



1. Project Data

Project ID

P118145

Project Name

GEF:Governance and Knowledge Generation

Country

Middle East and North Africa

Practice Area(Lead)

Environment & Natural Resources

L/C/TF Number(s)

TF-11513

Closing Date (Original)

30-Jun-2015

Total Project Cost (USD)

3,713,300.00

Bank Approval Date

29-Nov-2011

Closing Date (Actual)

30-Oct-2015

	IBRD/IDA (USD)	Grants (USD)
Original Commitment	3,000,000.00	3,000,000.00
Revised Commitment	3,000,000.00	2,568,601.67
Actual	2,568,601.67	2,568,601.67

Prepared by

Ranga Rajan
Krishnamani

Reviewed by

Peter Nigel Freeman

ICR Review Coordinator

Christopher David Nelson

Group

IEGSD (Unit 4)

2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives

The Global Environment Objective (GEO) as stated in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD, page 5) was:

" To foster the integration of environmental issues into sectoral and development policies of the Beneficiaries (Morocco, Lebanon and Tunisia) through the production of innovative knowledge on environmental issues, with specific reference to water related topics (freshwater, coastal, and marine resources), and the organization of trainings during which this knowledge will be used to strengthen the capacity of key stakeholders at a local, national and regional level".

The GEO was used as the basis of assessment as it was more specific.



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

No

c. Will a split evaluation be undertaken?

No

d. Components

The goal of this project was to enhance the delivery and impacts of the multi-donor Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Program (METCAP) program. This program which was launched in 1990 and went through four phases of implementation closed in 2010 covered different themes: integrated water resources management, solid and hazardous waste management, chemical pollution, coastal zone management, urban environmental management, institutional development and capacity building and environmental policy tools. There were three components.

Governance (Appraisal estimate US\$1.50 million. Actual cost at closure US\$1.31 million). This component was aimed at promoting dialogue and coordination among local, national, and regional stakeholders on environmental issues, with specific reference to water-related topics (freshwater, coastal, and marine resources). Activities included training the relevant stakeholders and studies on: (i) a review of the environmental management systems of the beneficiaries; (ii) a review of environmental issues at the sectoral and macroeconomic level of the beneficiaries; (iii) promotion of private sector participation in environmental management; (iv) involvement of local stakeholders in the environmental dialogue; and, (v) regional environmental integration.

Knowledge generation (Appraisal estimate US\$1.26 million. Actual cost at closure US\$0.87 million). This component aimed at producing innovative knowledge on environmental issues. Activities included: (i) training the relevant stakeholders and studies on: (i) preparation of knowledge products on various aspects of environmental vulnerability pertaining to the relevant economic sectors and critical locations at local, national and regional levels; and (ii) dissemination of activities and establishing a project website.

Project Coordination and Management (Appraisal estimate US\$0.24 million. Actual cost at closure US\$0.27 million). This component supported project implementation. Activities included financing incremental operating costs and costs of project audits.

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

Project Cost. Appraisal estimate US\$0.30 million. Actual cost at closure was 87% of the appraisal estimate at US\$2.45 million. Costs of component three activities were slightly higher than estimated due to the addition of two beneficiaries (The West Bank and Gaza, and Egypt) and actual costs of component one and two activities were slightly lower than estimated. The higher than expected cost of component three activities was met through reallocation of funding between project components.

Project Financing. The project was financed by a Global Environment Facility (GEF) Trust Fund Grant. Appraisal estimate US\$3.00 million. Amount disbursed was about 86% of the grant at US\$2.57 million. There was parallel financing in kind from: (i) The Plan Bleu pour l'Environnement et le Développement en



Mediterranee (hereafter referred to as Pan Bileu), Agence pour le Développement Française (AFD), the European Investment Bank, the Marseille Center for Mediterranean Integration and the French Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development, Transport and Housing.

Borrower Contribution. None was planned by way of contribution from the project countries.

Dates. There were two Level Two restructurings. The changes made through the first restructuring on April 29, 2013 were: (i) West Bank and Gaza and Egypt were added as project beneficiaries (addition of these countries did not require modification the Grant Agreement as provisions for their inclusion had already been made in the Grant Agreement); and, (ii) funding was reallocated between project components, with an increase in funding for activities associated with incremental operating costs following the addition of the two countries. The main changes made through the second restructuring on June 23, 2013 were: (i) The results framework was revised and two new Global Environment Objectives (GEOs) were added; and (ii) The project closing date was extended by four months. The project closed four months behind schedule on October 31, 2015.

3. Relevance of Objectives & Design

a. Relevance of Objectives

The Mediterranean Sea region encompasses a wide range of unique and extremely fragile ecosystems. While some progress had been made in the region with regard to improving environmental quality in the years before appraisal, serious environmental threats remained, such as declining availability of per capita water resources, loss of arable land, pollution-related health problems, overexploitation and degradation of marine resources, and deterioration of coastal zones. These conditions were exacerbated by climate change effects. The environmental challenges were mainly due to inadequate environmental institutions, regulatory frameworks and enforcement mechanisms. Given that the key environmental issues in the Mediterranean sea region were related to the management of common environmental resources and development of a common framework for regional cooperation to tackle the transboundary pollution, the PDOs was highly relevant both for the project countries and in the regional context.

The Project Development Objectives (PDOs) continue to be relevant to the Bank strategies for the participating countries. The PDO was aligned with the pillar on "sustainable development in a changing climate, supported by the two crosscutting beams of governance and territoriality" in the Country Partnership Strategy (CPS) for the 2014-2017 period. The Country Partnership Framework (CPF) of Tunisia for the 2016-2020 period identified governance as a crucial issue and also highlighted the need for addressing governance issues in a holistic and integrated manner. The Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) for West Bank and Gaza for the 2015-2016 period highlighted the need for "strengthening the institutions of a future state to ensure service delivery to citizens". The CAS for Lebanon for the 2017-2022 period identified the water sector as a strategic pillar. Egypt's CPF for the 2015-2019 period identified environmental sustainability as a long-term issue. The project was also consistent with the strategic orientations of the Bank's Environment Strategy for the 2012-2022 period, which supported pollution management and highlighted the need for developing partnerships with the private sector to spur cleaner production standards and strategies.



The PDOs were in line with the new Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development for the 2016-2025 period approved at the 19th Conference of Parties of the Barcelona Convention in February 2016. This strategy identified the importance of ensuring sustainable development in marine and coastal areas, transitioning towards a green and blue economy and improving governance for sustainable development. The project was well-aligned with the strategic objectives for the Global Environmental Facility International Waters focal area. These objectives aimed at "fostering a more comprehensive, ecosystem-based approach to management of transboundary waters" and "to play a catalytic role by assisting countries to utilize the full range of technical assistance, economic, financial, regulatory and institutional reforms that are needed" for addressing priority transboundary water pollution-related issues. The project was consistent with the first three International Waters Focus Areas Strategic Programs of GEF-4 replenishment. The outcome 3.1 identified the need for "improving governance of shared water bodies, including conjunctive management of surface and groundwater through regional institutions and frameworks for cooperation " for increased environmental and socio-economic benefits.

Rating

High

b. Relevance of Design

The statement of the PDO was clear. Project activities, their outputs and their outcomes were logical. Component one activities aimed at providing technical assistance for enhancing governance through promoting dialogue and coordination at the local, national and regional stakeholders on environmental issues with specific reference to water-related topics. Component two activities aimed at providing technical assistance for producing innovative knowledge products for addressing various aspects of environmental vulnerability to the relevant economic sectors and critical locations at local, national and regional levels. The combination of these activities in conjunction with support for project coordination and implementation were intended to aid in integrating environmental issues into sectoral and development policies of the beneficiary countries. The PDOs could be expected to contribute to the GEO objective of fostering a more comprehensive, ecosystem-based approach to management of transboundary waters and addressing issues associated with transboundary pollution. Given the regional nature of the project and ensuring close participation of the individual countries, the design incorporated providing decision rights to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) which included representatives from the GEF National Focus Points (NFPs- usually Ministers of Environment or relevant agencies).

The project components were not specifically defined at design in terms of interventions or budget and kept flexible to enable maximum number of beneficiaries. However, this contributed to implementation delays as specific interventions were only prepared after the project became effective. Further, the lack of clarity on the scope of activities at design necessitated modification of the results framework to better fit the actual outcomes by adding few specific outcome indicators.

Rating



Substantial

4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

Objective 1

Objective

To foster the integration of environmental issues into sectoral and development policies of the beneficiaries

Rationale

Outputs

- Ten studies were completed at project closure. This exceeded the target of eight. The completed studies included: a set of 22 audit reports for Lebanon as a part of study on "Industrial Pollution Abatement, a set of 20 environmental audits for stone and cutting industry for West Bank and Gaza, set of two environmental studies for Lebanon, a set of two reports "E1 system in Morocco, set of four national reports "Socio-Economic Assessment of Maritime Activities", a guidebook for environment assessment in three languages (Arabic, English and French), strategic environmental assessment for the new National Water Sector Strategy for Lebanon, a set of three reports for "Industrial Pollution Abatement in Palestine", a guidebook and best practice manual for the participatory activity in Morocco and Tunisia, a set of reports for the environmental observatories and indicators for Morocco and Tunisia (ICR, Datasheet, Intermediate Outcome Indicator Number Six). All the deliverables from the project were publicly available at the project website (ICR, Datasheet, Intermediate Outcome Indicator Number Eight).
- Seven government policies and strategies in beneficiary countries were supported by the project as compared to the target of five (ICR, Datasheet, Key Outcome Indicator Number One).
- Four platforms for exchanging environmental data/information as targeted. This included: (i) Observatory Platform for Morocco - this was an information exchange platform where the Moroccan Regional Observatories of the Environment and Sustainable Development (OREDD) exchanges information with its partners at local, national and regional levels: (ii) Environmental Map for Tunisia - This was a web-based map which allowed the general public as well as political representatives and administrative staff to have access to all data generated by different institutions active in the environmental field: (iii) Mediterranean network of law enforcement officials (MENELAS) to prevent and respond to illegal marine pollution from ships to the Mediterranean Sea: and, (iv) Project website which provided information about project design, regional strategies and assessments, project outcomes and relevant events (ICR, Datasheet, Intermediate Outcome Indicator Number Seven).
- An action plan for the review of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) law was completed (ICR, page 20).
- The Government of Egypt initiated the revision of the National Environment Strategy and Action Plan for the 2017-2022 period (ICR, page 20).
- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) methods were completed and based on this Lebanon



adopted legislation for a National Water Sector Strategy in 2012 (ICR, page 22).

- The website for the MENELAS network was developed for enhancing enforcement through regional cooperation (ICR, page 22).
- Priority pollution abatement measures were identified and considered by donors for financing (ICR, page 21)

Outcomes.

- All indicators were output-oriented. There is very little credible evidence that the project activities contributed to fostering the integration of environmental issues into sectoral and development policies of the beneficiaries..

Rating

Modest

Objective 2

Objective

To strengthen the capacity of key stakeholders at a local, national and regional level.

Rationale

Outputs.

- 39 stakeholders were trained at project closure. This exceeded the target of 18. (The training included, regional and country trainings on Environmental and Social Impact Assessments, participatory workshops in Tunisia and evaluation of maritime activities in Tunisia, Egypt, Morocco, National Training on observatories and evaluation of maritime activities in Tunisia, Egypt, Morocco, Regional Trainings "cost of environmental degradation, National trainings on Environmental Inspection, Egypt National Environment Strategy Workshop, Green Growth Workshop in Marseille, France and National Consultation sectoral workshops). (ICR, Datasheet, Intermediate Outcome Indicator Number One).
- As part of GEO objective, 36 stakeholders from the Ministry of Environment were trained at project closure (including through workshops, seminars, meetings and conferences). This exceeded the target of Seven (ICR, Datasheet, Intermediate Indicator Number Two).
- 23 stakeholders from two ministries were trained at project closure. This exceeded the target of four (ICR, Datasheet, Intermediate Indicator Number Three).
- 23 people from the private sector were trained on local environmental issues (including on local environment issues and knowledge of clean production technologies). This exceeded the target of six (ICR, Datasheet, Intermediate Indicator Number five).



Outcomes

- 835 benefitted from the training activities. This exceeded the target of 150. 32.7% of the people were women as compared to the target of 30%. (ICR, Datasheet, Key Outcome Indicator Number One and Two).
- Based on beneficiaries assessment, 82% of the trainings were deemed to be effective as compared to the target of 80% (ICR, Datasheet, Intermediate Indicator Number four). The ICR however provides no details on the methodology followed in administering the beneficiary survey.

While it is difficult to assess the extent to which the activities contributed to the PDO, it is reasonable to assume that the activities made a significant contribution to realizing the PDO.

Rating

Substantial

5. Efficiency

A traditional cost-benefit or financial analysis was not conducted at appraisal or at closing, as the project mainly focused on governance and knowledge related activities. The project was financed by a GEF Grant in the amount of US\$3.00 million (of this US\$2.27 million was disbursed). The project was able to leverage funding in the form of in-kind contribution of US\$0.71 million from Plan Bleu, the Agence pour le Developpement Francaise (AFD), the European Investment Bank (EIB), the Marseille Center for Mediterranean Integration (CMI) and the French Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development, Transport and Housing.

The project with a limited budget was efficient in the use of project resources in terms of the number of outputs produced and in comparison with other projects on a regional scale. For instance, under knowledge generation component (US\$1.30 million) the project delivered over 40 reports in five beneficiary countries as compared to other regional projects financed by the Bank such as the Climate Adaptation and Mitigation Program for Aral Sea Basin, with a knowledge management component (US\$12.5 million) for two countries.

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

The relevance of PDO for the participating countries and the Bank strategy for the project countries and in the regional context was rated as High. Relevance of design was rated as Substantial as despite minor shortcomings at design, the causal links between project activities, their outputs and outcomes were clear. Efficacy of the first objective - to foster the integration of environmental issues into sectoral and development policies of the beneficiaries - was rated as Modest. All indicators were output-oriented. Efficacy of the second objective - to strengthen the capacity of key stakeholders at a local, national and regional level - was rated as Substantial. While it is difficult to assess the extent to which project activities contributed to the PDO, it is reasonable to assume that the project made a significant contribution to realizing the outcome. Efficiency was rated as Substantial. The project with a limited budget was efficient in the use of project resources in terms of the number of outputs produced and in comparison with other projects on a regional scale.

a. Outcome Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

7. Rationale for Risk to Development Outcome Rating

Institutional support. The plan was implemented by Plan Bleu, one of the active Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in the region. Its website includes the Regional Governance and Knowledge Generation Project (REGOKO) website and Plan Bleu is expected to provide further support in future; there is only modest Institutional Risk.

Political Commitment: Although there was strong government commitment to mainstreaming environment in the sectoral policies, there is moderate risk associated with the overall political environment in the region.

a. Risk to Development Outcome Rating

Modest



8. Assessment of Bank Performance

a. Quality-at-Entry

The project was prepared based on lessons from the regional Global Environment Facility (GEF) regional operations (such as, the Aral Sea Program, the Baltic sea Program, the Black Sea/Danube Partnership Investment Fund and the Partnership Investment Fund for Pollution Reduction in the Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia) and the experience gained from implementing multi-donor Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Program (METCAP) over the last two decades which considered water resources as a global public good in the context of sustainable development. The lessons from these operations highlighted the need for developing capacity at the local, national and regional levels, consistent procedures for monitoring, building partnerships with the private sector, partnering with existing activities and organizations, tailoring approaches to suit the needs of different riparian countries and translating the regional vision into national level actions for sustainability of results. The agency chosen for implementing the project had prior experience in activities associated with promoting environmental regional cooperation (discussed in 9b). To ensure close participation and involvement of governments in a project with regional dimension, the design provided decision rights to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) which included GEF National Focal Points (NFPs- usually Ministers of Environment or relevant agencies). However, there were shortcomings at Quality-at-Entry.

As indicated in section 3b, the project components were not specifically defined at design and kept intentionally flexible to enable the maximum number of beneficiaries. However, this contributed to implementation delays as specific interventions were only prepared after the project became effective. The lack of clarity on the scope of activities at design affected M&E design (discussed in section 10a) and necessitated modification of the results framework to better fit the actual outcomes by adding a few specific outcome indicators.

As indicated in section 2a, the project envisioned to enhance the delivery and impacts of the multi-donor Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Program (METCAP) program. It is not clear if there were linkages with the environmental investments in the region (including non-Bank) and other environment projects under the Sustainable MED program.

Quality-at-Entry Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

b. Quality of supervision

The Task Team Leader (TTL) was located in the first year of the project in the region and thereafter in Washington DC. In addition to regular supervision missions in the region, communications between the team and the Project Management Team (PMT) using online communication tools aided in resolving procurement delays (which affected disbursements), fiduciary, environmental and technical issues on the ground in a timely fashion. The project task team was also peer reviewer at Plan Bleu's request. The team also facilitated coordination with the existing Bank projects in the region, including the Regional Coordination on Improved Water Resources Management and Capacity Building Program.



Quality of Supervision Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

Overall Bank Performance Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

9. Assessment of Borrower Performance

a. Government Performance

The National governments were highly committed and this was demonstrated by their contribution to project preparation and implementation through participating as the GEF National Focal Points (NFPs) as members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and through selecting activities at the national level. Involvement of the NFPs also aided the project in terms of regional cooperation, as all of the NFPs were active contributors and participants of other regional level initiatives and strategies (such as the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development). During implementation central, county and community governments participated in project activities.

The degree of responsiveness from beneficiaries sometimes wavered due mainly to the political situation in the region.

Government Performance Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

b. Implementing Agency Performance

The project was implemented by Plan Bleu - a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) based in France and the Project Management Team (PMT) in charge of day-to-day implementation of the project was located in the premises of Plan Bleu. The implementing agency had over 30 years of experience in projects promoting environmental regional cooperation and had a track record of implementing environmental projects in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Region. It had the required analytical capacity on environmental issues and had worked with other development agencies conducting similar work (such as the European Investment Bank (EIB) the European Union (EU) and the *Agence pour le Développement Francaise* (AFD). During implementation the implementing agency worked closely with the beneficiaries by facilitating regular meetings with the Project Steering Committees and communicating with the National Focal Points directly. The Project Management Unit was well staffed trained when the project became effective and this aided in implementation.

The limitations of the project GEO indicator did not allow for the measurement of actual progress toward the outcome. These were however rectified during implementation.

Implementing Agency Performance Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

Overall Borrower Performance Rating



Moderately Satisfactory

10. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization

a. M&E Design

Given the demand-driven nature of the project, original indicators and targets were not specific enough (such as number of the non-environmental ministries and agencies). Given that the project activities were oriented towards technical assistance and capacity building, only one indicator was aimed at measuring the effectiveness of training. Even this was inadequate, as it did not capture the number of participants for each training).

No core indicator was associated with environmental policies and institutions in the original results framework and monitoring at design, as these indicators were being developed at the Bank and expected to be finalized by the end of 2012.

b. M&E Implementation

During restructuring, three outcome level indicators were added, including a core indicator (number of project beneficiaries, of which female) were incorporated and the evaluation sheet proposed by Plan Bleu was used for measuring the usefulness of training and studies for policy making.

c. M&E Utilization

The key results were utilized to monitor project performance and aid the Bank, the Project Management Team (PMT) and the Project Steering Committee in addressing issues relating to project implementation (such as identifying which studies had to be cancelled as a result of delays or training which were ineffective, based on the assessment procedure).

M&E Quality Rating

Modest

11. Other Issues

a. Safeguards

The project was classified as a Category C project for environmental purposes, as the project did not involve any physical works with potential adverse environmental impacts. No safeguard policies were triggered (PAD, page 15). The ICR (page 14) notes that the safeguard category of the project remained unchanged during implementation. However, the Mid Term Review noted that although the project activities did not involve adverse environmental or social impact, future investments arising out of these studies or section reforms, could have potential environmental impacts (such as environmental studies associated with



industrial enterprises and the National Water Sector Strategy for Lebanon, socio-economic evaluation of maritime activities for Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia and studies associated with Mapping and Controlling Pollution Sources). Based on the MTR results, the Bank recommended to Plan Bleu that safeguard screening be conducted for future activities that may be funded under this project.

b. Fiduciary Compliance

Financial Management. An assessment was made of the financial arrangements of the implementing agency, Pan Bleu, at appraisal (PAD, page 14). The assessment concluded that although the agency had the necessary financial arrangements, Pan Bleu staff had limited knowledge of World Bank financial management standards. As a mitigation measure, a training plan was envisaged at appraisal (PAD, page 12).

The ICR (pages 14-15) notes financial management training was provided to the project team in 2011 with a representative from the World Bank financial management department. The ICR (page 14) notes that financial management of the project was deemed to be satisfactory through the implementation period but provides no details on the quality of audits.

Procurement Management. An assessment was made of the procurement arrangements of Pan Bleu at appraisal (PAD, page 15). Given that Pan Bleu staff had the required capacity to address procurement issues, was expected to allocate its own staff on part-time basis for implementing procurement and expenses associated with salaries of the staff were eligible for disbursement from the Grant proceeds under incremental operating costs (PAD, page 15).

The ICR (page 14) notes that there were no major procurement issues. Although there were minor procurement delays during implementation, procurement management of the project was deemed to be satisfactory (ICR, page 14).

c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)

d. Other

12. Ratings

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
Outcome	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	---
Risk to Development Outcome	Modest	Modest	---



Bank Performance	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	---
Borrower Performance	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	---
Quality of ICR		Substantial	---

Note

When insufficient information is provided by the Bank for IEG to arrive at a clear rating, IEG will downgrade the relevant ratings as warranted beginning July 1, 2006.

The "Reason for Disagreement/Comments" column could cross-reference other sections of the ICR Review, as appropriate.

13. Lessons

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

(1) In order to achieve sustainability of projects with a regional dimension, a strategic approach should be put in place from the beginning that aims at anchoring the work in a regional institution. This project was conceived to contribute to the overarching objectives of the Mediterranean Environmental Sustainable Development Program - "Sustainable MED". The link with the program was however weakened, given that there was no permanent MED Regional Knowledge center at closure.

(2) Involvement of beneficiaries can facilitate project implementation. In this project, the outputs and outcomes were fully achieved in countries where beneficiaries were involved. Establishment of operational country focus groups for each activity in Lebanon helped in adequate follow up of the activities' implementation. Implementation of the project was also facilitated by mobilization of in-kind financing from the beneficiaries.

(3) Selectivity and prioritizing of specific outcomes is required for effective monitoring. The experience with this project showed that for projects of relatively small size and implemented in a large geographic area, it is important to focus on specific outcomes and project activities.

(4) It is useful to consider the advantages and disadvantages associated with a flexible project design. The experience with this project demonstrated that while a flexible design allows for better alignment to the needs of beneficiaries, it also weakened the results framework. For a project of this size and in the context of a larger program, it is important to identify all interventions ahead of time and defining the results framework before the project becomes effective.

(5) It is necessary to consider the timeline when proceeding with restructuring. In the case of this project, halfway through project implementation, Egypt and West Bank and Gaza became beneficiaries via a lengthy restructuring. Although West and Gaza had submitted the endorsement letter in February 2012 and Egypt in October 2012, the restructuring became effective only in April 2013. While the design of this project allowed for new countries to join the project, the actual process of adding the new participants affected the implementation of existing activities.

(6) Capacity building and Knowledge generation/management intervention tend to yield benefits in the long run. Given that a six month window of evaluation of results can only capture part of the impact, it may be useful to have an impact evaluation of outcomes in the medium term.



14. Assessment Recommended?

No

15. Comments on Quality of ICR

The ICR is concise and provides a detailed overview of the project. It is for the most part, well written. It is candid particularly in discussing the issues at Quality-at-Entry. The report follows the guidelines adequately.

a. Quality of ICR Rating

Substantial