations on the study conducted

- 21 Moving targets – The triple constraints (scope, Time, and cost) of the CCRM JP represent moving targets that were difficult to trace with any accuracy.
- 22 Scope – “Climate Change” is a new theme in Egypt that was added to the portfolio of the UN agencies under the UNDAF 2007-2011 framework at the time the CCRM JP was submitted to MDG-F for approval. Therefore, the design did not follow traditional hierarchical structure of Joint Programs implemented under UN modalities. It was uncertain at the time of the design, what kind of outputs will result from implementing certain activities, how long it will take and how much it will cost. So, there is no baseline for the scope to compare with since the scope of most activities evolved over time during implementation.
- 23 Time – Although the funds were transferred to UN agencies in October 2008, the JP document was not detailed enough to start implementation. Limited activities started under different

components that enabled the JP to prepare an inception report by May 2009 including a revised Results Framework. It was found that some outputs for example are not feasible such as establishing pilot projects under the CDM component. However, implementation did not start until June 2009 for most of the activities, when government partners were able to prepare annual work plans, recruit staff and receive funds from UN agencies.

- 24 Cost – The budgets for different activities under each component have changed several times over the course of the JP. It is unknown how many versions exist of the JP budget because this was not traced over time. Each of the 6 UN agencies and 4 government agencies has a different version of the budgets over 3 years. There are many reasons for those discrepancies:
- The design of outcome 2 is complicated making reporting difficult as will be explained in details under JP design.
 - Each of the 6 UN agencies is using a different computerized system that tracks expenses from a central location.
 - Each of the UN agencies have different processes for accounting, procurement and disbursements (*See Annex 5 for procurement procedures of the six UN agencies participating in the JP*)
 - Each of the UN agencies has their own definitions of commitment and disbursement.
 - There was no tracking of a Baseline budget and revisions to this baseline. Therefore it is unknown how many revisions have taken place in each UN agency
 - The government agencies are using manual system, spread sheets, to track expenses.
 - Tracking actual disbursements is more difficult than tracking budgets. The government agencies and some of the UN agencies are not using Activity Based Costing (ABC) to track expenses against activities or outputs. They are tracking expenses against accounting codes such as salaries, travel, supplies, etc.
 - Some UN systems don't have the flexibility to produce custom reports during the year. They are designed to produce one report at the end of the fiscal year. Any interim reports will be based on unofficial estimates which might change up or down over time.
 - Some activities are implemented jointly by several UN agencies which makes it difficult to estimate how much was the contribution of each agency into the progress of the activity, for example, activities performed under output 1.2 expanding CDM Market are supported by UNEP, UNIDO and UNDP
 - For reporting purposes, each agency is making a subjective judgment on estimates in a certain period. The variations are so wide between those estimates. For example, one UN agency signed a letter of agreement with an implementer and they considered all the funds committed and disbursed from day 1 of the project. Another agency is applying 0-100 rule. This means that the system will report zero disbursement for a very long time and then suddenly a very large sum will appear on the report.
- 25 Therefore, the approach to the Midterm evaluation considered those constraints and limitations. Since Climate Change is an innovative theme, the scope of the JP is assessed using mixed methods according to the nature of the design of each component.
- 26 The cost element is the most challenging constraint. For the purpose of the Midterm evaluation, the consultant used the Results Framework attached to the inception report dated May 2009 as a baseline for annual budgets; the second semester report until the end of 2009 is used for actual

disbursement in year1; while the revised year 2 WP disbursed and committed report dated May 2010 is used as the source of the actual disbursement during year 2. It should be clear that the analysis carried out using those sources will not be accurate and that there will be discrepancies with the data on each of the organizations' systems.

4 Joint Program description

- 27 The aim of the proposed Climate Change and Risk Mitigation JP (CCRMP) is to help Egypt align its climate risk management and human development efforts in pursuing the achievement of MDGs in the face of climate change and the predicted serious threats to the country. In this context, the JP serves to reduce poverty and mitigate risk by combining mitigation and adaptation under one integrated Climate Risk Management (CRM) banner with a special attention given to the vulnerable poorest populations of Egypt through two complementary approaches: 1) Mainstreaming GHG mitigation into national policy and investment frameworks, including increased CDM financing opportunities; 2) Enhancing the country's capacity to adapt to climate change.
- 28 The JP Document for the CCRMP was signed on August 20, 2008 on the premises of the Cabinet of Ministers (COM) in Cairo, Egypt. The Project Document was approved by, Secretary General of COM, MWRI, MALR, MOIC, MOFA, UNDP, UNESCO, UNIDO, UNEP, FAO and IFAD.
- 29 The CCRMP is a national Programme implemented across multiple ministries and sectors, targeting both mitigation and adaptation. The JP consists of two Outcomes: mitigation and adaptation.
- 30 Under the first outcome, mitigation, the JP intends to assist in elaborating, updating and reforming Egypt's energy policy for a more sustainable energy economy; and expanding CDM market, thus mainstreaming GHG mitigation and CDM into national policy. The JP is a vehicle to initiate a policy dialogue process; build the capacities of the technical secretariat of SEC; elaborate analytical studies that justify issuing decrees on reducing and phasing out of energy subsidies at the sector level. The JP assists EEAA in establishing and training a new CDM promotional and awareness unit. The JP also implements CDM Programme of activities that reduces GHG in areas related to energy efficiency, solid waste management, transportation etc.
- 31 Under the second outcome, adaptation, the JP intends to develop the capacities of Egyptian institutions and authorities on adapting to climate change. In this context, the JP starts by assessing vulnerability and gaps, then assist Egypt in preparing and updating strategies for integrating adaptation practices for climate-sensitive development Programmes and projects. The JP, therefore, supports building a Regional Circulation Model (RCM) for River Nile to predict the impact of climate change on rainfall pattern and Nile flood. The JP also takes stock of MALR efforts to develop stress tolerant crop varieties, and improve on farm water management, which eventually prepares the agricultural sector for future possibilities of climate change.
- 32 The Joint Program consists of four components: Supreme Energy Council (SEC) Component; Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Component; the Forecasting and Integrated Water Resources Management (F&IWRM) Component; and the Vulnerability and Adaptation (V & A) Component

Supreme Energy Council (SEC) Component

- 33 In this component, the Cabinet of Ministers (COM) collaborates with UNDP and UNEP to avail advisory and coordination services to the Supreme energy Council (SEC) in the areas of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.
- 34 SEC and UNDP-UNEP collaborates to support the ongoing reform of the energy subsidy scheme and promote renewable energy and energy efficiency. The JP provides technical assistance to assimilate and convert existing wealth of studies and information into policy papers for SEC as a step towards institutional transformation to an energy efficient economy. The Technical assistance also ensures coordination among ministries on implementing decisions of SEC and mobilizing additional resources to support longer term studies serving national energy priorities.

Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Component

- 35 In this component, MESA/EEAA liaises with UNEP, UNDP, and UNIDO to promote the utilization of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) as a tool to make environmental projects financially feasible.
- 36 UNIDO, UNEP and UNDP liaise with the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Designated National Authority (DNA) at EEAA and other interested groups on the expansion of the CDM markets in Egypt through updating and promoting the existing CDM portfolio, capacity building activities and implementation of pilot projects for GHG reductions. UNIDO mobilizes an additional US\$ 150,000 from its own resources to complement the MDG-F JP funds in order to address adaptation of the industrial sector to climate change. This component will build on UNEP's CD4CDM project (2002-2005) and complements the ongoing bilateral CDM support.

Adaptation in the Water Sector Component (the Forecasting and Integrated Water Resources Management (F&IWRM) component)

- 37 In this component, MWRI collaborates with UNEP, UNDP and UNESCO in the Forecasting and Integrated Water Resources Management (F&IWRM). The partners develop an RCM to forecast the impact of climate change on precipitation in the Nile Basin. Finally, UNDP will support MWRI in introducing the developed RCM to the Nile Basin Initiative in fulfillment of the Nile Council of Ministers decision to develop the RCM for the Nile Basin.
- 38 In adaptation, IFAD, FAO and UNDP cooperate with the ongoing UNDP-GEF SNC to the UNFCCC to develop in-depth assessments on vulnerability and adaptation gaps and needs for the agriculture, water and coastal development sectors. These V&A and policy assessments support establishing an effective Adaptation Policy Framework in the water, agriculture and ICZM sectors. This component also includes implementation of a communication strategy through media, fact sheets, public relations materials, video tapes, radio programming, etc., to increase awareness of climate change risks and promote integration of adaptation principles into national development plans.

Adaptation in the Agricultural Sector Component (The Vulnerability and Adaptation (V & A))

- 39 In this component, the agricultural sector, based in the Agriculture Research Center (ARC) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR) collaborate with IFAD and FAO to: assess existing agricultural policies and advocate the adaptation of strategies and practices into climate-sensitive policies and plans; develop stress-tolerant crops in pilot Programmes to support adaptation mainstreaming and policymaking; along with the dissemination of knowledge on crop stress varieties.

- 40 IFAD and FAO work together with the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation and its Research Centers on adapting agriculture and fisheries policies and practices to changing climate. IFAD focus on the development of stress tolerant crop varieties and optimized cropping pattern that cope better with harsh climatic conditions, while FAO will address optimal use of on farm water resources management under climate change.
- 41 Meanwhile, UNDP will survey available models applied to the River Nile and assess the added value and level of certainty that could be achieved by the adaptation of a Regional Circulation Model (RCM) for River Nile in predicting the impact of climate change on the Nile annual flood. In case the study indicates that the RCM proves feasible and doable, UNEP bid among international climate modeling centers including UNEP-DHI for the development of a RCM for River Nile that will link with the NBI hydrological modeling activities. UNDP also work on climate proofing of UN development policies and plans. UNESCO will be working on the implementation of climate resilient Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Plans on the local level, based on the climate scenarios generated by the RCM, with the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation (MWRI). Meanwhile the ICZM as part of the JP is linked with the activities of the GEF-UNDP Project Proposal to the SCCF adaptation funds on ICZM on addressing the risks posed by climate change induced SLR in the Nile Delta.
- 42 UNDAF outcomes one and three are the overall arching framework for this JP that aims to ensure achievement of the MDGs in the face of climate change in Egypt through sustainable energy development strategies and effective management of climate risks in key affected sectors. This should help Egypt align its climate risk management and human development efforts in responding to the predicted serious threats to the country.

5 Key Stakeholders

5.1.1 Oversight bodies

National Steering Committee

- 43 The UN RC and the Government representative co-chair the NSC. The co-chairs can invite other representatives and observers. The members of the NSC include heads of UN agencies as observers, a representative of the Government from Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) and the Ministry of International Cooperation (MOIC), representative of the Government Implementing Agencies, (which is MSEA/EEAA), and a representative from the Spanish Embassy. The NSC's role is to provide oversight and strategic guidance to the Programme. The NSC meets semi-annually and makes decisions by consensus.
- 44 The responsibilities of the NSC include approving the strategic direction for the implementation of the JP within the operational framework authorized by the MDG-F Steering Committee, aligning the MDG-F funded activities with the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), approve strategic partnership, and establishing Programme baselines to enable sound monitoring and evaluation. The NSC is also responsible for approving the annual work plan and budgets, reviewing the consolidated JP Report from the Administrative Agent and providing strategic comments and decisions. Creating synergies and seeking agreement on similar Programmes and projects is another strategic advantage of the NSC.

Programme Management Committee

- 45 The PMC is co-chaired by the Chief Executive Officer of EEAA, as the Government Lead Implementing Partner and the UNDP Country Director, as the Lead UN Agency. The PMC consists of the 6 participating UN Organizations (UNIDO, FAO, IFAD, UNEP, UNESCO, and UNDP) and the 4 implementing Government Agencies (MSEA, COM, MALR, MWRI) in addition to the JP Manager. The role of the PMC is to provide operational coordination to the JP. The PMC normally meets quarterly, but may have to meet more often depending on the need to address issues related directly to management and implementation of the Programme.
- 46 The responsibilities of the PMC include managing the Programme resources to achieve the outcomes and outputs, addressing management and implementation issues, and identifying emerging lessons learnt, as per the TORs in JP document. The PMC should also ensure operational coordination, establishing adequate reporting mechanisms, integrate work plans, budgets, reports, and ensures that budget overlaps or gaps are addressed.

Component Management Committees

- 47 There are 4 Component Management Committees. The members of each component include the relevant departments within the government institutions and the relevant UN partners for the component, in addition to the assigned component coordinator from the government side, as shown in Table 1. The JP Manager maybe invited, or may request to participate in the meetings to discuss issues related to the overall implementation of the Programme.

Table 1: Component Committee Members

Component	Government Institution (Department)	UN Agency
SEC	COM	UNDP, UNEP
CDM	EEAA, (Environmental Quality Sector)	UNDP, UNIDO, UNEP
F & IWRM	MWRI, (Planning Sector and National Water Research Center)	UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO
V & A	MALR, (ARC/ Central Laboratory for Agricultural Climate)	FAO, IFAD

- 48 The role of the component management committee is to plan and follow up the implementation of the component's activities to ensure proper and timely implementation according to the Annual Work Plan and the Results Frame Work. The frequency of the meetings is decided by each component, but the meetings must be documented, and each component should maintain their documentation.
- 49 Table 2 below shows the focal and operational Focal Points for each of the organizations represented on the JP

Table 2: Partner Focal and Operational Focal Points

Organization	Focal Point	Operational Focal Point
COM	Advisor to General Secretary	Energy Advisor
MSEA/EEA	Head of Environmental Quality Sector	2 representatives from the Environmental Quality Sector
MWRI	Chairperson, National Water Research Center Head - Planning Sector	2 representatives from NWRC 2 representatives from the Planning Sector

MALR	Director, Agriculture Research Center	Director of Central Laboratory for Agricultural Climate, Agricultural Research Center.
UNDP	UNDP Country Director	Assistant Resident Representative
UNESCO	Regional Advisor for Hydrology	n/a
FAO	Assistant FAO Representative	n/a
IFAD	IFAD Country Presence Officer	n/a
UNIDO	Deputy UNIDO Representative	Industry Development Officer* National Programme Coordinator
UNEP	UNEP RISOE Center Project Leader*	Representative from UNEP RISOE*

5.1.2 Government Agencies

- 50 Four governmental agencies are taking the lead in implementation of the 4 JP components. The Cabinet of Ministers (COM) is leading implementation of the Supreme Energy Council (SEC) component. Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs (MESA) represented by Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA) is taking the lead on overall implementation of the JP and the lead in implementation of the CDM component. Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation is leading the implementation of the F&IWRM component. Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation represented by Agriculture Research Centre (ARC) is leading the implementation of the Vulnerability and Adaptation (V & A) component.

5.1.3 UN Agencies

- 51 Six UN agencies, namely UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, IFAD, FAO and UNESCO, are engaged in formulating this JP with the central bodies of the Government of Egypt for a coordinated, complementary effort that establish needed synergies to, first, reduce transaction costs for both the Government and the UN; second, strengthen the UN Agencies Programme with the Government; and finally, ensure that the combined resources of the system are put to best use through improved work processes.
- 52 UNEP and UNDP work together to support the Technical Secretariat of the SEC of the Cabinet of Ministers in its ongoing endeavors in reforming the national energy policies. Meanwhile the UN Agencies in addition to UNIDO works with the EEAA on expanding CDM markets in Egypt and implementation of pilot projects pertaining to the reduction of GHGs. UNEP, UNDP and UNESCO work with the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation on the development of a Regional Circulation Model (RCM) for the River Nile in full coordination with the National Office of the NBI and implementation of IWRM pilot projects using the generated scenarios from the RCM. Meanwhile FAO and IFAD are supporting the efforts of the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation on the adaptation of the agricultural sector to climatic changes. In addition, UNDP, FAO and IFAD are also support formulation of adaptation policies in the three targeted vulnerable sectors as well as integration of Climate Risk Management approaches in the UN Programming Frameworks.

5.1.4 Coordination with other projects

- 53 Each of the four components of the JP is linked to one or more projects.
- 54 The SEC Component benefits from two new GEF energy efficiency projects (budget of US\$ 9 million) that currently under preparation. The two projects are expected to provide assistance and

support to the efforts that are currently being discussed at the Energy Efficiency Unit. The first project is implemented by the MSEA/EEAA and UNIDO on energy efficiency in the industrial sector, while the second project will be implemented by Ministry of Electricity and UNDP on energy efficiency in residential, public, and commercial sectors.

- 55 Under the CDM Component a new unit is established for promotion and awareness of CDM projects within EEAA but separate from the Designated National Authority. The CDM component trained the staff of the new unit and provides them with technical assistance to perform their functions and achieve the JP Outputs. The new unit is located in the Environmental Quality Sector and work very closely with the World Bank Multi-Donor funded Environmental Pollution Abatement Project II (EPAP II) that has allocated US\$ 200 million for implementation of environmental investment projects.
- 56 The water sector Component, within the adaptation activities, supports activities address the impact of Sea Level Rise (SLR) on the coastal zones of Egypt. In this respect, the limited budget was used to co-fund the preparatory phase study for a US\$ 4 million UNDP-GEF funded project on the adaptation of the low-lying lands in the Nile Delta to SLR through the promotion of Integrated Coastal Zone Management principles. Additional SLR activities are coordinated between relevant projects to integrate the coastal zone management activities.
- 57 The Vulnerability and Adaptation (V & A) Component in the agricultural sector is based in the Agriculture Research Center (ARC) in Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR). This Programme is linked to a national Programme called "Green for tomorrow". "Green for Tomorrow" is based in MALR and raises public awareness of Arabian communities about climate change and its relation to agricultural sector. The Programme aims to present an integrated scientific and accurate overview about climate change phenomenon, the causes standing behind this phenomenon, the methods used in studying it, the impacts of it on natural and human systems, the adaptation methods and strategies that may decrease the magnitude of the projected impacts over the different systems. They present information focusing on the regional (Mediterranean, North Africa, Arabian region) and national levels.²

5.1.5 Geographical coverage

- 58 The CCRMP is a national Climate Change Programme implemented across multiple ministries and sectors, targeting both mitigation and adaptation.

6 Data Analysis

- 59 The data analysis section of this report follows two integrated and interrelated approaches: Analysis of the Project Life Cycle of the Joint Program following the Project Management Institute (PMI) guidelines known as the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK)³; and analysis of the evaluation questions and criteria following OECD/DAC guidelines and definitions published in 2002⁴ and Standards for Evaluations in the UN System published in 2005⁵

² Inception report,

³ A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide) - Fourth Edition, PMI, 2008

⁴ Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Development Assistance Committee, OECD/DAC, 2002

⁵ Standards for Evaluation in the UN System , UNEG, April 2005

6.1 Analysis of the Project Life Cycle

6.1.1 Analysis of JP phases

- 60 The analysis of the life cycle of the JP follows best practices in program/project management. The guidelines of Project Management Institute (PMI) are de facto standards for Project Managers. The Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK) – fourth edition illustrates that projects of all sizes and complexities go through four phases: Starting the project, organizing and preparing, Carryout the work and closing the project.
- 61 The Project Life Cycle consists of 5 process groups: Initiation, Planning, Executing, Monitoring and Control, and Closing.
- 62 The roles and responsibilities for the initiation phase of the JP were not well defined. The activities of the initiation phase include procedures and timelines for hiring Project Management Team (PMT), setting up project office (s), acquiring office equipment, and arranging communication and transportation. (The JP document does not clarify who is responsible for carrying out those activities and when they should be completed)
- 63 The time required to complete planning phase was not taken into consideration in the JP document. The roles and responsibilities for the Planning phase of the JP were not well defined.
- 64 Performing activities to develop a Project Management Plan was not factored in while preparing the JP document. Not completing a Project Management Plan, had led to underestimating the level of effort, time, and resources required to complete the scope, and to effectively manage the completion of the JP deliverables
- 65 The inception report submitted in May 2009 revised some of the outputs/activities in the JP document. However, it did not provide detailed description of activities. Each of the government agencies implementing components did this function in a different way. An agency used a Gantt chart, another used a check list, and a third used narrative descriptions. This is clear from the format of the monitoring reports of the 4 components
- 66 Overall progress on the implementation of outputs was delayed from the onset of the JP due to the late start in setting up the component team members and the transfer of funds from UN agencies to government counterparts (May – October 09)
- 67 Delivering as One (DaO) tends to be a more complex model to apply for implementation of Joint Programs because of the large number of communication channels that need to be managed with different stakeholders, due to the nature of the activities and the number of agencies involved in delivering outputs. Communications with non-resident agency Focal Point added to the complexity.
- 68 The monitoring activities are currently being performed by the JP coordinator. An M&E specialist that tracks progress of activities as well as collects and analyzes data on performance indicators was not hired. The JP submitted a progress report on 09 April 2009 summarizing results during Q4-08 of operation (Oct 08 – Dec 08), A second progress report was submitted on 31 March 2009 summarizing results in Q1-09, A third progress report summarizing results in Q3-09 until end November, 2009. The 2nd semester progress report was submitted on 4 February 2010 detailing progress until end December 2009. A report was submitted in June 2010 called “Annual Work plan (Rev.1) as of May 31, 2010 For MTE” detailed progress in disbursements and commitments from Jan to May 2010.
- 69 The plan to carry out closing activities, to define roles and responsibilities, and to estimate time and cost required was not considered in the JP design. It is anticipated that, if this process is not

planned well in advance of the end of the JP, it will become extremely difficult to trace transactions backward for 3 years among the large number of agencies, and implementers involved.

6.2 Analysis of Evaluation Criteria

- 70 The main users of the evaluation are represented in the evaluation reference group. The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the program.

6.2.1 Design level

6.2.1.1 Relevance:

The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies of associates and donors.

- 71 The aim of the proposed Climate Change and Risk Mitigation JP (CCRMP) is to help Egypt align its climate risk management and human development efforts in pursuing the achievement of MDGs in the face of climate change and the predicted serious threats to the country. In this context, the JP will serve to mitigate risk by combining mitigation and adaptation under one integrated Climate Change Risk Management (CCRM) banner through two complementary approaches: 1) Mainstreaming GHG mitigation into national policy and investment frameworks, including increased CDM financing opportunities; 2) Enhancing the country's capacity to adapt to climate change.
- 72 Under the first outcome, mitigation, the JP intends to assist in elaborating, updating and reforming Egypt's energy policy for a more sustainable energy economy; and expanding CDM market, thus mainstreaming GHG mitigation and CDM into national policy.
- 73 Under the second outcome, adaptation, the JP intends to develop the capacities of Egyptian institutions and authorities on adapting to climate change. In this context, the JP will start by assessing vulnerability and gaps, then assist Egypt in preparing and updating strategies for integrating adaptation practices for climate-sensitive development Programmes and projects. The JP, therefore, will support building a Regional Circulation Model (RCM) for River Nile to predict the impact of climate change on rainfall pattern and Nile flood. The JP will also take stock of MALR efforts to develop stress tolerant crop varieties, and improve on farm water management, which eventually will prepare the agricultural sector for future possibilities of climate change.
- 74 The joint program is relevant as it addresses the needs and interests of Egypt to mitigate the impact of climate change. However, it is only the beginning and extensive efforts are still required to achieve this goal.
- 75 Follow up indicators are developed at activity level and need to be enhanced to measure results at output and outcome levels.

6.2.1.2 Ownership in the design:

Effective exercise of leadership by the country's social agents in development interventions

- 76 The Joint program responds to national priorities indicated in the first national communication and is aligned with Law 4/1994 for the Protection of the Environment in Egypt and its amendments by Law 9/2009
- 77 The joint program was initiated through brainstorming meetings with UN Agencies, national experts and relevant government authorities

6.2.2 Process level

6.2.2.1 Efficiency:

Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, etc.) have been turned into results

- 78 Due to the complexity of the Joint Program, it is difficult to associate inputs to particular outputs and outcomes. The total Budget over 3 years is \$4 million (\$1,135 thousands for the Y1, 1,748 thousands for Y2, and 1, 117 thousands for Y3). Y1 funds were transferred to the JP in October 2008 and Y2 funds were transferred in January 2010. The total funds transferred until the date of this report is approx \$2,883 thousands.
- 79 The total actual amounts disbursed until end May 2010 is estimated at \$1,137 thousands representing about 40% of the amounts transferred and about 28% of the total budget.
- 80 Those percentages don't represent progress in the rate of delivery because of the reasons explained under section 3.4 "Constraints and limitations".
- 81 Other examples are shown under section 7 "CCRM Progress". There are cases where a deliverable is complete while there are no funds disbursed yet because of some accounting rule in the system of UN agencies. *(See Annex 7 for more details)*
- 82 The level of coordination is high within each component. There is a significant room for improvement of coordination across components.
- 83 The level of coordination with other projects is expected to be high, according to the design of the JP. So far, coordination with other projects was limited.

6.2.2.2 Ownership in the process

Effective exercise of leadership by the country's social agents in development interventions

- 84 Four government agencies are leading implementation of the JP.
- 85 The agencies implementing the first outcome are receiving support from UN agencies and are outsourcing implementation of activities to private sector entities and consultants. The second outcome is implemented by MWRI and MALR who are depending mainly on their in-house capacity with support from UN agencies and an international contractor to develop the RCM.
- 86 This implementation strategy, following the Paris Declaration, is leading to building the capacity of the government agencies and is supporting sustainability in the long run

6.2.3 Results level

6.2.3.1 Effectiveness

Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, bearing in mind their relative importance.

- 87 The Joint Program is aiming to achieve the MDG goal number 7 of Ensuring environmental sustainability
- 88 Several activities of the JP had a late start of the implementation phase of about 7 months, although the contract for the RCM was made early. However, the pace of implementation was high after recruiting staff, hiring of consultants, and transferring funds to implementing agencies.
- 89 Due to the nature of the activities performed under the JP, it was difficult to make an accurate estimation of the time required to complete certain deliverables. However, in general significant progress was achieved so far as demonstrated in section 7.
- 90 There is a high potential that most of the activities be completed before the end of the JP, as shown on the Gantt chart in the attached file.
- 91 However, at output and outcome levels, there are various challenges facing the JP as will be discussed in details in the next section.

6.2.3.2 Sustainability:

Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.

- 92 The implementation phase of the JP has just passed its one year mark in May 2010. It is difficult to estimate the probability of continuing the benefits of the JP in the long run at this stage.
- 93 Under the revised Results Framework, it will be useful to develop a sustainability plan to empower Climate Change Risk Management Units and to allocate sufficient resources

7 CCRM JP Progress at Outcome/Output/Deliverable level till end/May 2010

- 94 The JP design consists of different components, each having different nature, background and challenges. The JP design does not follow a standard structure for Outcomes/Outputs/Deliverables/Activities/Indicators. Therefore, the analysis below will not follow a standard format in reporting findings, conclusions and recommendations.

7.1 Outcome 1: Mainstreaming GHG Mitigation and CDM into National Policy and Expanding Access to Finance Frameworks

7.1.1 Output 1.1: National Policy Reform for a more sustainable energy economy achieved

Findings

- 95 There are 3 deliverables under output 1.1 “National Policy Reform for a more sustainable energy economy achieved”. Those are SEC Technical Secretariat strengthened; Energy policy papers to support energy policy reform prepared; Long term draft energy strategies to support energy policy reform formulated

SEC Technical Secretariat strengthened - **Achieved**

- 96 A Prime Ministerial decree was issued in June 2009 to establish the Energy Efficiency Unit (EEU) at the Cabinet of Ministers. The EEU’s mandate is to coordinate, guide, support and monitor all energy efficiency activities in the country. It is headed by the Secretary General of the Cabinet and includes representation from eight Ministries, and managed by the National Energy

Consultant. Two LT consultants were recruited to manage the EEU. ST specialists are recruited, as needed. Capacity needs for the Technical Secretariat were defined.

Energy policy papers to support energy policy reform prepared - **Ongoing**

- 97 Compiling existing relevant studies and information is ongoing. Initiating short-term consultancies to prepare energy policy papers was started in March 2010. Coordination among Ministries on implementation of SEC decisions is ongoing. Four position papers on relevant subjects were provided by the National Energy Consultant to the Secretary General of the Cabinet including 1) the allocation of natural gas resources to the consuming sectors, 2) the involvement of the private sector in developing wind energy resources, 3) the contribution of energy efficiency as a mitigation tool to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and 4) the cost of developing traditional and renewable energy generation.
- 98 In late 2009, a proposal was developed to initiate a lighting energy efficiency program for public buildings. An operational plan to reduce energy consumption in public buildings was completed by the EEU and was discussed in a sub-committee consisting of the representatives of the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Electricity and Energy. The Minister of Finance has approved the initial concept and is willing to support the project.

Long term draft energy strategies to support energy policy reform formulated - **Ongoing**

- 99 Initiating long-term consultancies to develop draft strategies. Mobilizing additional resources to expand the scope of work. The EEU discussed several energy efficiency programs with the World Bank, the European Union, the French aid agency (AFD), the German KfW and GTZ, the Japanese JICA, USAID and UNIDO.

Conclusions

- 100 This output is managed by the Cabinet of Ministers (COM) with support from UNDP and UNEP. The three deliverables under this output are inter-related.
- 101 A national consultant was recruited in December 2008. He compiled and reviewed existing legislation related to energy efficiency and the needs required to support decisions taken by the Supreme Energy Council. The EEU held its kick-off meeting on August 31, 2009.
- 102 The EEU is currently in the process of developing an 'Energy Indicators' study through a local consulting consortium (of two companies). The study aims at identifying the current level of energy use in different key consuming sectors in relation to the specific output of the respective sector. These indicators will be linked the contribution to the GDP. Once these indicators are developed for each sector, long-term benchmarks for each sector will be established and a tracking and monitoring system would be developed to follow up on progress. The EEU will also seek funding opportunities to support implementation of energy efficiency initiatives.
- 103 The total budget for Output 1.1 is approx. \$350 thousands over 3 years (\$280 thousands managed by UNDP and \$70 thousands by UNEP). By the end of May 2010, only 20% of the UNDP budget was disbursed, and No funds were disbursed from the UNEP budget.
- 104 However, the SEC component summary of activities report dated May 2010, demonstrated a commitment and disbursement of approx. \$ 275 thousands until the end of the JP corresponding to approx. 77% of the total budget. Most of the commitments are allocated to hiring the ST consultants mentioned in the previous paragraph.

Recommendations

- 105 The goals established for the EEU are very ambitious and far reaching. The original Results Framework (RFW) and budget line items were refined several times since July 2009, reflecting the dynamic nature of the EEU activities. The EEU is well positioned to influence decision making process of SEC based on evidence. The RFW needs to be revised to take stock of progress achieved so far and outputs/activities foreseen until the end of the JP. A work group consisting of representatives of agencies implementing the SEC component could work on the revision of the RFW.
- 106 Some boundaries need to be defined to the contribution of the EEU in support of the SEC decisions taking into consideration EEU capacity, budget and time. By its nature, policy formulation, implementation, and monitoring are extended processes that are not bound by time limits.
- 107 Options for the sustainability of the EEU, beyond the end of the JP, need to be assessed including 1) forming a standalone project to formulate Energy Efficiency and renewable energy policies, strategies and action plans; 2) absorbing the EEU into the structure of the COM; 3) Integrating EEU into ongoing energy efficiency projects.

7.1.2 Output 1.2 Expanded CDM Market

Background

- 108 In 2003, Egypt issued its National Strategy Study on the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) to develop options and opportunities for GHG emission reductions through the CDM mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol. The study objectives were to identify institutional national prerequisites for CDM, prepare a pipeline of projects for implementation under the CDM, and study the international market for GHG emissions reductions for Egypt's CDM projects. The scope of this study concentrated on the potential sectors for CDM projects in Egypt, including energy, industry, transportation, waste management and agriculture.
- 109 The Egyptian Designated National Authority (DNA) was established by a decree issued by the Minister of State for Environmental Affairs on 14 March, 2005 (Ministerial Decree No. 42 dated 14/3/05). The DNA is responsible for all related CDM activities in Egypt, where its main tasks are: Setting regulations for project evaluation and approval; Approve conformity of the project activity to CDM rules (the project is voluntary, satisfies additionality and contributes to Egypt sustainable development); Promote Egyptian CDM projects among the international investment community; Follow up on CDM project implementation and contact with Designated Operational Entity (DOE); and Issuances of letters of endorsement and approval for CDM projects.⁶
- 110 Between 2005 and 2009, The Egyptian DNA has issued Letters of No Objection for 32 CDM projects. However, only 12 projects have reached either validation or registration phase. Other projects in the portfolio are facing various barriers to proceed in the CDM cycle.

Findings

- 111 There are 3 deliverables under output 1.2 "Expanded CDM Market". Those are CDM Unit Established and Trained; Technical Assistance for Implementation of CDM projects provided; and CDM Program of Activities (PoA) developed and implemented

CDM Unit Established and Trained - **Achieved**

⁶ CDM Status Study In Egypt, Integral Consult, February 2009

- 112 A study⁷ was completed in February 2009 highlighted opportunities and barriers to expanding CDM market in Egypt. The study recommended establishing the APU at EEAA to overcome the barrier of lack of awareness of the CDM mechanism and some of the other barriers.
- 113 The February 2009 Study identified nine barriers to expanding CDM in Egypt. Those are: 1) Insufficient awareness and lack of trust in the system; 2) Institutional and legislative barriers; 3) Lack of sufficient resources for DNA operation; 4) Lack of adequate institutional/ Technical capacities for identification and development of CDM projects; 5) Lack of underlying finance for CDM projects; 6) unexploited CDM potential in service sector; 7) High transaction cost and lengthiness of the CDM cycle; 8) Uncertainties of post 2012; 9) Barriers identified from projects having a letter of no objection but had not started
- 114 The CDM APU has been established in May 2009 and is headed by the Head the Environmental Quality Sector in EEAA. An operational manager has been assigned from EEAA staff for managing the CDM APU activities. Three technical specialists were recruited. They are responsible for technically evaluating and developing CDM project opportunities for targeted sectors (Energy, Industry, Waste, or Transportation). One Marketing and Communication Specialist has been recruited to address a range of marketing and communication for the CDM APU outreach activities. One senior financial specialist has been recruited to manage budgets for program work under the direction of operational manager and to track expenses against available resources .One office co-coordinator has been recruited to be responsible for assisting CDM APU team in their day-to-day administrative activities. Also a driver has been recruited.
- 115 Eight Training sessions were conducted and attended by 75 participants from CDMAPU staff, DNA staff, EEAA related department, and participants from variety entities. An international consultant has been contracted to conduct Advanced Training Workshop on Clean Development Mechanism in the period of June 26-29 2009

Technical Assistance for Implementation of CDM projects provided - **Ongoing**

- 116 The APU is applying 3 approaches to increasing awareness and exploring opportunities for generating CDM projects: Field visits to enterprises, Sectoral workshops, and feasibility studies carried out by national consultants. 30 CDM projects have been identified as a result of field visits, out of these projects 15 PINs have been prepared and submitted to DNA and UNFCCC. Six sectoral workshops were carried out for cement, fertilizer, pulp and paper, oil and gas, and textile sectors. 28 CDM projects have been identified and 13 PINs have been prepared and submitted. Six feasibility studies are underway in the following sectors; Agro-based residues, Municipal Solid waste, Wastewater and Water Utilities, Green building, Industry, and Oil & Gas and Petrochemicals. The feasibility studies might result in 30 additional PINs.
- 117 The APU presented and promoted 28 PINs in Africa Carbon Forum in Kenya (3-5 March 2010) and Carbon Expo in Germany (26-28 May 2010) to identify opportunities for funding.

CDM Program of Activities (PoA) developed and implemented - **Ongoing**

- 118 An international consultant has been contracted together with six national consultants to help identify PoA opportunities. 10 opportunities for PoA have been identified: Shifting from traditional technology to Clean Technology in Egyptian Foundries; Energy Efficiency measures through rehabilitation of Irrigation Pumping Station; Energy efficiency in water pumping systems in greater Cairo drinking water Company; Demand side energy efficiency project in the

⁷ CDM Status Study In Egypt, Integral Consult, February 2009

governmental buildings (CFL); Demand side energy efficiency project in Street Lighting; Household Solar Water Heaters; Scraping of Old Two-Stroke motorcycles and replacing it with Four-Stroke motorcycles in Cairo Governorate; Replacing Old Public Buses to more efficient Buses in Greater Cairo; and Small Scale Grid Connected Renewable Electricity Generation from Rice Straw.

Conclusions

- 119 This output is managed by the EEAA with support from UNEP, UNIDO and UNDP
- 120 The CDM Mechanism is one of three mechanisms (Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), Joint Implementation (JI), Emission Trading (ET)) defined in Kyoto protocol, to mitigate the impact of increasing GHGs. The Kyoto Protocol sets binding targets for 37 industrialized countries and the European Community for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by an average of 5% against 1990 levels over the five-year period 2008-2012
- 121 The CDM allows a country with an emission-reduction or emission-limitation commitment to implement an emission-reduction project in developing countries. Such projects can earn saleable Certified Emission Reduction (CER) credits, each equivalent to one ton of CO₂, which can be counted towards meeting Kyoto targets. It is uncertain what the mechanisms to reduce GHG will be post 2012 as no agreement was reached during the Copenhagen meeting in 2009.
- 122 So far, the EU remains the main buyer for CERs from CDM projects. EU's commitment to reduce its GHG emissions by 20-30% by 2020 on its 1990 level and allow for using CERs to realize part of its emission reductions provides some degree of certainty to CER market beyond 2012.⁸
- 123 The EU is developing new mechanisms to achieve its commitment. A key tool for cutting GHGs, cost effectively, is the EU Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS). The EU ETS will contribute two-thirds of the overall emission reductions the EU intends to achieve by 2020. The volume of MtCO₂e traded more than doubled between 2008 from 3.1 Billion tCO₂e to 6.3 Billion tCO₂e (representing 73% of the total global carbon market in 2009) while the value increased from \$100.5 billion to 118.5 billion.⁹
- 124 CDM is one of the topics covered in the international climate negotiations. Each of the past five UN climate negotiation meetings passed some decisions to guide the CDM EB on how to improve CDM for higher transparency, more balanced regional distribution, better governance, as well as higher environmental integrity. In the mean time, various proposals have been submitted by countries and experts on how to reform CDM beyond 2012. A study prepared by the Center for European Policy Studies (CEPS) summarized four of such proposals: 1) Reformed CDM. Program of Activities (PoAs): registering a set of activities of the same type under one umbrella. 2) Reformed JI. JI must deal with administrative and organizational issues as well as technical issues such as baseline setting. 3) Sectoral crediting. A sectoral crediting mechanism credits emissions reductions from a covered sector against a threshold well below the 'business as usual' scenario. 4) Sectoral trading. Sectoral trading is a cap-and-trade scheme applied to a whole sector or a subsector within a country.¹⁰

⁸ Report - EU action against climate change: leading global action to 2020 and beyond, European Commission, 2009 edition

⁹ State and trends of the Carbon Market, World Bank Institute, May 2010

¹⁰ Policy paper - Flexible Mechanisms to Support a New Climate Change Regime: The CDM and Beyond, Center for European Policy Studies (CEPS), November 2009

- 125 In addition to the nine domestic barriers already identified in the “Status of CDM in Egypt study mentioned earlier, the rapid developments in the global climate change mitigation measures are posing a major threat to the continuation of activities of the APU.”
- 126 The APU has achieved substantial success in increasing awareness of climate changes issues, promoting the CDM mechanism, and generating high demand for CDM projects. However, the barriers are still very high to reach the registration phase with the UNFCCC, for most of the developed Project Information Notes (PINs).
- 127 During the design phase of the JP, expanding the CDM market in Egypt was an attractive objective and was worth pursuing. The results achieved so far in increasing awareness of the CDM mechanism are impressive. However, the CDM mechanism has reached its peak in 2008 and is declining sharply since then.
- 128 At output level, there is a low probability to register most of the PINs in the pipeline by the end of the JP. The time required for projects to reach registration rose significantly, from 373 days in 2007 to 572 days in 2009, the window of 2008 - 2012 to achieve Kyoto Protocol targets is closing soon, there are a fewer opportunities remaining to trade CERs using CDM mechanism beyond 2012; the total value of the primary CDM market in 2009 fell to US\$2.7 billion, 59% less than the US\$6.5 billion transacted in 2008, in addition to falling prices per ton CO₂ of about 21% from an average of \$16.1 in 2008 to an average of \$12.7 in 2009.¹¹
- 129 At outcome level, the potential is very low to get any project to the implementation phase before the end of the JP, which is the second deliverable under output 1.2.
- 130 The total budget for output 1.2 is \$1,200 thousands over 3 years (\$ 350 thousands managed by UNEP, \$500 thousands by UNIDO and \$350 thousands by UNDP). Until end May 2010, the estimated total amounts disbursed represented approx. 22% of the total budget over 3 years.
- 131 The CDM component cannot just continue implementing activities listed on the Annual Work Plan ignoring internal barriers and the dynamic external environment of climate change mitigation mechanisms.
- 132 The challenges facing the CDM component, creates an unparalleled opportunity to mitigate the risks of uncertainty of the carbon market post 2012.

Recommendations

- 133 A work group could be formed from the agencies implementing the CDM component and other stakeholders to review the Results Framework in the remaining period of the JP with assistance from experts in the field. (UNEP is well positioned to make a significant contribution)
- 134 The work group will assess current and future mechanisms for reducing GHGs using carbon trading schemes. The work group will submit assessment of different mechanisms, including CDM, to the PMC with a recommendation to expand the scope of the APU to other mechanisms, in addition to the CDM, if it is still feasible to continue activities under the CDM mechanism.
- 135 The workgroup should also recommend alternatives to sustain the APU activities after the end of the JP.

¹¹ State and trends of the Carbon Market, World Bank Institute, May 2010

7.2 Outcome 2: Enhanced capacity to adapt to climate change

7.2.1 Output 2.1: Adaptation strategies and practices integrated into climate sensitive development policies, plans, and Programmes

- 136 There are 5 deliverables under output 2.1. Those are: Adaptation needs and gaps for climate resilient Integrated Coastal Zone Management assessed and identified; Adaptation needs and gaps for Integrated Water Resources assessed and identified; Climate risk management measures integrated into UN development Programmes and operations; a communication strategy on climate change prepared and implemented; and Adaptation needs and gaps for agriculture assessed and identified. Those 5 deliverables are not directly related. Therefore they are analyzed separately.

Adaptation needs and gaps for climate resilient Integrated Coastal Zone Management assessed and identified - **Ongoing**

Findings

- 137 A study on the needs and gaps to adapt to Sea Level Rise (SLR) risks has been prepared jointly by the Stockholm Environment Institute, Alexandria University, and the Coastal Research Institute (CoRI) of the National Water Research Centre (NWRC).¹²
- 138 Based on this document, a project proposal entitled “Adaptation to Climate Change in the Nile Delta through Integrated Coastal Zone Management” has been submitted to the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) for \$4 Million financing through the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF). The project has been endorsed in August, 2009 and will be implemented through cooperation of UNDP-Egypt and the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation. A parallel co-funding of \$12 Million has been availed by the Ministry through Shore Protection Authority (SPA) for this project.
- 139 The 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 (i) strengthening the regulatory framework and institutional capacity for Integrated Coastal Zone management as a framework for climate change adaptation; (ii) implementing innovative and environmentally friendly measures that facilitate/promote adaptation in the Nile Delta.

Conclusions

- 140 This deliverable is managed by UNDP. The deliverable has been fully achieved. A GEF funded project was approved and has started to implement recommendations identified by the completed study.
- 141 The estimated budget to complete this deliverable in 3 years is \$35 thousands managed by UNDP. Although the deliverable is complete, no funds have been disbursed until end May 2010.

Adaptation needs and gaps for Integrated Water Resources assessed and identified - **Ongoing**

Findings

¹² Climate Change Risks to Coastal Development and Adaptation Options in the Nile Delta, January 2010

- 142 A report was completed in November 2009 on “Assessing Existing Water Resources Policies”. The report identified challenges facing Egypt under different scenarios using Global Climate Models (GCM). The report concluded that the range of projections of change in both precipitation and river runoff tends to be wide with no consensus even on the direction of change.¹³
- 143 The report recommended implementing Regional Circulation Model (RCM) to refine the scenarios of forecasting level of flow of water in the Nile River.

Conclusions

- 144 This deliverable is managed by UNDP. This deliverable has been fully achieved in November 2009.
- 145 The estimated budget to complete this deliverable in 3 years is \$30 thousands managed by UNDP. Although the deliverable is complete, no funds have been disbursed until end May 2010.
- 146 It is mentioned in the progress report of 2nd semester 2009 that the consultant was hired through UNESCO.

Climate risk management measures integrated into UN development Programmes and operations - Achieved

Findings

- 147 Assessing and identifying climate risk management measures to UN development Programmes and operations and developing guidelines to reduce climate change impact on UN Projects. UNDP indicated that this study was carried out jointly with other UNDP funded projects and was completed in the first quarter of the JP.

Conclusions

- 148 This deliverable is managed by UNDP. The deliverable is complete.
- 149 The total budget for this deliverable over 3 years is \$10 thousands managed by UNDP. Until end May 2010, the total amount disbursed represents 53% of the total budget.

A communication strategy on climate change prepared and implemented - Ongoing

Findings

- 150 A documentary is being prepared to increase awareness of climate change

Conclusions

- 151 This deliverable is managed by UNDP. This activity is ongoing and is implemented jointly with other projects implemented by UNDP related to environment.
- 152 The total budget for this deliverable is \$36 thousands over 3 years. Until end May 2010, The estimated total amount disbursed represent 48% of the total budget by UNDP

Adaptation needs and gaps for agriculture assessed and identified – Ongoing

¹³ Assessing Existing Water Resources Policies, November 2009

Findings

- 153 Six Studies have been completed funded by FAO such as: macro-economic analysis for the cost of climate change, climate change impacts on food security, Identifying uncertainties, cost/benefits, risks, opportunities for potential adaptation measures. (*See Annex 6 for a complete list of studies completed by MALR,*).
- 154 Four more studies are ongoing

Conclusions

- 155 This deliverable is managed by MALR/ARC and is supported by FAO.
- 156 It is clear that this deliverable has no relation to the previous four deliverables under Output 2.1
- 157 The completed studies and reports are valuable for research purposes. However, the quality of the reports formats, contents, conclusions and recommendations need further work to make them useable.
- 158 This valuable research need to inform policy decisions and strategies of adaptation in the agriculture sector. It is not clear how the last two activities planned under this output will take place to turn the studies into policies and strategies
- 159 The total budget for this deliverable over 3 years is \$187 thousands managed by FAO. The total estimated funds disbursed until end May 2010 represents approx. 56% of the total budget.

Recommendations

- 160 It is planned to hire an international consultant to analyze the results of the studies carried out under component 2.2.2, deliverable 5 “Optimal use of on-farm water resources”. It is recommended to hire a consultant to perform the same function under this output.
- 161 This deliverable does belong under output 2.1. The studies carried out under the two outputs (2.1 and 2.2.2) are interrelated and could be analyzed together.

7.2.2 Output 2.2: Pilot measures implemented and scaled up in support of adaptation mainstreaming and policymaking

- 162 There are two sub-outputs under Output 2.2. Those are Output 2.2.1: Adaptation of water resources sector and Output 2.2.2: Adaptation of Agriculture Sector.

7.2.3 Output 2.2.1: Adaptation of water resources sector

- 163 There are 3 deliverables under output 2.2.1. Those are: RCM for the River Nile completed; RCM outputs used in formulating national adaptation water management scenarios; and Links established with the NBI

RCM for the River Nile completed – Ongoing**Findings**

- 164 UNEP-DHI developed the Regional Circulation Model (RCM) for the River Nile Basin in collaboration with the Hadley Centre of the UK Met Office as the owner of the highly recognized Global Circulation Models (GCM).

- 165 The Nile Forecast Centre of the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation has been equipped to enable it to run the RCM. At the moment, five runs have been completed. Work is ongoing to review the GCM boundary conditions to evaluation of the RCM according to historic conditions to ensure the RCM can correctly predict historic conditions to ensure that the future conditions are forecasted as accurately as possible.
- 166 UK Met Office held a five-day training for the engineers in the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation in Cairo on the run of the RCM and development of climate change scenarios. The software was provided to the Ministry. The training was attended by 13 participants from the planning sector, the Environment and Climate Research Institute, and the Nile Water Sector during the period 28 June to 2 July, 2009
- 167 Building Climatic Information Database and Constructing climate scenarios using the RCM, Running the Nile Forecast System (NFS) is ongoing

Conclusions

- 168 This deliverable is managed by MWRI and is supported by UNEP.
- 169 The RCM is already installed and operational at MWRI. There are technical issues that are being discussed among different partners. The deliverable is nearly complete.
- 170 The total budget for this deliverable over three years is \$374 thousands managed by UNEP. The total amount disbursed until end May 2010 represented 25% of the total budget.

RCM outputs used in formulating national adaptation water management scenarios – Ongoing

Findings

- 171 Assessing existing water resources policies, Assessing Climate Change adaptation needs and gaps in Water Resources Sector is complete
- 172 Using the output of adopted RCM to develop National Water Resources strategies. Developing/Assessing water resources adaptation strategies. Integrating adaptation strategies into water resources policies is ongoing

Conclusions

- 173 This deliverable is managed by MWRI and is supported by UNESCO
- 174 Training activities performed under this deliverable will follow on developing climate change related strategies which will be held in September 2010.
- 175 Activities planned to use the outputs of different scenarios to formulate a national water resources strategies needs further elaboration.
- 176 The total budget for this deliverable over three years is \$403 thousands managed by UNESCO. The total amount disbursed until end May 2010 represented 16% of the total budget

Recommendations

- 177 Transforming the outputs from the RCM model into policies and strategies is a challenging task. It involves other stakeholders outside the MWRI.
- 178 Forming a work group to draft a revised Results Framework for completing this deliverable.

Links established with the NBI

Findings

- 179 No activities have been performed under this deliverable.

Conclusions

- 180 There are difficulties facing the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) countries in reaching a framework agreement that would include all the countries.

Recommendations

- 181 Form a work group of the two UN agencies and other stakeholders to revise this deliverable and reallocate budget

7.2.4 Output 2.2.2: Adaptation of Agriculture Sector

- 182 There are 4 deliverables under output 2.2.2. Those are: Field crops stress-tolerant varieties developed; Knowledge on crop-stress varieties disseminated; Optimal cropping pattern formulated under climate change conditions; and Optimal use of on-farm water resources.

Field crops stress-tolerant varieties developed - **Ongoing**

Findings

- 183 Collecting historical data of weather conditions, soil and water resources of the locations of the study, identifying and selecting crop tolerant varieties is complete
- 184 Conducting two seasons' field studies to evaluate the selected varieties under the three locations conditions, with different treatments of heat, water and salinity stresses. Analyzing the results of crops field-studies is ongoing

Conclusions

- 185 This deliverable is managed by MALR and is supported by IFAD. Most of the activities under this deliverable are complete.
- 186 Analyzing the results of the studies is planned to start in the second half of 2010
- 187 The total budget for this deliverable over three years is \$237 thousands managed by IFAD. The total amount disbursed until end May 2010 represented 48% of the total budget

Knowledge on crop-stress varieties disseminated - **Ongoing**

Findings

- 188 Developing a communication strategy including identification of a suitable channel means of communication and information dissemination. Implement the communication strategy including holding workshops, training programs and field visits is planned

Conclusions

- 189 This deliverable is managed by MALR and is supported by IFAD. Activities under this deliverable are dependent on previous deliverables

- 190 The total budget for this deliverable over three years is \$90 thousands managed by IFAD. The total amount disbursed until end May 2010 represented 49% of the total budget

Recommendations

- 191 Transforming the outputs from the stress tolerant studies into a communication strategy is a challenging task. It involves other stakeholders outside the MALR.
- 192 Forming a work group to draft a revised Results Framework for completing this deliverable.

Optimal cropping pattern formulated under climate change conditions - Ongoing

Findings

- 193 Identifying the current major crop patterns from historical agricultural statistics; Identifying the key parameters and forces driving the annual changes in crop pattern, and studying the trend of change in cultivated area by using remote sensing techniques is complete.
- 194 Preparing the data sets of future climate conditions by using GCM and/ or RCM future climate data sets, preparing the data sets required to crop simulation mode, and conducting simulation experiments is ongoing.

Conclusions

- 195 This deliverable is managed by MALR and is supported by IFAD. Activities under this deliverable are dependent on previous deliverables
- 196 The total budget for this deliverable over three years is \$140 thousands managed by IFAD. The total amount disbursed until end May 2010 represented 31% of the total budget

Recommendations

- 197 So far, there has been limited coordination between activities performed in MWRI and activities performed in MALR
- 198 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 policies and strategies of water resources and agriculture jointly.

Optimal use of on-farm water resources - Ongoing

- 199 Identifying three pilot locations in Nile Delta, Middle Egypt and Upper Egypt to represent different agriculture regions/systems in Egypt, Collecting the data and information, and prepare the data sets required for simulation experiments, and Specifying Deficit Irrigation (DI) management levels and recommendations that could be applied under different agricultural systems in Egypt are complete
- 200 Conducting a two seasons- field studies to investigate the impact of Deficit Irrigation (DI) treatments, analyzing the results of crop field-studies, and Developing guidelines book of for the application of Deficit Irrigation (DI) and other water-stress related practices for producing major field crops under Egyptian conditions is ongoing

Conclusions

- 201 This deliverable is managed by MALR and is supported by FAO. Most of the studies performed under this deliverable are complete. Analyzing the results of those studies will take place by the end of 2010 using an international consultant.
- 202 The total budget for this deliverable over three years is \$164 thousands managed by FAO. The total amount disbursed until end May 2010 represented 58% of the total budget

8 Advocacy and Communications

- 203 Under the advocacy and communication component, a website was prepared and four events took place to raise awareness on climate change.
- 204 An Inception Workshop took place on 5 May, 2009 to discuss the issue of climate change in Egypt and the importance of implementing mitigation efforts as well as to understand the adaptation needs. The workshop was opened by the Egyptian Minister of State for the Environmental Affairs, the Spanish Ambassador to Egypt, and the United Nations Resident Coordinator in Egypt. There was active participation from the audience, 150 in total, who also provided many comments and feedback on the Programme.
- 205 The JP participated in the international climate change conference that was organized by the GEF Evaluation Office in Alexandria Library in May 2009. The JP activities were presented in a special plenary session among selected initiatives focused on the climate change activities in Egypt.
- 206 The Resident Coordinator outlined the Programme objectives during the Egypt Climate Change conference organized by the American Chamber of commerce and UNDP and sponsored by the private sector. Al-Gore former Vice President of the US was the keynote speaker.
- 207 An innovative Transformational Leadership Training was applied for the first time to climate change mitigation and adaptation issues, The training targeted middle management officials within ministries and other national institutions with the aim of creating a cadre of climate change leaders similar to a previous successful initiatives directed towards religious leaders in Arab States to engage them in the fight against AIDS. The three-day training was instructed by Dr. Monica Sharma, Director, Leadership and Capacity Development, UNDP and was attended by 40 participants including representatives from the four UN agencies. The participants acknowledged the added value of the training and there are currently some negotiations to also do the training for other national entities.

9 Conclusions and Recommendations

9.1 JP Design

9.1.1 Conclusions

- 208 The CCRM JP started in October 2008. The inception phase was completed in May 2009. The implementation of activities started in June 2009. The design of the CCRM JP was innovative to address climate change issues. The implementation strategy set up adequate structures to manage the 4 components. Substantial progress on implementation of activities is taking place until May 2010.

- 209 The JP design served to start the Climate Change Risk Management Joint Program. The design grouped some related and unrelated activities under one umbrella based on the assumption that progressive elaboration of activities could take place along the way during implementation. This is a common approach to emergency situations and to tackling unprecedented problems. “Climate Change” falls into those two categories. An immediate action was required but it was unknown in which direction and what the impact of this action will be?
- 210 The JP design has served this purpose so far and achieved intended and unintended results that were not foreseen before the inception of the JP.
- 211 The activities performed under the mitigation outcome have generated awareness and interest from different stakeholders at top government level, production and service sectors and funding agencies.
- 212 The activities performed under the adaptation outcome have led to significant results already like starting a project to adapt to Sea Level Rise (SLR) funded by the GEF and the GoE and the implementation of a Regional Circulation Model (RCM) at the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation (MWRI) that could lead to developing policies and strategies to deal with different scenarios of the Nile River flow.
- 213 The design of Outcome 2 “Enhanced capacity to adapt to Climate Change” need to be streamlined. Outcome 2 consists of two outputs: Output 2.1 “Adaptation strategies and practices integrated into climate sensitive development policies, plans, and Programmes”, and Output 2.2 “Pilot measures implemented and scaled up in support of adaptation mainstreaming and policymaking”.
- 214 There are five unrelated deliverables under Output 2.1:
- Adaptation needs and gaps for climate resilient Integrated **Coastal Zone** Management assessed and identified (**UNDP, MWRI/CoRI,**)
 - Adaptation needs and gaps for Integrated **Water Resources** assessed and identified (**UNDP, UNESCO, MWRI**)
 - Climate risk management measures integrated into **UN development Programmes** and operations (**UNDP, MESA/EEAA**)
 - A **communication strategy** on climate change prepared and implemented (**UNDP, MESA/EEAA**)
 - Adaptation needs and gaps for **agriculture** assessed and identified (**FAO, MALR/ARC/CLAC, FCRI**)
- 215 There are three ministries, five governmental agencies and three UN agencies involved in delivering this output. It is not clear why the last deliverable supported by FAO is grouped with the previous four deliverables, all supported by UNDP, Especially that there is another output under outcome 2 managed by MALR and supported by FAO (Output 2.2.2).
- 216 A critical missing component in the design of the JP is building capacity for “Risk Management”.
- 217 The Project Management Institute (PMI) has acknowledged the significance of risk management unique expertise and has designated a professional credential to individuals with expert level skills, knowledge and experience in risk management, PMI-RMP.¹⁴

¹⁴ <http://www.pmi.org/CareerDevelopment/Pages/AboutCredentialsPMI-RMP.aspx>

9.1.2 Recommendations

- 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.
- 219 It is recommended to streamline the RFW of the JP to enhance the delivery of results at output and outcome levels. The following is an illustrative RFW.
- JP PMT
 - Outcome 1: GHG Mitigation
 - Output 1.1 GHG Mitigation National Policy
 - Deliverable 1.1.1 Support SEC
 - Activity 1.1.1.1 Develop policy papers
 - Task 1.1.1.1.1
 - Activity 1.1.1.2 Develop implementation strategies
 - Output 1.2 Build Risk Management (RM) capacity
 - Deliverable 1.2.1 Develop a national Climate Change Risk Management (CCRM) policy
 - Deliverable 1.2.2 Create a CCRM Unit (TBD where)
 - Deliverable 1.2.3 Build capacity of CCRM service providers
 - Deliverable 1.2.4 Support establishing RM units at relevant gov agencies
 - Output 1.2 Promote Carbon Trading schemes
 - Deliverable 1.2.1 Promote CDM
 - Deliverable 1.2.2 Promote other CT schemes
 - Outcome 2: CC adaptation
 - Output 2.1 Water Resources Adaptation
 - Deliverable 2.1.1 establish RM unit in coordination with Deliverable 1.2.4
 - Deliverable 2.1.2 promote development of adaptation policies
 - Deliverable 2.1.3 promote development of implementation strategies
 - Output 2.2 Agriculture Adaptation

- Deliverable 2.2.1 establish RM unit in coordination with Deliverable 1.2.4
 - Outcome 3: Promote CC initiatives
 - Output 3.1: Develop a communication strategy
 - Output 3.2: Nile Basin Initiative?
 - Outcome 4: JP Project Management
- 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.)
- 221 Reviewing the scope of each component will be based on progress in implementing activities achieved so far, d 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
- 222 The Revised RFW is suggested to be completed by 1 October 2010 to allow enough time for implementation. It needs further refinement in the work groups.
- 223 It is recommended that each deliverable is managed by one UN agencies to streamline communication with counterparts
- 224 The design of outputs should consist of groups of relevant deliverables only. There is still a room for innovative initiatives that will be progressively elaborated and assessed over time under Outcome 3.
- 225 There are opportunities for synergies at outcome level between SEC and CDM components and between adaptation to Water Resources and Agriculture components. Those opportunities need to be exploited when revising the RFW.
- 226 It is recommended to recruit a facilitator to support the process of streamlining the Results Framework and provide training on Results Based Management.
- 227 A request for extension to MDG-F global steering committee is highly advisable to realize expected results at output and outcome levels

9.2 Program Management

9.2.1 Conclusions

- 228 The JP design did not take into consideration the five phases of the Project Life Cycle (initiation, planning, implementation, monitoring, and closing). The JP document grouped all the phases into one, implementation phase.
- 229 The roles and responsibilities of different partners were not clearly defined before the start of the JP

- 230 Most of the participants in the implementation of the Joint Program are not familiar with the UN system of implementing programs. It was found out that the terminology of outcome, output, indicators, etc are difficult to deal with and it was not explained.
- 231 The time required to complete planning phase was not taken into consideration in the JP implementation time. The roles and responsibilities for the Planning phase of the JP were not well defined in the JP document.
- 232 Performing activities to develop a Project Management Plan was not factored in while preparing the JP document.

9.2.2 Recommendations

- 233 The design of the program should clearly define the five phases of a program life cycle.
- 234 Roles and responsibilities for implementing each phase should be clearly defined
- 235 Resources required to carry out each phase should be clearly defined (time, budget, staff, consultants, equipment, supplies, communication, transportation, etc.)
- 236 A Project Management Plan is an indispensable tool for managing complex projects and should be considered when designing Joint Programs
- 237 Orientation/training should be planned and provided throughout the project to project teams to familiarize them with the UN system and to provide necessary tools/templates/formats/guidelines to carry out their tasks.

10 Annexes

10.1 Annex 1: Terms of Reference (ToR) – As approved by the JP Reference Group

Draft TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION for the CLIMATE CHANGE RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

General Context: The MDGF Environment and Climate Change Thematic Window

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDGF supports countries in their progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other development goals by funding innovative programmes that have an impact on the population and potential for duplication.

The MDGF operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 128 joint programmes in 50 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs.

The Environment and Climate Change thematic window aims to contribute to a reduction in poverty and vulnerability in eligible countries by supporting interventions that improve environmental management and service provision at the national and local levels, as well as increasing access to new funding mechanisms and expanding the ability to adapt to climate change.

The Window includes 17 joint programmes that encompass a wide range of subjects and results. Nevertheless, certain similar underlying characteristics can be identified across most of these joint programmes. The majority of the programmes in the window seek to contribute to three types of result: making the environment, natural resource management and action against climate change a mainstream focus in all public policy; improving national capacities to plan and implement concrete actions in favour of the environment; and assessing and improving national capacities to adapt to climate change.

The joint programmes within this thematic window serve a variety of participants¹⁵, ranging from national governments to local populations. All joint programmes include a support component directed at national and local governments. Other beneficiaries include civil society, communities and citizens.

THE PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES:

¹⁵ It refers to what previously was refereed as beneficiaries

The Climate Change Risk Management Programme (CCRMP) is a national cross-cutting programme implemented across multiple ministries and sectors, targeting both adaptation and mitigation. The funds were transferred to the HQs of UN Participating Agencies on the 15th of October 2008. The JP Manager started on 1st December 2008.

For mitigation, it will assist in policies to help mitigate Egypt's contribution to emissions by providing an enabling environment and incentive schemes to promote financing of renewable energy and energy efficiency initiatives as well as taking advantage of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). For adaptation, the programme will assist in providing tools to make strategic decisions to strengthen the institutional capacity to develop and to implement national strategies in the water resources, agricultural, and other sectors.

This programme aims to contribute to MDG Goal # 7: Ensure environmental sustainability by mainstreaming GHG mitigation and CDM into National Policy and Expanding Access to Finance Frameworks and Enhanced capacity to adapt to climate change.

THE PROGRAMME OUTCOMES:

1. Mainstreaming GHG Mitigation and CDM into National Policy and Expanding Access to Finance Frameworks
2. Enhanced capacity to adapt to climate change

As of April 2010, the programme is in the 18th month of implementation, out of 36 planned months.

PROGRAMME COMPONENTS

The programme consists of four components, each of which with an outcome that responds to either mitigation or adaptation. In each component, one or more UN organization coordinates its cooperation with one of the national partners towards the achievement of specific goals. The four components are:

A. Supreme Energy Council (SEC) Component:

The Cabinet of Ministers collaborates with the UNDP and UNEP to allocate consulting expertise to support the SEC's energy policy objectives in the renewable energy and energy efficiency areas.

B. Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Component:

The Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA) in the Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs liaises with UNEP, UNDP, and UNIDO to promote the utilization of the Clean Development Mechanism as a tool to make environmental projects financially feasible.

C. Forecasting & Integrated Water Resources Management Component:

The Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation (MWRI) collaborates with UNEP and UNDP to develop a Regional Circulation Model that will forecast impact of climate change on precipitation in the Nile Basin, and collaborates with UNESCO to adapt the existing hydrological models to forecast climate change impact on Nile River flows to Egypt. The component will also address the inclusion of Climate Change scenarios in national Integrated Water Resources Management plans. In addition, an assessment will be carried out for potential sea water rise adaptation mechanisms in Coastal Zones at risk.

D. Vulnerability & Adaptation of the Agricultural Sector Component:

The Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR) collaborates with IFAD and FAO to develop stress tolerant crops, to identify optional cropping patterns, to optimize the use of potentially less water resources and increased temperature, and to disseminate information in response to the climate change risks.

Estimated Human Resources:

	Number	Type
National Consultants	4	Joint Programme
	1	SEC Operation
	5	CDM Operation
	1	MWRI Operation
	10	MALR Operation
International Consultants	1	CDM Operation
	3	MWRI Operation
	1	MALR Operation

The programme's first year work plan has changed during the inception phase to better design the programme according to the advice of experts, especially those of the CDM component, and recommendations were provided on the practical implementation steps needed. The second year workplan was presented to the MDG-F in December 2009 for transfer of funds, and was later revised in March 2010 to reflect the unused budget of 2009 in 2010.

2. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION

One of the roles of the Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDGF. This role is fulfilled in line with the instructions contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund. These documents stipulate that all joint programmes lasting longer than two years will be subject to an mid-term evaluation.

Mid-term evaluations are highly formative in nature and seek **improved implementation of the programmes during their second phase of implementation. They also seek and generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned** that could be transferred to other programmes. As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation will be addressed to its main users: the Programme Management Committee, the National Steering Committee and the Secretariat of the Fund.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC GOALS

The mid-term evaluation will use an expedited process to carry out a systematic, fast-paced analysis of the design, process and results or results trends of the **joint programme**, based on the scope and

criteria included in these terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period of approximately three months.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this mid-term evaluation is the joint programme, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This mid-term evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. To discover the programme's **design quality and internal coherence** (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the **Millennium Development Goals**, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
2. To understand how the joint programme **operates** and assess the **efficiency of its management model** in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the **One UN** framework.
3. To identify the programme's **degree of effectiveness** among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the **Environment and Climate Change thematic window**, and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS AND CRITERIA

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

Design level

- **Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies of associates and donors.**
 - a) Is the identification of the problem and its causes in the joint programme being addressed? (Environmental and human)
 - b) Does the joint programme address the problem's most salient, urgent and prioritized causes? Does it address the environmental and socio-economic needs of the population in the areas of involvement? Does it reflect the role of the Programme in solving problems and meeting identified needs?
 - c) Is the strategy adapted to the socio-cultural context to which it is applied?
 - d) Are the monitoring indicators relevant? Are they of sufficient quality to measure the joint programme's outputs and outcomes?
 - e) To what extent has the MDGF Secretariat contributed to improving the quality of the formulation of joint programmes?
- **Ownership in the design: national social actors' effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions**

- a) To what extent do the joint programme's goals and lines of action reflect national and regional plans and programmes, identified needs (environmental and human) and the operational context of national policy?
- b) To what degree have national and local authorities and social actors been taken into consideration in designing the development intervention?

Process level

- Efficiency: The extent to which the resources/inputs (funds, time etc.) have been turned into results

- a) How well does the joint programme's management model – that is, its tools, financial resources, human resources, technical resources, organizational structure, information flows and management decision-making – contribute to generating the expected outputs and outcomes?
- b) To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other and with the government and civil society?
- c) Are there efficient mechanisms for coordination that prevent counterparts and beneficiaries from becoming overloaded?
- d) Does the pace of implementing programme outputs ensure the completeness of the joint programme's results?
- e) Are work methodologies, financial tools etc. shared among agencies and among joint programmes?
- f) Have the most efficient measures for the context been adopted to solve the environmental issue?

- Ownership in the process: National social actors' effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions

- g) To what extent have the target participants taken ownership of the programme, assuming an active role in it?
- h) To what extent have national public/private resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme's goals and impacts?

Results level

- Efficacy: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been met or are expected to be met, taking into account their relative importance.

- i) Is the programme making progress towards achieving the stipulated results?
 - a. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?
 - b. To what extent is the programme contributing to the goals set by the thematic window, and in what ways?
- j) Is the stipulated timeline of outputs being met?
- k) Do the outputs produced meet the required quality?
- l) Is the programme providing coverage to participants as planned?
- m) What factors are contributing to progress or delay in achieving outputs and outcomes?
- n) To what extent has the programme contributed innovative measures towards solving the problems?

- o) Have any success stories been identified, or examples that could be transferred to other contexts?
- p) To what extent have the behaviours causing the environmental problem been transformed?
- q) To what extent has the joint programme contributed to putting environmental problems on the country's policy agenda?
- r) What differential impacts and types of effect is the joint programme producing among population groups, such as youth, children, and adolescents, the elderly, indigenous communities and rural populations?

Sustainability: The probability that the benefits of the intervention will continue in the long term.

- a) Are the necessary preconditions being created to ensure the sustainability of the impacts of the joint programme?
 - i. At the local level: are local knowledge, experiences, resources and local networks being adopted?
 - ii. At the country level: have networks or network institutions been created or strengthened to carry out the roles that the joint programme is performing?
 - iii. Is the joint programme's duration sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project the sustainability of the interventions into the future?
- b) To what extent are the visions and actions of partners consistent with or different from those of the joint programme?
- c) In what ways can governance of the joint programme be improved so as to increase the chances of achieving sustainability in the future?

Country level

- d) During the analysis of the evaluation, what lessons have been learned, and what best practices can be transferred to other programmes or countries?
- e) To what extent and in what way is the joint programme contributing to progress towards the Millennium Development Goals in the country?
- f) To what extent and in which ways are the joint programmes helping make progress towards United Nations reform? One UN
- g) How have the principles for aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, managing for development results and mutual accountability) been developed in the joint programmes?
- h) To what extent is the joint programme helping to influence the country's public policy framework?

5. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The mid-term evaluations will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as annual reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form opinions. Consultants are also expected to use interviews as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the desk study report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at a minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the Secretariat of the MDGF:

✧ **Inception Report** (to be submitted within seven days of the submission of all programme documentation to the consultant)

This report will be 5 to 10 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose an initial theory of change to the joint programme that will be used for comparative purposes during the evaluation and will serve as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation managers.

✧ **Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 10 days of completion of the field visit)

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be shared with evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions.

✧ **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within seven days of receipt of the draft final report with comments)

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. This report will contain the following sections at a minimum:

1. Cover Page
2. Introduction
 - Background, goal and methodological approach
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Methodology used in the evaluation
 - Constraints and limitations on the study conducted
3. Description of interventions carried out
 - - Initial concept
 - - Detailed description of its development: description of the hypothesis of change in the programme.
4. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions
5. Conclusions and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear)

6. Recommendations

7. Annexes

7. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The mid-term evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.
- **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the MDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDGF in these terms of reference.
- **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

8. ROLES OF ACTORS IN THE EVALUATION

The main actors in the interim evaluation process are the Secretariat of the MDGF, the management team of the joint programme and the Programme Management Committee that could be expanded to accommodate additional relevant stakeholders. This group of institutions and individuals will serve as the evaluation reference group. The role of the evaluation reference group will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design.
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation.

- Providing input on the evaluation planning documents,(Work Plan and Communication, Dissemination and Improvement Plan).
- Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference.
- Facilitating the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods.
- Monitoring the quality of the process and the documents and reports that are generated, so as to enrich these with their input and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention.
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.

The Secretariat of the MDGF shall promote and manage Joint Programme mid-term evaluation in its role as proponent of the evaluation, fulfilling the mandate to conduct and finance the joint programme evaluation. As manager of the evaluation, the Secretariat will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation process is conducted as stipulated, promoting and leading the evaluation design; coordinating and monitoring progress and development in the evaluation study and the quality of the process. It shall also support the country in the main task of disseminating evaluation findings and recommendations.

9. TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

A. Design phase (15 days total)

1. Each of the Secretariat's portfolios managers shall send the generic TOR for the window in question to the specific country where the evaluation takes place. These are then to be adapted to the concrete situation of the joint programme in that country, using the lowest common denominator that is shared by all, for purposes of data aggregation and the provision of evidence for the rest of the MDGF levels of analysis (country, thematic window and MDGF).

This activity requires a dialogue between the Secretariat and the reference group of the evaluation (the body that comments on and reviews but does not interfere with the independent evaluation process). This dialogue should be aimed at rounding out and modifying some of the questions and dimensions of the study that the generic TOR do not cover, or which are inadequate or irrelevant to the joint programme.

2. The TOR will be sent to the MDG-F Secretariat consultant.
3. From this point on, each programme officer is responsible for managing the execution of the evaluation, with three main functions: to facilitate the work of the consultant, to serve as interlocutor between the parties (consultant, joint programme team in the country, etc.), and to review the deliverables that are produced.

B. Execution phase of the evaluation study (55-58 days total)

Desk study (15 days total)

1. Briefing with the consultant **(1 day)**. A checklist of activities and documents to review will be submitted, and the evaluation process will be explained. Discussion will take place over what the evaluation should entail.
2. Review of documents according to the standard list (see TOR annexes; programme document, financial, monitoring reports etc.).
3. Submission of the inception report including the findings from the document review specifying how the evaluation will be conducted. The inception report is sent and shared with the evaluation reference group for comments and suggestions (**within seven days of delivery of all programme documentation to the consultant**).
4. The focal person for the evaluation (joint programme coordinator, resident coordinator office, etc) and the consultant prepare and agenda to conduct the field visit of the evaluation. (Interview with programme participants, stakeholders, focus groups, etc) (**Within seven days of delivery of the desk study report**).

Field visit (9-12 days)

1. The consultant will travel to the country to observe and contrast the preliminary conclusions reached through the study of the document revision. The planned agenda will be carried out. To accomplish this, the Secretariat's programme officer may need to facilitate the consultant's visit by means of phone calls and emails, making sure there is a focal person in the country who is his/her natural interlocutor by default.
2. The consultant will be responsible for conducting a debriefing with the key actors he or she has interacted with.

Final Report (31 days total)

1. The consultant will deliver a draft final report, which the Secretariat's programme officer shall be responsible for sharing with the evaluation reference group (**within 10 days of the completion of the field visit**).
2. The evaluation reference group may ask that data or facts that it believes are incorrect be changed, as long as it provides data or evidence that supports its request. The evaluator will have the final say over whether to accept or reject such changes. For the sake of evaluation quality, the Secretariat's programme officer can and should intervene so that erroneous data, and opinions based on erroneous data or not based on evidence, are changed (**within seven days of delivery of the draft final report**).
The evaluation reference group may also comment on the value judgements contained in the evaluation, but these may not affect the evaluator's freedom to express the conclusions and recommendations he or she deems appropriate, based on the evidence and criteria established.
3. The Secretariat's programme officer shall assess the quality of the evaluation reports presented using the criteria stipulated in the annex to this evaluation strategy (**within seven days of delivery of the draft final report**).
4. On the completion of input from the reference group, the evaluator shall decide which input to incorporate and which to omit. The Secretariat's programme officer shall review the final copy of the report, and this phase will conclude with the delivery of this report

to the evaluation reference group in the country **(within seven days of delivery of the draft final report with comments).**

C. Phase of incorporating recommendations and improvement plan (within seven days of delivery of the final report):

1. The Secretariat's programme officer, as representative of the Secretariat, shall engage in a dialogue with the joint programme managers to establish an improvement plan that includes recommendations from the evaluation.
2. The Secretariat's programme officer will hold a dialogue with the point person for the evaluation to develop a simple plan to disseminate and report the results to the various interested parties.

10. ANNEXES

a) Document Review

MDG-F Context

- MDGF Framework Document
- Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- General thematic indicators
- M&E strategy
- Communication and Advocacy Strategy
- MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

Specific Joint Programme Documents

Overall Joint Programme

- Joint Programme Document
- Inception Report (August 2009)
- Year 2 work plan (Revised March 2010)
- 2008 Narrative Progress Report
- 2009 Narrative Progress Report (April 2010)
- July – December 2009 Monitoring Report (February 2010)
- Report on Leadership Training (2009)
- Quarterly reports (2008/12/31, 2009/3/31, 2009/6/30, 2009/9/30, 2010/3/31)
- Mini-monitoring reports (2009/6/30)

CDM Component

- CDM Status Study in Egypt
- Training report on estimating GHG emissions in Industry
- Training on estimating GHG emissions in Waste Sector
- Training on Opportunities in Cement Sector
- Training on Opportunities in Fertilizer Sector

MWRI Component

- Climate Change Risks to Coastal Development and Adaptation Options in the Nile Delta
- Assessing Existing Water Resources Policies
- Assessing the impact of Climate Change on the water resources in the Nile Basin using a RCM ensemble (2009)

MALR Component

- Assess and identify the adaptation needs and gaps for agriculture
- Identifying the STAKEHOLDERS GROUPS
- Identifying the PILOT LOCATIONS of the study, representing different agriculture systems in Egypt
- Collecting HISTORICAL DATA of weather conditions, SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES of the locations of the study
- Identify the key parameters and FORCES DRIVING the annual changes in CROP PATTERN
- Identify the current major CROP PATTERN from historical agricultural statistics.
- Study the trend of change in cultivated area by using REMOTE SENSING techniques.
- Final Report of the MALR Training Program

Other in-country documents or information

- http://www.oecd.org/infobycountry/0,3380,en_2649_3236398_1_70390_1_1_1,00.html ; on Paris Declaration for Aid Effectiveness
- <http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=87> ; MDG reports for Egypt 2002 and 2005.
- <http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=7> ; UN Delivering as One

c) File for the Joint Programme Improvement Plan









After the interim evaluation is complete, the phase of incorporating its recommendations shall begin. This file is to be used as the basis for establishing an improvement plan for the joint programme, which will bring together all the recommendations, actions to be carried out by programme management.

Evaluation Recommendation No. 1				
Response from the Joint Programme Management				
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up	
1.1			Comments	Status
1.2				
1.3				
Evaluation Recommendation No. 2				
Response from the Joint Programme Management				
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up	
2.1			Comments	Status
2.2				
2.3				
Evaluation Recommendation No. 3				
Response from the Joint Programme Management				

Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up	
3.1			Comments	Status
3.2				
3.3				

DRAFT

Evaluation Phase	Activities	Who	Duration	Starts	Ends
Design	Establish the evaluation reference group	Evaluation focal point	15 days	Thu 04/01	Thu 04/29
Design	TOR adapted and sent to the Secretariat and documents inputs for inception report	Eval Reference group	15 days	Thu 04/01	Thu 04/29
Implementation	Briefing with the consultant	Secretariat	1 days	Fri 04/30	Fri 04/30
Implementation	Desk review and delivery of inception report to the Secretariat	Consultant	7 days	Mon 05/03	Tues 05/11
Implementation	Discussion of the inception report and inputs from the Reference Group	Eval Reference group	7 days	Wed 05/12	Fri 05/21
Implementation	Agenda drafted and agreed between the consultant and the joint programme focal point	Focal point/consultant	7 days	Wed 05/12	Fri 05/21
Implementation	Mission: field visit	Consultant/reference group	9-12 days	Sun 06/06	Fri 06/18
Implementation	Delivery of the final report draft to the Secretariat	Consultant	10 days		

Implementation	Review of final report draft by the Secretariat and send to reference group	Secretariat	3 days		
Implementation	Discussion and contributions from the reference group to the final report draft	Eval Reference group	7 days		
Implementation	Delivery of the final report to the Secretariat and the Reference Group	Consultant	7 days		
Dissemination/ Improvement	Dissemination and Improvement plan designed	Reference group/Secretariat	7 days		

10.2 Annex 2: List of documents reviewed

CCRM EG, SEC. (2010, June 13). *Mid-term Progress Report* .

CCRM EG, CDM. (2010, June). *Mid-term Progress Report* .

CCRM EG. (2010, May 31). *Y2 Annual Workplan (Rev.1) as of 31 May 2010*.

CCRM EG. (2010, February 04). *Monitoring Report*.

CCRM EG. (2009). *Programme Progress Update until 30 Nov 2009*.

CCRM EG. (2009, October 14). *Color-Coded Modified Year 1 Work plan (from Inception Report) Period: October 15, 2008 – October 14, 2009*.

CCRM EG. (2009, July 31). *Mini Monitoring Report*.

CCRM EG. (2009, May). *Inception Report*.

CCRM EG. (2009, April 09). *2008 Joint Programme Progress Report*.

CCRM EG. (2009, March 31). *Programme 2nd Quarterly Progress Update*.

CCRM EG. (2009, February 2). *2nd Semester - Monitoring Report*.

CCRM EG, Integral Consult. (2009, February). *CDM Status Study In Egypt*.

CCRM EG. (2008, December 31). *Programme Quarterly Progress Update*.

CCRM EG. (2008). *Annex A – Workplan – color coded*.

CCRM EG. (2009). *Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report (Jan - Dec, 09)*.

Center for European Policy Studies (CEPS). (2009 , November). *Flexible Mechanisms to Support a New Climate Change Regime: The CDM and Beyond*.

Ibrahim Elshinnawy, Mohamed Borhan, Mohamed ElRaey, Bill Dougherty, Amanda Fencel, *Climate Change Risks to Coastal Development and Adaptation Options in the Nile Delta*, . (2010, January).

Climate Policy Institute. (2010, April 1). *The role of CDM post-2012*.

DAC. (2002). *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. OECD/DAC.

Egypt Second National Communication, . (2010, May).

European Commission. (2009). *EU action against climate change: leading global action to 2020 and beyond*, .

- European Environment Agency (EEA). (2010). *Annual European Union greenhouse gas inventor*.
- FAO, EG JP. (2010, June). *Assessment of Climate change impacts on food security*. ARC, CLAC.
- FAO, EG JP. (2010, May). *Training, Identification of agro-ecosystems , From 21 to 28 May, 2010*, ICARDA,. Aleppo, Syria.
- FAO, EG JP. (2010, March). *Identifying three pilot locations: Specifying Deficit Irrigation (DI) management levels*. ARC, FCRI.
- FAO, EG JP. (2010, March). *Project Study on Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation of Agriculture Sector in Egypt*., ARC, CLAC, Dr. Mohamed Abdrabbo, Dr. Alaa Abdelraouf.
- FAO, EG JP. (2010, February). *Identification of spatial distribution of risk and vulnerability of agriculture system in Egypt*. ARC, CLAC.
- FAO, EG JP. (2009, December). *Agricultural policies*. ARC, Universidad Politecnica de Madrid, Spain, Ana Iglesias.
- FAO, EG JP. (2009, December). *The Impacts of Climate Change on Plant Diseases, and Pests in Egypt*. ARC, Dr. Mohamed Ali Fahim.
- FAO, EG JP. (2009, November). *Final Report of the Training*. ARC, CLAC.
- FAO, EG JP. (2009, November). *Agricultural macro-economic analysis*. ARC, Dr. Bahaa El-Din Mohamed Morsy.
- FAO, EG JP. (2009, October). *Description of Agro-ecological Ecosystems of the Egyptian Agriculture*.
- FAO, EG JP. (2009, July). *Boosting participatory opportunities to promote business based on sustainable use of forest resources*.
- FAO, EG JP. (n.d.). *Conducting a two season field studies to investigate the Impact of Deficit irrigation Treatments*.
- IFAD, EG JP. (2010, April). *Identifying the Pilot Location of the study representing different Agriculture systems in Egypt*. Dr. Mohamed A. M. Ibrahim.
- IFAD, EG JP. (2010, February). *Study the trend of change in cultivated area by using Remote Sensing techniques*.
- IFAD, EG JP. (2010, January). *Factors and driving forces of change in cropping pattern during 1952 – 2008*. ARC, Dr. Bahaa El Din Mohamed Mursy.
- IFAD, EG JP. (2009). *Crop pattern and forces driving*. ARC, CLAC.
- IFAD, EG JP. (2009). *Identifying major field crops: Identifying and selecting crop tolerant varieties*., ARC, FCRI, CLAC.

- IFAD, EG JP. (2009). *Identifying the stakeholders*. ARC, AEI, CLAC.
- IFAD, EG JP. (2009). *Study the trend of change in cultivated area by using Remote Sensing techniques*. ARC, CLAC.
- IFAD, EG JP. (n.d.). *Conducting two seasons' field studies to evaluate the selected varieties*. FCRI.
- IFAD. (2009). *Study the trend of change in cultivated area by using Remote Sensing techniques*. ARC, CLAC.
- MDG-F Secretariat. (2010, February 09). *Egypt/Environment feedback*.
- MDG-F Secretariat. (2009, June). *Implementation Guidelines for MDG Achievement Fund Joint Programmes*.
- MDG-F Secretariat. (2008, April 24). *Revised Standard Joint Programme Document*.
- MDG-F Secretariat. (2007, August 1). *MDG-F Framework document*.
- MDG-F Secretariat. (n.d.). *Advocacy & Partnerships: Guidance Note for Elaborating Advocacy Action Plans*.
- MDG-F Secretariat. (n.d.). *MDG-F ADVOCACY & COMMUNICATION STRATEGY*.
- MDG-F Secretariat. (n.d.). *Monitoring & Evaluation system: learning to improve*.
- MDG-F Secretariat. (n.d.). *TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF Joint ProgrammeS ON ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE*.
- PMC, CCRM EG. (2010, April 22). *Minutes of Meeting - 7th meeting*.
- PMC, CCRM EG. (2010, January 13). *Minutes of Meeting - 6th meeting*.
- PMC, CCRM EG. (2009, October 14). *Minutes of Meeting - 5th meeting*.
- PMC, CCRM EG. (2009, June 07). *Minutes of Meeting - 4th meeting*.
- PMC, CCRM EG. (2009, March 26). *Minutes of Meeting - 3rd meeting*.
- PMC, CCRM EG. (2009, February 04). *Minutes of Meeting - 2nd meeting*.
- PMC, CCRM EG. (2008, December 21). *Minutes of Meeting - 1st meeting*.
- PMI. (2008). *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide) - Fourth Edition*,.
- The Journal of Environment & Development. (2009). *The Evolution of the CDM in a Post-2012 Climate Agreement*.
- UNEG. (2005, April). *Standards for Evaluation in the UN System*.

UK Met, DHI Water, MWRI EG. (2009). *Assessing the impacts of climate change on the water resources in the Nile Basin using a regional.*

UNEP Riso Center, CD4CDM. (2008). *A Reformed CDM: new Mechanisms for Sustainable Development.*

UNESCO, CCRM EG, Dr. Bayoumi Attia. (2009, November). *Assessing Existing Water Resources Policies.*

World Bank Institute. (2010, May). *State and trends of the Carbon Market.*

DRAFT

10.3 Annex 3: Field Visit schedule

Proposed Tentative Midterm Review Field Visit

(Revised June 13, 2010)

Day	Date	Time	Purpose	Attendees	Location
1	Sun, June 6	10:00-12:00	Discuss Programme with JP manager and PM team	Eng. ElAgizy, S Taha	JPMU, Maadi
		12:00-2:00	Meeting with CDM component Manager and Operational Focal Point & Meeting with EPAP II (WB) Manager	Eng.Hegazy, Eng. Ahmed Medhat, A. Khalil, A. Abdel Rasoul, M. Waheed, A. Bahaa	EEAA, Maadi, 5th Floor
		2:00-3:00	Meeting with CDM consultant	Dr. Amr Osama	EEAA, Maadi
		3:00-4:00	Meeting with CDM Local consultant	Dr. Khaled ElFarra	EEAA, Maadi
2	Mon, June 7	9:30-10:30	Sinai Cement	Dr. Helmy Kamel	EEAA, Maadi, 3rd Flr,
		10:30-11:30	ELNG	Eng. Yasser Fathy	EEAA, Maadi, 3rd Flr
		11:30 – 1:00	Meeting with Climate Change Unit	Hesham Eissa	EEAA, Maadi, 5th Flr.Mobile 010.606.2635
		1:00-1:30	Discuss Programme with GEF Coordinator	Ms. Yasmine Fouad	EEAA, Maadi, 7th Flr. Dr. Mostafa ElHakim Office
3	Tues, June 8	9:00 -9:30*	Discuss Programme with UNRC and UNDP Head	Mr. James Rawley, Mr. Mounir Tabet, Dr. Mohamed Bayoumi	World Trade Center, Korniche El Nile, Boulak
		9:30-10:30	Discuss Programme with the UNDP	Dr. Mohamed Bayoumi	World Trade Center, Korniche El Nile, Boulak
		11:00-1:00 (rescheduled fo 3:00pm)	Discuss Programme with SEC component	Ms. Amira Khalifa, Eng. Emad Hassan, Eng. Sahar	Maglass el Wozaraa, 1 Magles El Shaab, Kasr El Einy, 3rd Flr.
		1:30-3:00	Meeting with UNIDO	Lucia Cartini	2 Latin America Str., Garden City, 4th Flr.

					Min. of Trade Bldg
		3:00-4:30	Discuss Programme with SEC component	Ms. Amira Khalifa, Eng. Emad Hassan, Eng. Sahar	Maglass el Wozaraa, 1 Magles El Shaab, Kasr El Einy, 3rd Flr.
4	Wed, June 9	10:00-11:00	Teleconference with UNEP	Mr. Jyoti P.Painuly	Phn: +45 46775167
		2:00-4:00	Meeting regarding water resources	Dr. Bayoumi Attia	MWRI, Korniche El Nile Imbaba, 5th Flr
5	Thu, June 10	9:00-11:30	Discuss Programme with MWRI component	Dr. Moteleb, Dr. ElShamy, Dr. Fahmy, Dr. Akram Ganzouri	MWRI, Imbaba
		12:00-1:00 (Firm. Has appt at 1:00)	Discuss Programme with EEAA and JPM	Dr. Mawaheb Abu ElAzm, Eng. Mona ElAgizy	Cairo House, El Fostat
		2:00-3:30	Discuss Programme with UNESCO	Dr. Zaki (Mobile: 0106581138), Dr. Tarek Shawky	8 Abdel Rahman Fahmy Street, Garden City
6	Sat, June 12	11:00-12:00	Discussion with Coastal Research Institute	Dr. Frihy, Dr. Ibrahim ElShinnawy, 0165229132	15 Faraana Street, ElShallalat, Alexandria
		12:00-1:00	Discuss program with Coastal Zone Mgmt. Project Manager	Dr. Mohamed Borhan 010.122.5140	15 Faraana Street, ElShallalat, Alexandria
7	Sun, Jun 13	9:00-12:00	Discuss Programme with MALR component	Dr. Ayman Abu Hadid, Dr. Mosaad Kotb	6 Michael Bakhoom, behind Shooting Club, 6th gate, 1st floor. Dokki
		1:00-2:00	Meeting with FAO	Dr. Mohamed El-Ansary	11 El Eslah El Zeraii Str., next to Agricultural Museum 5th Flr. Dokki
		3:00-4:00	Meeting with IFAD	Dr. Mohamed El-Eraky	World Trade Cntr
		4:00-5:00	(Civil Society)	Dr. El Raey 0123109051 or 0113109051	UNDP, Dr. Mohamed Bayoumi's office
		5:00-7:00	Discuss Programme with the UNDP	Dr. Mohamed Bayoumi	UNDP

8	Mon, June 14	7:00-3:00	Field Visit to Kafr El Sheikh	Dr. Mosaad Kotb	Departure Meeting location TBD - Kafr El Sheikh
9	Tues, June 15	(anytime from 9:00am till 3:00pm)	Discuss Programme	Eng. Maysoun Nabil	Mobile: 010.529.5717
		TBC	Discuss Programme	Dr. Mohamed Bayoumi	World Trade Center, Corniche El Nil, Boulak
10	Wed, June 16	10:00-12:00	NSC and PMC meeting	All	EEAA Maadi, 6th Floor meeting room

Proposed Midterm Schedule for week 3

(Revised June 20, 2010)

Day	Date	Time	Purpose	Attendees	Location
11	Sat, June 19	10 am – 1 pm	MALR Component Meeting	Kotb, ElAnsary, ElEraky,	MALR, CLAC
12	Mon, June 21	11:15-12:15	Discuss Programme with Embassy of Spain	Luis Torres, José Lorenzo García-Baltasar	Embassy of Spain in Cairo 21, El-Maahad El Swissry St.; Zamalek; TEL.. (+ 2 02) 2 735 03 53 / 55; Mobile: (+2) 010 57 56 073
		1pm-2pm	SEC Component Meeting	E. Hassan, Sahar, M. Bayoumi, ElAgizy	Maglass El Wozaraa
13	Tues, June 22	11am-2pm	MWRI Component meeting	ElShamy, M.M. Ali, Akum, A. Fahmy, M. Bayoumi, M. Zaki, ElAgizy	MWRI HQ
		4-7pm	CDM Component meeting	A.Medhat, M. Bayoumi, L. Cartini, ElAgizy	EEAA, Maadi
14	Wed, June 23	12:15-1:15	Meeting with UNDP (tbc)	M. Bayoumi, ElAgizy	CCRMP office

15	Thu, June 24	10 am-12	NSC / PMC meeting (confirmed)	All	EEAA, Maadi
----	--------------	----------	-------------------------------	-----	-------------

DRAFT

10.4 Annex 4: List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and site visits

Sun, June 6		
Eng. Mona ElAgizy	Programme Manager	JPMU, Maadi
Ms. Sherine Taha	Admin, Awareness and Financial Assistant	JPMU, Maadi
Sun, June 6		
10:00-12:00		
Eng. Ahmed Hegazy	EPAP II & PPSI Projects Director	EEAA, Maadi
Eng. Ahmed Medhat	Operational Manager	EEAA, Maadi
Eng. Ahmed Mohamed Khalil	Technical Specialist	EEAA, Maadi
Eng. Ahmed Mohamed Abdel Rasoul	Technical Specialist	EEAA, Maadi
Eng. Ahmed Bahaa El-Din Mohamed	Technical Specialist	EEAA, Maadi
Mr. Mahmoud Waheed	Financial Manager	EEAA, Maadi
Sun, June 6		
12:00-2:00		
Dr. Amr Osama	CDM Consultant, President	Integral Environmental Solutions, Maadi
Sun, June 6		
2:00-3:00		
Dr. Khaled ElFarra	CDM Consultant, General Manager	TARSHEED, Nasr City
Mon, June 7		
3:00-4:00		
Dr. Helmy Kamel	CDM Beneficiary, Board Member	Sinai White Portland Cement Co.
Eng. Ihab Farouk	CDM Beneficiary, Env. & Quality	Sinai White Portland Cement Co.
Mon, June 7		
9:30-10:30		
Eng. Nael Atta	CDM Beneficiary, Environment Affair Manager	Suez Steel Co.
Mon, June 7		
10:30-11:30		
Eng. Hesham Eissa	Supervisor, Central Dept. of CDM	EEAA, Maadi
Dr. Essam Ahamed	Consultant, Central Dept. of CDM	EEAA, Maadi
Mon, June 7		
11:30 – 1:00		
Ms. Yasmine Fouad	Project Manager & Head of GEF Unit	SMRES, Maadi

Tues, June 8	9:00 -9:30	
Mr. James Rawley	Resident Coordinator	UNDP, Cairo
Dr. Mohamed Bayoumi	Environment Specialist , Assistant Resident Representative	UNDP, Cairo
Tues, June 8	9:30-10:30	
Dr. Mohamed Bayoumi	Environment Specialist Assistant Resident Representative	UNDP, Cairo
Tues, June 8	1:30-3:00	
Ms. Lucia Cartini	Deputy Representative	UNIDO, Cairo
Tues, June 8	3:00-4:30	
Ms. Amira Khalifa,	Advisor to the Secretary - General for International Relations	Council of Ministers
Mr. Emad Hassan	Advisor - The Supreme Council of the Energy	Council of Ministers
Ms. Sahar		Council of Ministers
Wed, June 9	10:00-11:00	
Jyoti P.Painuly		UNEP, Copenhagen by Phone
Wed, June 9	2:00-4:00	
Dr. Bayoumi Attia	Consultant, Minister's Advisor	MWRI
Thu, June 10	9:00-11:30	
Dr. Mohamed Moteleb	Head of the Planning Sector	MWRI
Dr. Akram Ganzouri	Deputy Director	MWRI, ECRI, Cairo
Dr. Mohamed Ezzat Elshamy	Manager of Works	MWRI
Thu, June 10	12:00-1:00	
Dr. Mawaheb Abu ElAzm,	CEO	EEAA, Maadi
Eng. M. ElAgizy	Programme Manager	JPMU, Maadi
Thu, June 10	2:00-3:30	
Dr. Tarek Shawky	Director	UNESCO, Cairo
Dr. A. Zaki	Consultant in Water Science	UNESCO, Cairo
Sat, June 12	11:00-12:00	
Dr. Ibrahim ElShinnawy	Institute Director	CORI, Alexandria

Sat, June 12	12:00-1:00	
Dr. Mohamed Borhan	Project Manager	Adaptation to Climate Change in the Nile Delta, Alexandria
Sun, Jun 13	9:00-12:00	
Dr. Ayman Abu Hadid,	President	ARC, Cairo
Dr. Mosaad Kotb	Director of the Central Lab. For Agric. Climate	ARC, CLAC, Cairo
Sun, Jun 13	1:00-2:00	
Dr. Mohamed El-Ansary	Assistant FAO Representative	FAO, Cairo
Sun, Jun 13	3:00-4:00	
Dr. Mohamed El-Eraky	IFAD Country Presence Officer	IFAD, Cairo
Sun, Jun 13	4:00-5:00	
Dr. M. El Raey	Consultant, Director, Enviroinfo Consultants	ENVIROINFO, Alexandria
Sun, Jun 13	5:00 - 7:00	
Dr. Mohamed Bayoumi	Environment Specialist Assistant Resident Representative	UNDP, Cairo
Mon, June 14	7:00-5:00 (Field Visit to Kafr ElSheikh)	
Dr. Mohamed Abdrabou Ahmed	Researcher	CLAC
Dr. Gamal Mohamed Ali Sarhan	Deputy , ARC Research & Training Center	ARC
Dr. El.Sayed Saad Naeem	Agronomist & Soil Scientist	RRTC
Dr. Abbas Abd El-hay El-Shenawy	Sakha Agric. Research Station, Maize Depart.	Field Crops Research Institute
Dr. Adel Abdel Moaaty El-Kaddi	Head of Rice Research Department	ARC
Dr. Hamada Hussein Abdel Maksoud	Head of El-Gimeazah ARC Research Station	ARC
Dr. Olaa Mokhtar El-Galali	Head of Sakha Research Group	ARC
Dr. Galal Abdel Moniem Mahgoub	Head of Maize Research Department	ARC
Dr. Hany Borhamy	Deputy , Sakha Research Center	ARC
Dr. Mona Ghazy	Researcher	ARC

Sat, June 19

Dr. Mosaad Kotb,	Director of the Central Lab. For Agric. Climate	ARC, CLAC, Cairo
Dr. Samia El-Marsafawy	Seputy Director	ARC, Cairo
Dr. Mohamed Ali Fahim	ARDC	The ARDC President's Office
Dr. M. ElAnsary,	Assistant FAO Representative	FAO, Cairo

Mon, June 21

Mr. José Lorenzo García-Baltasar	Coordinator General de Cooperation	Embassy of Spain, Cairo
Mr. Luis Torres	Programme Manager	Embassy of Spain, Cairo

Mon, June 21

Emad Hassan	Advisor - The Supreme Council of the Energy	EEAA, Maadi
Dr. M. Bayoumi,	Environment Specialist Assistant	UNDP, Cairo
M. ElAgizy	Resident Representative	
	Programme Manager	JPMU, Maadi

Tues, June 22

Dr. A. Ganzouri	Deputy Director	ECRI, Cairo
Dr. M. ElShamy,	Manager of Works	MWRI
Dr. M.M. Ali,	Deputy Manager of Works	MWRI
Dr. A. Fahmy		MWRI
Dr. M. Bayoumi,	Environment Specialist Assistant	UNDP, Cairo
	Resident Representative	
Dr. M. Zaki,	Consultant in Water Science	UNESCO, Cairo
Eng. M. ElAgizy	Programme Manager	JPMU, Maadi

Tues, June 22

Eng. A. Medhat,	Operational Manager	EEAA, Maadi
Dr. M. Bayoumi.	Environment Specialist Assistant	UNDP, Cairo
	Resident Representative	
M. ElAgizy	Programme Manager	JPMU, Maadi
Shantanu Roy	Int'l Consultant	EEAA, Maadi

Wed, June 23

Dr. M. Bayoumi,	Environment Specialist Assistant	UNDP, Cairo
	Resident Representative	

Eng. M. ElAgizy

Programme Manager

JPMU, Maadi

Thu, June 24

10 am-12

All

NSC/PMC meeting

EEAA, Maadi

DRAFT

10.5 Annex 5: Procurement Procedures ¹⁶

FAO: Funds will be managed according to FAO Execution rules and financial regulations.

UNDP: Funds are transferred from UNDP HQ to UNDP-Egypt. Funds are applied to the project activities and transferred to the relevant partners according to UNDP National Execution Modality rules and regulations.

UNEP: UNEP's Division of Technology, Industry and Environment (DTIE) will manage the funds in accordance with UNEP's financial rules and regulations. Accountable advances will be transferred to the selected partners in this joint Programme following the designated modalities outlined in the agreements and/or subcontracts with UNEP.

UNESCO: Funds are transferred from UNESCO HQ to UNESCO Office Cairo. UNESCO Cairo Office implements the activities of the project through contracts with the contractors, mainly: national and international consultants, specialized institutions and consultancy firms. UNESCO Cairo, in joint collaboration with the national counterparts, prepares the TOR of the contracts. Selection of contractors is undertaken according to UNESCO rules and regulation. Payments of contracts are effected upon submission of the contract deliverables and implementation of the needed activities as agreed upon in the contracts. Final payments are effected upon completion of all contract activities.

UNIDO: Funds are transferred from UNIDO HQ to UNIDO Office Cairo, which will manage and pay to the relevant national and local partners under contracts according to UNIDO financial rules and regulations.

IFAD: Funds are transferred from IFAD HQ to MALR. Hence, IFAD standard disbursement conditions for the recipient include:

Initial payment:

1. Opening of a grant account for the MDG Fund
2. Submission of AWP&B;
3. Submission of authenticated specimen signatories of person or persons authorized to sign the withdrawal applications;

Successive payments:

4. Submission of Statement of Expenditures with respect to the use of up to 75% of the initial/advanced payment;
5. Submission of progress report

Final payment (IFAD normally withholds 5% of the total amount) to be released only after the Programme completion date and upon receipt satisfactorily of the following:

6. Final Statement of Expenditures;
7. Audit report; and
8. Programme Completion Report.

¹⁶ Annual programme narrative progress report (Jan – Dec, 09)

10.6 Annex 6: List of studies prepared by Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR)/ Agriculture Research Center (ARC)

FAO. (June 2010). *Assessment of Climate change impacts on food security*. ARC, CLAC.

FAO. (May 2010). *Training, Identification of agro-ecosystems , From 21 to 28 May, 2010, ICARDA, . Aleppo, Syria.*

IFAD. (April 2010). *Identifying the Pilot Location of the study representing different Agriculture systems in Egypt*. Dr. Mohamed A. M. Ibrahim.

FAO. (March 2010). *Project Study on Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation of Agriculture Sector in Egypt, . ARC, CLAC, Dr. Mohamed Abdrabbo, Dr. Alaa Abdelraouf.*

FAO. (March 2010). *Identifying three pilot locations: Specifying Deficit Irrigation (DI) management levels*. ARC, FCRI.

IFAD. (February 2010). *Study the trend of change in cultivated area by using Remote Sensing techniques*.

FAO. (February 2010). *Identification of spatial distribution of risk and vulnerability of agriculture system in Egypt*. ARC, CLAC.

IFAD. (January 2010). *Factors and driving forces of change in cropping pattern during 1952 – 2008*. ARC, Dr. Bahaa El Din Mohamed Mursy.

FAO. (December 2009). *The Impacts of Climate Change on Plant Diseases, and Pests in Egypt*. ARC, Dr. Mohamed Ali Fahim.

FAO. (December 2009). *Agricultural policies*. ARC, Universidad Politecnica de Madrid, Spain, Ana Iglesias.

FAO. (November 2009). *Final Report of the Training*. ARC, CLAC.

FAO. (November 2009). *Agricultural macro-economic analysis*. ARC, Dr. Bahaa El-Din Mohamed Morsy.

FAO. (October 2009). *Description of Agro-ecological Ecosystems of the Egyptian Agriculture*.

FAO. (October 2009). *Description of Agro-ecological Ecosystems of the Egyptian Agriculture*.

IFAD. *Conducting two seasons' field studies to evaluate the selected varieties*. FCRI.

IFAD. (2009). *Study the trend of change in cultivated area by using Remote Sensing techniques*. ARC, CLAC.

IFAD. (2009). *Study the trend of change in cultivated area by using Remote Sensing techniques*. ARC, CLAC.

IFAD. (2009). *Identifying the stakeholders*. ARC, AEI, CLAC.

IFAD. (2009). *Identifying major field crops: Identifying and selecting crop tolerant varieties*,. ARC, FCRI, CLAC.

IFAD. (2009). *Crop pattern and forces driving*. ARC, CLAC.

FAO. *Conducting a two season field studies to investigate the Impact of Deficit irrigation Treatments*,. ARC, FCRI.

DRAFT

10.7 Annex 7: Analysis of Progress of CCRM until May 2010

A summary is provided on the next two pages. For more details an Excel file is attached: (18 Pages)

DRAFT

Analysis of Progress of CCRM until May 2010

(US\$)

WBS ID	Level	Description	UN	Gov	Y1	Actual Y1	Y2	Actual Y2	Y3	TTL Budget	TTL actual	Progress %	Remaining	Remaining %
	0	TTL JP			1,135,377	720,124	1,747,799	417,116	1,116,824	4,000,000	1,137,240	28%	2,862,760	72%
	1	Outcome 1+2			983,100	607,027	1,488,457	358,657	892,491	3,364,048	965,684	29%	2,398,364	71%
	1	JP Management			78,000	65,986	145,000	31,171	151,270	374,270	97,157	26%	277,113	74%
	1	Agency Management Support			74,277	47,111	114,342	27,288	73,063	261,682	74,399	28%	187,283	72%
1	1	Mainstreaming GHG Mitigation and CDM into National Policy and Expanding Access to Finance Frameworks			351,067	154,438	698,709	179,101	500,563	1,550,339	333,539	22%	1,216,800	78%
1.1	2	<i>National Policy Reform for a more sustainable energy economy achieved</i>	UNDP UNEP	COM	108,070	37,185	146,478	18,484	95,371	349,919	55,669	16%	294,250	84%
1.2	2	<i>Expanded CDM Market</i>	UNEP, UNIDO, UNDP	EEAA	242,997	117,254	552,231	160,617	405,192	1,200,420	277,870	23%	922,550	77%
2	1	Enhanced capacity to adapt to climate change			700,850	495,080	893,940	204,662	454,402	2,049,192	699,743	34%	1,349,450	66%

2.1	2	Adaptation strategies and practices integrated into climate sensitive development policies, plans, and Programmes	UNDP FAO	MWRI EEAA MALR	82,390	52,327	156,220	85,600	79,990	318,600	137,927	43%	180,673	57%
2.2	2	Pilot measures implemented and scaled up in support of adaptation mainstreaming and policymaking	UNEP	MWRI	618,460	442,753	737,720	119,062	374,412	1,730,592	561,815	32%	1,168,777	68%
2.2.1	3	Adaptation of water resources sector	UNEP UNESCO UNDP	MWRI NBI	274,990	159,566	480,920	11,203	174,403	930,313	170,769	18%	759,544	82%
2.2.2	3	Adaptation of Agriculture Sector			343,470	283,187	256,800	107,859	200,010	800,280	391,046	49%	409,233	51%
3	1	JP Management			83,460	70,605	155,150	33,353	161,859	400,469	103,958	26%	296,511	74%