



1. Project Data

Project ID P113794	Project Name 1W-Strategic Action Plan for Red Sea II	
Country Middle East and North Africa	Practice Area(Lead) Environment, Natural Resources & the Blue Economy	
L/C/TF Number(s) TF-14701	Closing Date (Original) 31-Jan-2018	Total Project Cost (USD) 3,000,000.00
Bank Approval Date 29-Aug-2013	Closing Date (Actual) 31-Dec-2018	
	IBRD/IDA (USD)	Grants (USD)
Original Commitment	3,000,000.00	3,000,000.00
Revised Commitment	3,000,000.00	3,000,000.00
Actual	3,000,000.00	3,000,000.00

Prepared by Ranga Rajan Krishnamani	Reviewed by John R. Eriksson	ICR Review Coordinator Christopher David Nelson	Group IEGSD (Unit 4)
--	--	---	--------------------------------

2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives

The Project Development Objective (PDO) as stated in the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Grant Agreement (Schedule 1, page 5) and the Project Appraisal Document (PAD, page 6);

"To improve management of marine resources in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (RSGA) in selected Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) building on resource protection and incentive systems for



communities and the harmonization of the knowledge base of marine resources among the Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (PERSGA) member countries."

The revised PDO as stated in the amendment to the Grant Agreement of October 13,2016:

"To improve management of selected MPAs by local communities and strengthen information sharing between PERSGA member countries."

In view of the changes in the PDOs, the IEG Review is based on a split rating of objectives, when 40% of the GEF Grant was disbursed before restructuring and after restructuring when the balance 60% was disbursed.

b. Were the project objectives/key associated outcome targets revised during implementation?

Yes

Did the Board approve the revised objectives/key associated outcome targets?

Yes

Date of Board Approval

16-Sep-2016

c. Will a split evaluation be undertaken?

Yes

d. Components

This was second phase of the GEF regional project for implementing the strategic plan for RSGA in PERSGA countries (Djibouti, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen). The first phase, completed in 2005, developed a platform for regional collaboration for improving the marine environment of RSGA. The second phase aimed at continuing the program through an incentive-based ecosystems approach for managing marine resources and establishing an operational framework for managing the region's MPAs.

1. Strengthening of Marine Management Concept in MPAs. Appraisal estimate of GEF Grant US\$0.75 million. Actual cost US\$0.75 million. This component aimed at strengthening marine management in selected MPAs using ecosystem-based principles. Activities included: (i) technical assistance for strengthening the PERSGA member countries capacity for updating management plans of selected MPAs; (ii) capacity building of member countries to share information and select appropriate marine protection models.



2. Strengthening Coastal Communities. Appraisal estimate of GEF Grant US\$0.80 million. Actual cost US\$0.80 million. This component aimed at strengthening the local communities' capacity to implement alternative livelihood sub-projects for reducing pressure on marine resources.

3. Regional Environmental and Socioeconomic Monitoring Network. Appraisal estimate of GEF Grant US\$1.20 million. Actual cost US\$1.20 million. This component aimed at strengthening the regional environmental and socioeconomic monitoring network through community-based management (including through standardizing parameters, making data comparable across member countries and expanding monitoring to include socio-economic data for MPA communities).

4. Project Management. Appraisal estimate of GEF Grant US\$0.25 million. Actual cost US\$0.25 million. This component aimed at providing project management support in the areas of coordination and monitoring and evaluation.

e. Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates

Project cost. Cost at appraisal US\$18.89 million (including GEF Grant of US\$3.00 million, co-financing from PERSGA member countries of US\$6.00 million and expected parallel finance of US\$9.89 million from the Yemen Fisheries Resource Management and Conservation Project). Actual cost US\$11.53 million (including GEF Grant of US\$3.00 million and Co finance from PERSGA member countries of US\$8.53 million). The ICR provides no information on the extent of parallel financing from the Yemen Fisheries Resource Management Project (ICR, Annex 3, page 59).

Project financing. The project was financed by a GEF Grant of US\$3.00 million. The Grant was fully disbursed. Appraisal estimate of direct co finance by PERSGA member countries, US\$6.00 million. Actual co finance at closure was 42% higher at US\$8.53 million. Appraisal estimate of parallel finance from other donor projects, US\$9.89 million. Actual parallel finance from other donor projects at closure was about three times the appraisal estimates at US\$29.10 million (ICR, Table four, page 18).

Borrower contribution. As indicated above, borrower contribution was provided by PERSGA member countries. Appraisal estimate US\$6.00 million. Actual contribution US\$8.53 million.

Dates. The project was approved on August 29, 2013, became effective on November 4, 2013 and scheduled to close on January 31, 2018. The project closed 11 months behind schedule on December 31, 2018 (see next section).

Other changes. The following changes were made through a Level 1 restructuring on September 16, 2016. (i) The PDOs were revised for clarity (discussed in section 3). (ii) The key outcome and intermediate indicators pertaining to biodiversity protection of MPAs were removed, as none of the project activities specifically aimed at protecting marine biodiversity: (iii) Key indicators were added to monitor performance with regard to improved management of MPAs (discussed in section 10b): and (iv) the number of direct



project beneficiaries was reduced by half (from 3,000 to 1,500), as the original target was deemed to be overly ambitious.

The following changes were made through a Level 2 restructuring on December 1, 2017. The project closing date was extended by 11 months from January 31, 2018 to December 31, 2018 to complete ongoing activities associated with livelihoods subprojects, MPA management plans and environmental and socioeconomic monitoring of activities in Djibouti.

Split rating. As the PDOs were changed, this review is based on a split rating of objectives, when 40% (US\$1.21 million) of the GEF Grant was disbursed before restructuring and after restructuring when 60% (US\$1.79 million) was disbursed.

3. Relevance of Objectives

Rationale

Regional context. The marine ecosystem of the RSGA, is an important natural economic asset for PERSGA countries. Before appraisal, the marine resources of the ecosystem faced threats of over-exploitation, due to a combination of factors, including rapid growth of tourism and industrial center development. Given that the member countries lack of enforcement of their regulations, could impact on other countries' resources, the need for coordination to monitor, manage and protect fragile environmental resources of a shared resource was important in the regional context. The PDO was in line with PERSGA's Joint Regional Strategic Action Plan for RSGA. This plan identified improving governance and management of shared marine resources as a priority for member countries. The PDO was consistent with Goal 14 of the United Nations Sustainable Development overall goal of "conservation and sustainable use of oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development.

Bank regional strategy. The original and revised PDOs were well-aligned with the Bank's commitment to the Global partnership for Oceans launched in 2012, as a new approach to restoring ocean health. The PDOs were relevant to the priorities outlined in the Bank's new 2019 MENA regional strategy titled "*Economic and Social Inclusion for Peace and Stability in MENA: A New Strategy for the World Bank Group*". The Pillar 2 of the strategy highlighted the need for regional cooperation around public goods and sectors. Although there is no explicit mention of ocean health, the Bank's Country Partnership Strategy for Djibouti for 2014-2017, the Country Engagement Note for Yemen for 2017-2018, the Country Partnership Framework (CPF) of Egypt for 2015-2019 and the CPF of Jordan for 2017-2022 highlighted the need for regional cooperation.

GEF strategy. At appraisal, the original PDO was consistent with the 2014-2018 GEF-4 International Waters Focus area strategy of fostering cooperation on priority trans-boundary concerns and catalyzing action to address marine resource concerns. The PDO was consistent with the global priorities of the



current 2018 - 2022 GEF 7 focal area of "*strengthening the blue economy*" aimed at sustaining marine systems and fisheries.

Original and revised PDO. The original PDO, which was identical to the GEO objective, lacked clarity in terms of the intended outcomes and is rated as Substantial. The revised PDO clearly stated that the intended outcomes were aimed at improving management of MPAs and that the local communities were the intended beneficiaries. The revised PDO also stated project focus was on "strengthening information sharing", for sharing a common resource. This revised PDO, unlike the original PDO, was specific, measurable and realistic given the country capacities and policies and the regional context. . The revised PDO is hence rated as High.

Rating

High

4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

OBJECTIVE 1

Objective

To improve management of marine resources in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (RSGA) in selected MPAs building on resource protection and incentive systems for communities

Rationale

Theory of change.

Original and revised PDOs. Capacity building activities aimed at ecosystem-based marine management based on principles of user-rights and supporting alternative livelihoods to relieve pressure on marine resources, were aimed at improving marine management. These activities together with harmonizing monitoring parameters at the regional level, were likely to contribute to sustainable growth of marine habitats in the RSGA. These outcomes were aimed at protection of a shared resource in the region. As indicated in Section 3, the revised PDOs and sub-PDOs (Objectives 1 and 2) were clear in terms of intended outcomes. Given that the nature and scope of the project remained unchanged, the theory of change stated above remained applicable to the revised PDOs.

Outputs. (ICR, pages 13-16).

The selected pilot project activities were in two MPAs (Sudan and Egypt), of the six PERSGA countries. The ICR (paragraph 28) notes that, the Wadi El Gemal- Hemata National Park (WHGNP) in Egypt and Dungonab Bay – Mukkawar Island Marine National Park (DMNP) in Sudan, were identified as the two pilot sites. However, Egypt did not submit the GEF required endorsement letter and withdrew from the project early on. At appraisal, the plan identified Kamran Island MPA in Yemen as a possible MPA site, but this plan was



dropped in the wake of the violent conflict in Yemen, which continues to date. Meanwhile Egypt returned to the project after elections in May 2014 and WHGNP became the second project site.

- Three MPA plans in the two selected MPAs were updated with community input and assigned rights for user groups, based on an agreed zoning scheme, exceeding the target of two plans. The MPA plans were for DMNP in Sudan, the WGHNP in Egypt, and the Integrated Management Plan for Sanganeb and Dugonab National Park in Sudan.
- 1000 people participated in consultation activities during implementation, exceeding the target of 545 participants, of whom 380 were females, exceeding the target of 165.
- Ten alternative livelihood projects in total in Egypt and Sudan, selected on the basis of their potential to benefit the ecosystem, were completed at project closure. This exceeded the target of four. The projects spanned from making pastries, milk production, handicrafts, fishing vessel maintenance, to solar-energy powered water desalination plants. Two other alternative community livelihood projects associated with glass bottom tourist boats were awaiting licenses when the project closed.
- According to the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), scores on MPA management at DMNP and WGHNP, improved by 30% and 32% respectively, between 2015 and 2018. The ICR (page 15) reports that METT is scored on multiple dimensions from community involvement in the planning process, updated zoning demarcations, improved fisheries management and improved monitoring and enforcement. There were no targets for this indicator. According to the information provided subsequently by the team, the METT is one of the most widely used tools to track improvements of protected areas, and by 2016 it had been applied in over 25% of the world's terrestrial protected areas.

Outcomes.

- The management plans of selected MPAs, included updating the zoning demarcations governing fishing practices. The rules pertained to use of nets, the size of the mesh and restricted access for commercial fishing during spawning season. At project closure, 600 fishermen were using the specified mesh size and 500 fishermen were observing the closed season. This exceeded the target of 300 and 200 respectively.
- 200,000 hectares of marine waters in the MPA sites of DMNP in Sudan and the WHGNP in Egypt were under improved management, when the project closed. This represented a 500% increase relative to the target of 40,000 hectares.
- 2000 people (in local communities benefitting from sub-projects) benefitted from project activities at closure. This exceeded the target of 1500. 50% of the beneficiaries were women as compared to the target of 30%.

Given that outcomes pertaining to MPA management plans, MPA protected sites and people benefiting from alternative livelihoods were realized in the two selected MPAs, this review concludes that the project significantly contributed to realizing the PDOs.

Rating
Substantial



OBJECTIVE 1 REVISION 1

Revised Objective

To improve management of selected MPAs by local communities.

Revised Rationale

The outputs and outcomes mentioned above were relevant to this objective.

Revised Rating

Substantial

OBJECTIVE 2

Objective

To improve management of marine resources in the RSGA in selected MPAs through harmonizing the knowledge base of marine resources among the (PERSGA) member countries.

Rationale

Outputs (ICR, pages 47-48).

- 66 PERSGA member country staff were trained on monitoring methods using common variables. This exceeded the target of 40.
- 12 regional exchanges on data collection and monitoring results on water quality, fisheries and coral reef habitats, were established at project closure, exceeding the target of ten.
- Marine monitoring data were developed with standardized data on five variables (socioeconomic characteristics, marine litter, coral reef habitats, fisheries and water physical and chemical characteristics) at project closure in five PERSGA countries. This exceeded the revised target of four.
- Knowledge products and "success stories" based on project experience were shared regionally and globally through a project website and a GEF Website.
- PERSGA participated internationally to share knowledge and experiences relating to the project, during the Second Annual Africa Regional Network Meeting in September 2018 in Dakar, Senegal and through conferences in Sri Lanka in May 2016 and Morocco in November 2018.

Outcomes.

- "Standardized Monitoring Protocol Manual" with common monitoring variables and methods approved by PERSGA in June 2018, were adopted by five PERSGA member countries (Egypt, Sudan, Jordan, Djibouti and Saudi Arabia), when the project closed. This exceeded the revised target of four.
- The outcome pertaining to direct project beneficiaries discussed above was also relevant to this objective.



In sum, while it is difficult to assess the extent to which the project contributed to the outcomes, given the complementary activities by other donors, it is reasonable to conclude that the project significantly contributed to realizing the PDOs of strengthening information between PERSGA countries.

Rating

Substantial

OBJECTIVE 2 REVISION 1

Revised Objective

To strengthen information sharing between PERSGA member countries

Revised Rationale

The outputs and outcomes discussed above were relevant to this objective.

Revised Rating

Substantial

OVERALL EFFICACY

Rationale

Given that Outcome Level targets were realized and that the efficacy of each of the revised sub-objectives was rated as Substantial, overall efficacy is rated as Substantial.

Overall Efficacy Rating

Substantial

5. Efficiency



Economic analysis. The GEF interventions were expected to generate global benefits, such as protect marine resources in the MPAs, protect fish stocks from illegal supranational fishing and economic benefits due to alternative livelihood incomes. The PAD (paragraph 47 and 48) notes that a stand-alone economic analysis was not conducted at appraisal as the expected benefits of capacity building activities were not quantifiable and the demand-driven nature of investments in alternative livelihoods could only be determined after the local communities had defined their needs.

An incremental cost analysis was however conducted in lieu of standard economic analysis. The methodology entailed, comparison of the costs and benefits from a baseline scenario (defined as set of activities that were likely to be implemented by the national governments independently of the project ("without GEF scenario"), with a "GEF scenario", that is, global environmental benefits (due to the application of eco-system-based management and regional approach to monitoring). Total expenditures under the baseline scenario was estimated at US\$15.89 million (consisting of US\$6.00 million in co-financing and US\$9.89 million in parallel projects), while the total expenditures under the GEF alternative was estimated at US\$18.89 million. GEF funding was to finance the incremental costs of US\$3.00 million.

The project was able to leverage substantial resources for the project. Direct co-finance provided by PERSGA and national governments were US\$8.53 million, 42% more than planned at appraisal (US\$6.00 million). Parallel finance leveraged from other donor projects, (which probably would not occurred without GEF financing), amounted to US\$37.63 million or more than double than expected at appraisal (US\$15.89 million). The ratio of GEF financing to total financing at project closure was 1:12 as compared to 1:5 at appraisal.

Administrative and operational efficiencies. Although issues associated with securing commitment from local communities contributed to delays, the delays were exacerbated by adverse external factors, such as suspension of activities for Egypt in the initial years and decline in security situation due to the outbreak of violent conflict in Yemen from September 2014. However, all envisioned activities were completed at project closure, with the extension to the closing date of under a year.

In sum, given the amount of co-financing and parallel financing raised, which may not have happened without GEF financing and that the envisioned project activities were completed within the slightly extended project timeframe, despite adverse external shocks, efficiency is rated as substantial.

Efficiency Rating

Substantial

a. If available, enter the Economic Rate of Return (ERR) and/or Financial Rate of Return (FRR) at appraisal and the re-estimated value at evaluation:

	Rate Available?	Point value (%)	*Coverage/Scope (%)
Appraisal		0	0 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
ICR Estimate		0	0 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable



* Refers to percent of total project cost for which ERR/FRR was calculated.

6. Outcome

Original PDOs. The relevance of the original and revised PDO to the PERSGA member countries and to the Bank regional and country assistance strategies is rated as Substantial, as the original PDO lacked clarity, in terms of the intended outcomes. Efficacy of the two original sub-PDOs is rated as Substantial, given that the outcomes were realized. Efficiency is rated as Substantial. Overall outcome before restructuring is rated as Satisfactory.

Revised PDO. The revised PDOs were clear in terms of intended outcomes and is rated as High. Efficacy of the two revised PDOs is rated as substantial, as the outcomes were realized. With substantial efficiency, outcome after restructuring is rated as Satisfactory.

Considering the ratings discussed above, outcome is thus rated as Satisfactory.

a. Outcome Rating

Satisfactory

7. Risk to Development Outcome

Institutional and financial risks. Although the zoning plans of the MPAs were complete at closure, they need to be periodically updated taking into account changes in the living marine environment. It is unclear if the capacity built at the level of local authorities and MPA managers, can be sustained without secure commitment of financial resources. Likewise, it is not clear, if issues relating to data sharing and monitoring can be adequately addressed without secure financial commitment from PERSGA member countries.

Political risk. Given that the marine environment is a trans-boundary matter and protecting the MPAs requires regional commitment, there is a political risk that potential regional benefits from improved management of MPAs could be disrupted due to shifting national priorities. This is particularly so, given that the political situation in countries like Yemen and Sudan remain fragile.

8. Assessment of Bank Performance

a. Quality-at-Entry



This project was prepared based on the experiences of the Phase I project (Strategic Action Program for the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden), completed in 2005. The lessons incorporated at design, included: (i) complementing the Integrated Coastal Zone management concept with support to local communities through alternative livelihoods: (ii) strengthening information sharing through regionally-supported monitoring: (iii) tailoring activities to country-specific conditions, given the different levels of development of the PERSGA member countries: and (iv) simplifying and streamlining project management arrangements by using one implementing agency for GEF funds (as opposed to three in Phase I project) (PAD, pages 8-10). The arrangements made at appraisal for project implementation were appropriate, with the Project Coordination Unit, located in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, responsible for day-to-day implementation, as in the Phase 1 project (PAD, page 11). Several risks were identified at appraisal, including risks associated with the uneven capacities of the PERSGA member countries, risks associated with securing co-financing and political risks in Sudan. Mitigation measures incorporated at design, included piloting demonstration projects in selected countries, securing upfront commitment of co-financing and selecting pilot sites based on local community engagement and other donor activities (PAD, page 15). The arrangements made at appraisal for safeguards and fiduciary compliance were appropriate (discussed in section 10).

There were moderate shortcomings in design. As indicated in section 3, the original PDOs lacked clarity, in terms of intended outcomes. There were shortcomings in M&E design (discussed in section 9a).

Quality-at-Entry Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

b. Quality of supervision

Supervision missions were held regularly, with ten supervision missions over five years. The continuity of leadership was maintained, with two Task Team Leaders over the project lifetime. The team was proactive in exploring new opportunities during implementation and extended the project closing date, in view of the delays during implementation. The team proactively clarified the indicators that were either too broad or vaguely worded following the first restructuring of the project and this provided the adjustment needed to mitigate the effects of shortcomings at design. The team addressed PERSGA's concerns in a timely manner (ICR, paragraph 84). The support provided by the supervision team aided in fiduciary compliance (discussed in section 10).

Quality of Supervision Rating

Satisfactory

Overall Bank Performance Rating



Moderately Satisfactory

9. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization

a. M&E Design

The Project Coordination Unit, in coordination with the National Coordinators (responsible for facilitating activities at the local level), were responsible for M&E (PAD, paragraph 38). The original key outcome indicator "marine areas brought under biodiversity protection" was inappropriate, given that none of the project activities were specifically directed towards biodiversity protection, but rather aimed at improving management of MPAs. This key outcome indicator and intermediate indicators associated with biodiversity protection were dropped and replaced with an indicator measuring the marine area under improvement with the same target value. Likewise, the other key original indicator associated with "harmonized parameters and database for PERSGA member countries" was not defined. This indicator was replaced with an indicator on standardized variables (socioeconomic, ecological, biological, chemical and physical variables) , that was endorsed by the PERSGA member countries.

b. M&E Implementation

The ICR (paragraph 89) reports that implementation of the M&E was subject to delays in the initial years, due to a combination of factors. including delays in appointing an M&E specialist and an unclear results framework at design. This was rectified in 2016, when PERSGA recommended a rigorous restructuring of the M&E framework. The ICR (paragraph 90) notes that PERSGA coordinated the efforts of national specialists to undertake environmental and socio-economic monitoring in PERSGA member countries.

c. M&E Utilization

According to the information provided subsequently by the team, indicators used in the results framework were directly integrated in the general M&E activities at the country level were incorporated in the regional database. The team also clarified that the regional database now has three years of monitoring data and that the data was being used by member countries and PERSGA to understand the state of the marine environment. This data was also to be used for forthcoming Bank-financed regional project.

M&E Quality Rating

Substantial



10. Other Issues

a. Safeguards

The project was classified as a category B project. Three safeguard policies were triggered at appraisal; (1) Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01); (2) Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04); and (3) Involuntary Resettlement.

The PAD (paragraph 74) notes that environmental safeguard policies were triggered, reflecting the potential for some negative environmental impacts associated with activities relating to alternative livelihoods. Safeguards on Natural Habitats was triggered in view of the activities relating to marine habitats and fish stocks (PAD, paragraph 78). Involuntary resettlement safeguards was triggered due to the potential restriction of access for fisheries and other users to new demarcated areas as part of the updating of zoning plans (PAD, paragraph 71). An Environmental and Social Management Framework and an Environmental and Social Management Plan were prepared and publicly-disclosed at appraisal (PAD, paragraph 78). The ICR (paragraph 94) notes that there was safeguards compliance through the implementation period. The ICR (paragraph 95) also reports that PERSGA is applying the same social and environmental safeguards to activities outside the pilot sites and sharing lessons learnt from the project.

b. Fiduciary Compliance

Financial management. An assessment of PERSGA's financial management arrangements conducted at appraisal, concluded that the arrangements were satisfactory. PERSGA had managed a prior GEF Grant and had sufficient capacity for financial management (PAD, paragraph 60). Financial management risk was rated as Moderate at appraisal (PAD, paragraph 62). The ICR (paragraph 96) notes that there were no financial issues during implementation and that project finances were audited regularly by the Bank Procurement Office in Cairo and by the internal audit unit of the World Bank Office in Zagreb and by externally certified consultants. All audits were unqualified.

Procurement management. An assessment of PERSGA's ability to address procurement issues conducted at appraisal (PAD, paragraph 65) concluded that although PERSGA had experience in international projects and had qualified procurement staff with knowledge in Bank procurement procedures, it had limited experience in handling large procurements. Mitigation measures incorporated at design, included training on procurement to the Project Coordination Unit staff and the designated officials of the beneficiary countries. A procurement plan for the first 18 months was prepared. The overall procurement risk was rated as Moderate at appraisal (PAD, paragraph 68). The ICR (paragraph 97) notes that procurement was in accordance with Bank procedures and there were no procurement issues during implementation.



c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)

d. Other

11. Ratings

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
Outcome	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Bank Performance	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	There were moderate shortcomings at Quality-at-Entry.
Quality of M&E	Substantial	Substantial	
Quality of ICR	---	Substantial	

12. Lessons

The ICR draws the following main lessons from the experience of implementing this project, with some adaptation of language.

(1) Regional projects require more time and effort in the startup phase to mobilize different stakeholders and this should be recognized in project design. The experience of this project showed that the startup phase takes longer in a regional project as the coordination effort can be more complex, particularly in view of the differences in implementation capacity across countries.

2). Strong political support and financial support from member countries and a leadership structure is a pre-requisite for regional projects. As a regional entity with a clear mandate, PERSGA was strongly supported by member countries. This was evident during implementation, where member countries (with the exception of Yemen) continued to commit financial resources to the project, elevating co-financing to above expected levels.

(3) A careful consideration of local traditions and capacities is required for effective community-based alternative livelihood projects. The experience of this project showed that developing alternative projects, taking into account locally available technologies, traditions and capacities, contribute to successful completion of livelihood projects.

13. Assessment Recommended?



No

14. Comments on Quality of ICR

The ICR is well-written and candid. It provides a clear rationale for the regional dimensions of the project and candidly discusses the problems during implementation due to the political uncertainty in Egypt and Yemen. It clearly describes the issues with M&E at design and the way these were resolved with the project restructuring. The quality of evidence and analysis is aligned to the messages outlined in the ICR and the ICR contains a reference to the theory of change that helps the reader to understand how the ratings have been reached. The ICR draws reasonably good lessons from the experience of implementing this project and the ratings assigned by the ICR are appropriate in general.

The tables in the text on project cost (page 2, Table Four, page 180 and in Annex Three, page 59) are very confusing. The ICR provides no details on PERSGA countries other than Egypt and Sudan. The ICR is unduly long (at 29 pages, almost twice the recommended length of 15 pages) and could have been better edited.

a. Quality of ICR Rating
Substantial