

**ENPI – Neighbourhood – Mediterranean & Eastern Europe (NEAR)
EuropeAid/132633/C/SER/multi**

Mid-Term Evaluation

**Supporting civil society in socio-
economic development at local level**

FWC BENEFICIARIES 2013 – LOT 7

Letter of Contract No. 2017/391899

Final Report

16 October 2018

Authors: Gianfrancesco Costantini, Nahla Hassan-Fouad



**The project is funded by
the European Union**



**The project is implemented by
International Consulting Expertise EEIG
in collaboration with STEM-VCR**

ICE on behalf of the Delegation of the European Union to Egypt

**ICE - International Consulting Expertise
150, Chaussée de La Hulpe
B-1170, Brussels, Belgium**

Tel: +32.2.792.49.05

**Fax : +32.2.792.49.06
www.ice-org.eu**



The content of this publication is the sole responsibility of ICE EEIG and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union

Contents

- Acronyms 4
- 1. Background 5
 - 1.1. The objectives of the assignment5
 - 1.2. The main methodological features of the evaluation.....5
 - 1.3. Limitations of the MTE7
- 2. The component 3 of the SPRING Programme in Egypt..... 8
 - 2.1. The SPRING Programme.....8
 - 2.2. The projects implemented under the Component 3.....9
 - 2.3. Achievements and perspectives for the projects 10
- 3. The context: CSOs in Egypt11
 - 3.1. Dynamics involving CSOs 11
 - 3.2. The Government of Egypt policies 11
 - 3.3. The EU engagement with CSOs in Egypt..... 12
- 4. The MTE main findings 13
 - 4.1. Relevance 13
 - 4.2. Effectiveness..... 18
 - 4.3. Efficiency 21
 - 4.4. Sustainability..... 23
 - 4.5. Impact..... 25
 - 4.6. EU added value 30
 - 4.7. Coherence with EU and member states policies 31
 - 4.8. Visibility and Communication 32
- 5. A synthetic view of the evaluation findings 32
- 6. Recommendations and operational indications 34
 - 6.1. Operational Recommendations on Programme Implementation..... 34
 - 6.2. Operational Recommendations for supporting the engagement of Civil Society Organisations in socio-economic development at local level..... 35
- Annex 1 – The indicators used in the MTE 38
- Annex 2 - Documentary references and sources 46
- Annex 3 –Stakeholders consulted 49
- Annex 4 – Profiles of the evaluators 52
- Annex 5 – Terms of Reference 1

Acronyms

ACF	Action Against Hunger (Fundación Acción Contra El Hambre)
CARE	CARE
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CDA	Community Development Association
CfP	Call for Proposals
CS	Civil Society
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EUD	European Union Delegation
GRO	Grassroots Organisation
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
MOIIC	Ministry of Investment and International Cooperation
MOSS	Ministry of Social Solidarity
MTE	Mid-Term Review
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
SFD	Social Fund for Development
SPRING	Support for Partnership, Reforms and Inclusive Growth
StC	Save the Children

1. Background

In early 2018, the EU Delegation in Egypt launched the mid-term evaluation of Component 3 of the Support for Partnership, Reforms and Inclusive Growth (SPRING) Programme in Egypt. The Programme encompasses two main components, namely socio-economic development and support to civil society.

The overall objective of the programme is to “improve the socio-economic conditions and rights of the poorest and those most in need of the population“. The total allocation of the programme is EUR 10 Million (9.6 Million for the development of grant scheme supporting CSO initiatives, and 0.4 Million for Evaluation and Communication).

The Financing Agreement of the Programme was signed in December 2013 and it was followed in early 2016 by the selection of 4 INGOs supported projects proposed by different four international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) those are CARE Österreich, PLAN Danmark, Save the Children Italia - Onlus (StC) and Fundación Acción Contra El Hambre (ACF). The four projects included sub-granting mechanisms to community based organisations (CDAs) which constitute part of the civil society organisations in Egypt. The activities were originally expected to be finalised by the end of 2018, however the duration of the action was extended to the end of 2019¹.

The mid-term evaluation mission, originally foreseen for April 2018, was carried out in September 2018.

1.1. The objectives of the assignment

According to the ToRs, the main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the European Union (EU) and the interested stakeholders with:

- an **overall independent assessment of the past performance** of the "Supporting civil society in socio-economic development at local level", paying particular attention to its intermediate results measured against its objectives;
- **key lessons and recommendations** in order to improve current (if relevant) and future Actions.

In particular, this mid-term evaluation (MTE) aims at providing decision-makers in the Government of Egypt and the EU with an assessment presenting sufficient information to make an informed judgement about the performance of the programme and to take decisions about any required adjustments for the remaining period of implementation (when applicable). Accordingly, the evaluation has focused on examining the efficiency, effectiveness, and likelihood for the programme to achieve its stated objectives.

1.2. The main methodological features of the evaluation

Geographic scope

The evaluation considered SPRING Component 3 activities in all the geographic areas in which it was implemented, namely Luxor, Qena, Sohag, Assiut, Alexandria, Beheira and Beni Suef.

¹ As it will be analysed in the following paragraphs, the Component 3 consists of 4 grants supporting 4 INGOs supported projects carried out by different NGOs, each having its own timing. The first project will be finalised in April 2019, while the last will be closed in December 2019.

Key methodological features

The approach adopted by the team for implementing the MTE is characterised by the following main aspects:

- a) using **different kinds of data** in an integrated manner, and integrating several sources of information, with the twofold aims to crosscheck the information itself and to identify issues that would not be visible by assuming one only perspective.
- b) considering **evaluation a participative exercise**, involving the actors engaged in the programme not only as bearers of useful information, but also has having perspectives, expectations, perceptions and attitudes that need to be integrated into the evaluation process, to understand the meaning of facts and data.
- c) considering **evaluation as a process, rather than simply as an exercise based on collection and processing of data and information**; the evaluation therefore involves changes in the analysed environment and programme that should be considered in the analysis and interpretation of information.
- d) considering the Programme (and the related projects) as **a process in which a variety of dynamics contribute to the outcomes**, and not simply as a set of actions based on blueprint projects, rather than simply looking at implementation of designed activities the evaluation should focus on the way these match with processes involving the stakeholders.

Use of indicators

In the MTE **two sets of indicators were used, and are presented as Annex 1**. The first set was based on the evaluation questions and has been used as a tool for revealing main issues and processes emerging in the implementation of the programmes. The second, focusing mainly on evaluation criteria, has been used for the analysis of the CBOs implemented projects visited, and allowed a better understanding of the way the programme matched local realities.

The projects taken into consideration during the field visits

Visited CBOs' implemented projects have been chosen in cooperation with the field staff of the four projects. The projects have been selected by considering the possibility to have examples of different types of interventions in different contexts. Clearly the visited projects are not a statistical sample of the whole, nevertheless they represent almost all possibilities foreseen under the different projects, including projects on environment, on gender and child rights, on community monitoring, on job creation and vocational training, on nutrition and health, and on agriculture. The organisations involved in the management of these CBOs implemented projects include large and medium NGOs working at national and governorate level, development associations working in one or more districts, small and large Community Development Associations, agricultural cooperatives.

Visited projects have some features that is worth considering since provide an insight on the way the programme is implemented and on the way the programme includes different groups of CSOs.

- The number of projects visited in each governorate is different, and depend upon the activities NGOs are implementing there: 2 in Alexandria, 6 projects in Assiut, 3 in Beni Suef, 5 in Qena, 4 in Sohag, 8 in Luxor.
- 19 CSOs over the ones managing the 28 projects visited have a long record of projects, funded by national and international agencies, and a strong consolidation as organisations; just 4 CSOs are involved in project implementation for the first time
- All CSOs have an office. In 4 cases, the CSOs rented a specific space for the implementation of the project.
- All CSOs have the capacity to work with PCs and have more than 1 PC.
- All CSOs had projects carried out in collaboration with public authorities.
- 4 CSOs have partnership with local enterprises and other local institutions, which have been involved in some project activities.
- 19 projects of the 28 focus on economic activities (2 generate temporary employment, 5 are based on the procurement and distribution of equipment or inputs for economic activities), while 3 focus on children's and women's rights, and 3 on environment. 7 projects focus on mutual support among CSOs and local governance.
- 17 of the 19 projects concerning economic activities include training for women.

Information sources

Information sources included:

- **Documentary sources**, including the programme and project documents and their reports as well as publications and documents produced by stakeholders and by other actors, concerning the activities carried out and the processes emerging in their environment.
- **Key informants**, including the representatives and staff of the NGOs involved in the implementation of the projects and in the sub-granting schemes (representatives of about 40 CSOs have been met).
- **External observers**, including the representatives of government entities and the representatives of CSOs not directly involved in the project activities.
- **Field visits** in 6 of the 7 governorates in which the programme is carried out (Luxor, Qena, Sohag, Assiut, Alexandria and Beni Suef).
- **Direct observation**, through visits to 28 project implementation sites (including projects focusing on women empowerment, environment, agriculture, child rights, vocational training and small economic activities).
- **Informal consultation** with project beneficiaries in the 28 visited sites.
- **10 semi-structured workshops and meetings** with representatives of local CSOs and with end beneficiaries.

1.3. Limitations of the MTE

The MTE was carried out with a delay of several months, due to administrative reasons out of the control of the EU Delegation and of the evaluation team. Such delay implies that the outcomes of the MTE would have limited ability to influence corrective approaches to the management and implementation strategies of Component 3 (particularly considering that all the four projects funded in the framework of the programme are already in an advanced state of implementation).

In addition, it is important to stress that the provision of grants to INGOs for implementing projects selected through a Call for Proposals – which is the main implementation modality of Component 3 – generates some inherent limits for the MTE, as the EU thus has limited capacity to influence project implementation and management.

Despite the limitations encountered by the MTE process as explained above, yet the flexibility of the process allowed it to assume some features that are typical of final evaluations and not simply of MTE, such as the possibility to reflect on programme strategy, relevance and document where possible initial impact. Hence, it was possible to identify recommendations relevant beyond the implementation of the programme itself. It was also possible to examine the programme in the wider context of EU engagement with the government of Egypt as well as other relevant elements that could inform EUD programmes and priorities.

Because of the existing regulation on data collection and management in Egypt, **it was not possible to carry out a quantitative survey during the course of the MTE**. Moreover, it was not possible to use data from the M&E of the programme, since:

- No M&E mechanism was set up at the programme level;
- While M&E mechanisms exist within the different projects that compose the “SPRING Component 3”, their data and information are currently not in a form that allows for comparability or use.

In this context it is important to stress that the 28 projects analysed through field visits cannot be considered a statistically representative sample. However, as shown in the box, they constitute a test able to represent the different kinds of CBOs implemented projects

supported by the programme in the 7 governorates. They also provide an overview of the different types of Grass Root Organisations (GROs); Community Development Associations (CDAs); and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) involved in programme implementations across the 7 governorates.

2. The component 3 of the SPRING Programme in Egypt

2.1. The SPRING Programme

Following up the “Arab Spring” movements and political changes in the Middle East and North African Region (MENA), the EU launched a cooperation programme with the Southern Neighbourhood partners aimed at addressing the challenges and opportunities created by such changes, including the strengthening of civil society organisations and people participation mechanisms, the strengthening of democratic institutions and the improvement of social and economic conditions that would support the development of democracy.

This programme, named SPRING (Support for Partnership, Reforms and Inclusive Growth), was structured within regional and country-based initiatives. In Egypt it had an initial allocation (2011 – 2012) of EUR 90 Million, focusing on three (3) main components: Enhancing access of children to education and fighting child labour; Upgrading informal areas in the Greater Cairo region; Supporting civil society in socio-economic development at local level.

The overall objective of Component (3) is to **improve the socio-economic conditions and rights of the poorest and those most in need of the population**. This has been translated into the following specific objectives:

- i. To improve socio-economic conditions in targeted areas through the participation of civil society;
- ii. To establish workable mechanisms needed for the effective participation of grassroots civil society organisations in local development;
- iii. To build on the ongoing efforts to increase mutual trust between civil society, government and the private sector.

The focus of the programme is therefore:

- on **improving the socio-economic conditions** of those most in need groups, in particular children exploited through child labour, girls who do not enjoy their rights to education, female-headed households and the poorest segments of the population.
- on **strengthening the capacity of the civil society organizations, in particular at grass-root level**, engaged in community service delivery in rural and less privileged communities.
- on **supporting the rights of those in need and their empowerment in the context of the current transition**.

The institutional setting of the programme

The programme governance is based on the activity of a steering committee, which includes the representatives of the EUD, of the MOIIC and of other ministries (MoSS, MLD) and the representatives of the four NGOs leading the 4 INGOs supported projects that compose the programme.

At governorate level, other committees were established, with the main aims of selecting the grantees and facilitating the management of the projects. These committees include the representative of the NGO managing the project, the representative of the Governor, the representatives of relevant ministries at governorate level, the representative of project staff and main local partner.

Both the central steering committee and the local steering committees have been functioning smoothly, providing when necessary and when possible support to the implementation. While both the representatives of ministries and those of CSOs recognised to the committees an important facilitating role, all of them also recognised that the committees could not influence the main obstacle found during the implementation, which is the lengthy process for obtaining the MoSS authorizations.

Despite the most apparent focus on “socio-economic conditions”, a strong attention appears devoted to the **strengthening of capacities related to the adoption of a “right-based approach” among community-based organisations (CBOs).**

2.2. The projects implemented under the Component 3

As mentioned, for the implementation of the component 3 of the SPRING programme, the EU signed four (4) contracts with four (4) international NGOs (CARE Österreich, PLAN Danmark, Save the Children Italia and the Fundación Acción Contra El Hambre - ACF), in May and July 2016, with a total allocation of EUR 9.6 Million. As a whole, Component 3 includes actions for supporting micro-projects implemented by local CSOs (including the CDAs – Community Development organisations, cooperatives and other CBOs) in the 7 governorates of Alexandria, Assiut, Baheira, Beni-Suef, Qena, Luxor and Sohag.

The expected operational duration for the contracts was 2.5 years. However, all the projects experienced delays in their inception phase. In August 2017, the Financing Agreement "Socio Economic development and civil society programme" which encompasses the three components of the SPRING programme has been extended and the end date for the operational implementation phase has been set to 27 May 2020, allowing the four main beneficiaries of component 3 to extend their contracts.

All the projects are based on a two-pronged approach of providing micro-grants and capacity strengthening, coaching and technical assistance to grassroots organisations to enable them to engage in social and economic development activities at the community level. However, they are characterised by different approaches and by different geographic focus, as shown in the following table.

Lead organisation	Project	Geographic area	Partners and co-applicant entities	Beneficiaries of grant-schemes	Key project features
CARE	Towards socio-economic wellbeing and women empowerment in Upper Egypt (Hayat Kareema) (ENPI/2016/374-374)	Assiut Beni Suef	Better Life Assn. for Development and Training – Beni Suef Giving without limits Assn. – Assiut	60 small farmers cooperatives /groups 60 CDAs (women economic activities) 10 groups on community-based monitoring	Grants to CDAs focusing on women economic activities, small farmers, and community monitoring through CSO-affiliated youth groups. Community monitoring activities are aimed at increase social accountability of CSOs, avoiding a confrontational approach and using methods like “third party monitoring” and “input-tracking”, as well as the implementation of public hearing session with stakeholders.
PLAN	Children and Youth Socio-Economic Development Fund - Supporting grassroots CSOs for area-based interventions in the poorest villages of Qena and Sohag (ENPI/2016/374-377)	Qena Sohag	Family & Environment Development Assn. – Qena Human Development Egyptian Assn. –Sohag	60 CDAs in Qena 56 CDAs in Sohag	3 sub-granting cycles in both targeted governorates Support, training and coaching activities for improving the capacities of beneficiary CDAs. Micro projects particularly target youth and girls and are expected to include partnerships with local government bodies and private sector entities.
Save the Children	Strengthening local actors for socio economic	Sohag, Assiut, Behira,		6 local focal points NGOs 107 CDAs	Two successive Calls for Proposals: the first for selecting the 6 focal NGOs

Lead organisation	Project	Geographic area	Partners and co-applicant entities	Beneficiaries of grant-schemes	Key project features
	development (ENPI/2016/374-380)	Alexandria			(Umbrella NGOs), the second for selecting the 107 GROs. Focal NGOs provide assistance and capacity strengthening activities to the 107 GROs. Focal NGOs are involved in training and coaching activities on implementation and in the development of communication and information sharing activities involving public actors and private sector.
Action against Hunger (Fundación Acción Contra El Hambre)	Grassroots Socioeconomic Programme for Local Communities Development Clusters in Egypt - 'GRASP Egypt' (ENPI/2016/375-950)	Luxor (Esna, Luxor and Armant districts)	RAED (Arab Network for Environment and Development) – Cairo	49 GROs	3 micro grants cycles. Micro projects are accompanied by the development of a governance model involving coordination with government, through the setting of “local clusters” at district level.

2.3. Achievements and perspectives for the projects

ACF	<p>All foreseen activities have been launched and are currently in a final stage: 53 CBOs have been involved in training activities and 49 CBOs have been involved in the sub-grant scheme through 3 CfP. 59 initiatives have been funded; 33 already are concluded. CSOs have been supported by a continuous assistance by project staff. CSOs initiatives receiving the grants will be finalised before the end of the programme. In few cases, initiatives risk to be not fully implemented in the foreseen time.</p> <p>There is not any defined arrangement regarding the way assistance will be provided to involve CSOs after the end of the project or about other grant schemes that could support them.</p>
PLAN	<p>Key activities have been launched and are under implementation. 60 projects have been funded in Qena, 56 in Sohag; 41% on environment, 26% on education and 33% on economic empowerment. 40 projects are already concluded and 6 of them have been identified as best practices suitable for replication. 2 projects were suspended. A total number of 170 sub-grants, is expected to be delivered by the end of the project. Few organisations are still waiting the approval of projects by MoSS.</p> <p>PLAN has a permanent presence in the local areas involved in the project and is setting up partnerships with some of the CSOs that were engaged in grants mechanisms.</p>
CARE	<p>Key activities have been launched and are under implementation: 130 CSOs have been supported in engaging on activities focusing on women economic empowerment, on agriculture and on community monitoring. 70 CSOs and 16 Agricultural Cooperatives, as well as 7 CSOs engaging on community monitoring, have started or have already finalised their projects. About 33 organisations are still waiting for the approval of projects by MoSS. 4 CSOs received an official rejection.</p> <p>In Assiut a project includes a large partnership among 10 CSOs and 8 private companies.</p> <p>CARE has a permanent presence in the local areas involved in the project and is setting up partnerships with some of the CSOs engaged in the project. CARE adopts a long-term engagement with the different CSOs and provides different types of support mechanisms.</p>
StC	<p>The preparatory activities have been carried out.</p> <p>The actions foreseen under the 1st CfP are under implementation (6 capacity building projects). The 2nd CfP has been carried out and organisations/projects have been selected in Assiut while the selection is still in progress in Alexandria and Beheira.</p> <p>The organisations and projects selected following the 2nd CfP are all still waiting for the approval by MoSS. This implies some risks for the implementation of projects, which is somehow moderated by the short term foreseen for their implementation (the project duration cannot exceed 6 months).</p>

Save the Children has a permanent presence in some of the areas. Long-term partnerships are expected to be set with the 6 CSOs identified for the capacity building activities. There are not perspectives for further granting scheme besides the one carried out under the project.

3. The context: CSOs in Egypt

The context of the programme is twofold. On the one side it includes the dynamics related to access to social services and economic income in Egypt, which are far too complex to be analysed here, but that are at the core of the global objective of the programme. On the other side, it includes the dynamics involving CSOs, which are shortly considered below, and that constitute the immediate focus of the action.

3.1. Dynamics involving CSOs

Egypt has a long history of civic activism and a very vibrant civil society engaged in a myriad of activities ranging from charity work and supporting poor and orphans to legal litigation and defending citizens' rights. CSOs in Egypt have always been very diverse and engage in a plethora of topics, from culture to economic development; from child rights to the improvement of conditions for women and youth. The diversity of CSOs goes beyond the thematic areas that they work on to include also a huge disparity in the size and geographic reach of CSOs. Despite differences, all CSOs are all governed by the same legal requirements.

Irrespective of their size, according to observers CSOs in Egypt are characterised by the presence of vertical linkages between donors and NGOs where large NGOs and INGOs are often seen by smaller ones as "donors" who provide funds, guidance and support. Such situation results in limited exchange and learning on the horizontal level and in a high level of competition amongst CSO themselves. In addition, organisations focusing on economic and social development have grown in distance and logic away from those focusing on issues relating to governance, citizenship rights and democracy.

Delivery of social services has been therefore the prevailing function of CSOs. In this framework in addition to funds from international donors and from local support, large amounts of funds flow from public authorities to local organisations and groups mainly involved in service delivery (including the provision of education and of "special education", the provision of vocational training and the support to micro-entrepreneurship, the creation of temporary work opportunities, etc.). Despite the prevailing focus on service delivery, both at local and national level experiences exist in which CSOs actively contribute to policy setting and implementation, including through the monitoring of public policy implementation in collaboration with public entities.

While collaboration initiatives involving CSOs and public actors are largely diffused, particularly after 2011 relationships between government and CSOs became rocky. In particular, the space for CSOs engagement has been progressively limited by a set of obligations that de facto increase control over CSOs autonomous actions, as in the new law of association (Law No. 70 of 2017), which risks restricting the work of CSOs in Egypt and introducing additional burdens on their work.

3.2. The Government of Egypt policies

The Government of Egypt (GoE) recognises the important role that CSOs can and should play to support economic, social and political development in Egypt. In 2016, GoE launched Egypt Vision 2030 stating the government's strategic objectives and plans for the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Egypt's Vision 2030 recognises the need to develop a sustainable and inclusive social accountability system with the support of the private sector and CSOs. The sustainable development plan and budget for FY 2016/2017 for example were primarily focused on achieving inclusive economic growth, enhancing social justice, and increasing employment rates, particularly among young people. According to the National Voluntary Review on the SDGs 'Input for the High-Level Political Forum report': "The growth will be inclusive, ensuring sustainability and preserving the rights of future generations, and will primarily benefit the poor and enhance the services provided to them, including housing, water, sanitation, health and education, and ensure that subsidies are well-targeted and reach those most in need. **The plan and budget encourage the positive contribution of both the private sector and the civil society organizations (CSOs)** in achieving the targets and in implementing the different programs and projects."²

The voluntary review reports confirm Egypt's commitment to improving collaboration between state, private sector and CSOs. Egypt Vision 2030 and the 2030 Agenda are implemented by engaging all stakeholders. The role of the private sector and the civil society is key in the realization of these goals. The inclusivity and transformability aspects of the 2030 Agenda and its national counterpart necessitate active contribution of the private sector and the civil society in the achievement of all the goals. The Government of Egypt realizes this fact and is capitalizing on the positive synergies between the governmental efforts, private sector efforts and civil society efforts to achieve this ambitious agenda.³

3.3. The EU engagement with CSOs in Egypt

The EU has a structured cooperation with Egypt since 1996. In this framework a variety of programmes are carried out, in coherence with a joint programming activity which lead to the formulation of the NIP (National Indicative Programme) as main guide of the cooperation between EU and Egypt. In this framework, EU engagement with CSOs in Egypt assumes different forms, such as:

- the involvement of CSOs within "bilateral" programmes and projects, carried out through the cooperation between the EU and Egypt's government and public institutions (the major probably being the cooperation with Social Fund for Development, which alone involved around 600 CSOs, mainly at grassroots level);
- the direct co-funding of CSOs initiatives, through so-called thematic programmes (EIDHR, DCI/NSA, ENPI Culture, CSF, etc.);
- the support to CSOs through regional programmes;
- the support to CSOs through programmes carried out at national and international level with international organisations.

Through these different forms – the main being the bilateral programmes involving public entities – more than 800 CSOs have been involved in EU-funded actions in the period 2007 – 2015.

Globally EU engagement with CSOs has remained for a long time without the definite guide of a clear strategy⁴. However, since the publication in 2012 of the EU Commission Communication "The roots of democracy"⁵, the EU engagement with CSOs has been focused on three main priorities:

² <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/10738egypt.pdf>

³ <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/egypt>

⁴ Costantini G., Hussein D., Hassan N., Barakat L., EU Engagement with Civil Society in Egypt under bilateral cooperation and thematic programmes (2007 – 2013). Final Report, August 2014, European Union - ECO

⁵ EC, The roots of democracy and sustainable development: Europe's engagement with civil society in external relations (COM(2012)0492)

- the promotion of an enabling environment for CS engagement in policy dialogue and governance, by supporting the opening of spaces and the formalisation of legal and administrative mechanisms;
- the promotion of a more structured CS participation in policy dialogue and governance, making the most of the many existing occasional initiatives, led both by the government and by the CSOs;
- the development of CS capacities in terms of networking, knowledge sharing, communication, evidence-based advocacy and monitoring.

4. The MTE main findings

4.1. Relevance

For assessing the relevance, the MTE focused on three evaluation questions.

- *To what extent the action focus on the issues related to CSO engagement in development in Egypt?*
- *To what extent the action provides an answer to the problems identified as basis for setting the action objectives?*
- *To what extent the action considers the issues that emerge at local level and that the stakeholders recognise?*

Component (3) focus on two main areas: local development and improvement of the socio-economic condition; and support to CSO engagement, through capacity strengthening and the improvement of local coordination. **These two focus areas make the programme vis-à-vis the context:** CSO dynamics, EU strategies and the Egyptian Government long-term development policies.

The representatives of the 4 INGOs managing the projects perceive programme and project relevance in different ways. Local stakeholders (including the beneficiary CSOs and the local staff of the organisations managing the grant schemes) perceive relevance as very high. The number of CSOs participating in the information session on the CfP and the number of proposals received confirm the perception of a high relevance of the projects and of the programme at local level. In particular, PLAN received over 500 proposals, CARE 175, StC 150, ACF over 100.

However, a deeper analysis of the programme in its various components reveals **some factors that limit its actual relevance**. In particular, the relevance of the programme decreased due to the time elapsed between the formulation of the Financing Agreement and its implementation. A key factor in the reduction in relevance has been due to the fact that **some issues, which were at the core of the programme when it was defined, become peripheral in the implementation**. These include all aspects related to CSO engagement with public authorities in the fostering of local

The calls for proposals

CfP constituted a key tool of the programme. The 4 INGOs' supported projects, of which the programme consists, were selected through a CfP. Each project selects the beneficiary organisations and the small-projects to be supported through CfP. In almost all cases, CfP were based on two steps and different stages as follows:

- Information sessions;
- Submission of concept notes;
- Selection of concept notes;
- Support to the CSOs whose concept notes were selected, through training activities and direct support;
- Submission of full proposal for the selected concept notes;
- Selection of full proposals to be supported based on the assessment of the proposal itself and on the assessment of the capacities of the CSO;
- Procedures for obtaining MoSS authorisation;
- Signature of the contract between the funding agency/NGO and the grantee.

Despite the fact that CfP were open to all organisations registered with MoSS and other relevant agencies (e.g. the Ministry of Agriculture for the Cooperatives involved in CARE Project), only well-established organisations were able to participate. This is due to the pre-selection of participating CSOs is done through communication with MOSS or INGOs websites. Another impediment to participation is the request for a matching contribution from participating CSOs which doesn't make it applicable to all possible CBOs.

governance mechanisms⁶, in the promotion of the rights of those in need and in the enhancing citizen participation.

The Action has been relevant to the needs of CSOs and citizens at the local level in a superficial manner. The sub-granting scheme responds to the **local demand for funding of CSO activities**, which has been increasing in 2017 and 2018, after a phase of stagnation between 2014 to 2017 when support available through international NGOs and other sources of funding decreased, because of the procedures for the approval by the national authorities⁷.

The relevance of the programme objectives

While, the objectives identified in the **Financing Agreement** take into account most of the dynamics identified in the context analysis, the formulation of objectives in both the “guidelines for the submission of proposals” and in the “**project documents**” are instead just focusing on **fewer dynamics**. Interviews and focus group meetings helped identify some key issues related to the capacity of CSOs to contribute to local development were left aside from the programme, such as:

- the prevalent engagement of CSOs in service delivery, without any linkage with other actors and with little impact on emerging problems, at the different level;
- the divides among the CSOs engaging in service delivery and those engaging in policy and governance;
- the prevalence of vertical relationships among CSOs, that make it the development of “autonomous CSOs”⁸ difficult;
- the issue of sustainability of CSOs.

Some issues were just partially considered in the definition of goals and aims during the implementation of the programme. Those include the internal governance, social legitimation and access to funding for CBOs, the relationships among CSOs and other actors. While aiming at strengthening the capacities of CSOs (and particularly of CBOs), the focus of capacity strengthening has been in fact mainly on project formulation, project management and financial accountability.

⁶ When discussing “governance engagement” a wide concept of governance is utilised. According to such concept, governance engagement does not consist only of the participation in policy dialogue and policy making at national level. Instead, it includes the mobilisation of CSOs together with other state and non-state actors to identify emerging social, economic or environmental issues and to find and implement actions for their management and solution. Engaging in local governance can in some cases include service delivery, particularly when services are provided as element of a wider action, involving not only a CSO, but also all other stakeholders, and foster the exercise of citizenship rights, the innovation in public action and the support to social change. This definition of “governance” is frequently used in the EU documents and it is at the core of the mentioned EC communication on “The roots of democracy”.

⁷ As referred by the representatives of some international NGOs having a long record of activities in supporting local CSOs, it is frequent for International NGOs to wait for an indeterminate time for the MoSS approval. While in the past, after 60 days project approvals were considered as granted in the lack of a clear denial by authorities, the current legal framework does not define any time limit for authorities to provide their approval. A consequence of that is the reduction of support opportunities at local and grassroots levels.

⁸ Since the 1990s, international NGOs and large national NGOs created their own networks and affiliated grassroots organisations, supporting them through capacity building activities and grants for a long time and strengthening their capacity to implement activities, but avoiding strengthening their autonomy of action – for instance by being able to analyse the local reality or to fundraise autonomously – and their capacity to identify and build partnerships with other entities. The almost exclusive relationship between a large NGO and a group of smaller/weaker ones let CSOs to compete among them and even in many cases to compete for the “beneficiaries” by working in the same geographical areas. Such a situation – as mentioned by the directors of some CSOs consulted in the evaluation – is still strong and has also influenced the CSO participation to the SPRING Component 3 activities.

The relevance of the programme implementation mechanisms and programme activities

The relevance of the implementation mechanisms decreased during the implementation of the action, leading to a limitation of the relevance of programme activities.

The **original implementation mechanism** – as defined in the Financing Agreement - included a) the involvement of CSOs at different levels, for supporting through micro-grants and capacity building the smaller CSOs, and b) the accompaniment of a strong Technical Assistance (TA), providing methodological support, carrying out needs assessment and M&E, facilitating the capitalisation of the experience and fostering communication and Knowledge Management.

The structure set up during the programme implementation, instead, includes only:

- 4 separate projects, implementing sub-granting schemes based on different methodologies and focusing on different CSOs in different geographic areas, and
- a small TA to support a limited aspect related to visibility and communication.

What was originally thought to be a programme for fostering CSOs engagement with other actors in local development has been de facto translated into a set of “one-time” sub-granting schemes, with limited interaction with actors not directly involved in the activities carried out.

Moreover, some of the programme implementation mechanisms, such as the “use” of International NGOs as leading sub-granting agencies risks to reproduce the modalities already in use for distributing resources for poverty mitigation and local development, such as those practiced in the past by many NGOs and by some public entities (including the Social Fund for Development).

Finally, some features related to the sub-granting schemes - included in the Call for Proposal that guided the identification and selection of the grants - strongly limit both the possibility to engage with small CBOs and grassroots organisation (especially those not having a formal structure and previous experiences in project implementation) and the possibility to support change processes due the following reasons:

- The size of the sub-grants is too large (10,000 – 30,000 Euro) for many organisations engaging in governance, but are rather small to carry out actions producing an impact on communities or on the local economy;
- Duration of small projects (6 to 10 months in most cases) is too short for allowing organisations to change and to focus on something other than “implementing activities”;
- Project duration is also too short to allow local CSOs to engage in activities having the potential to mitigate the dynamics that generate poverty and hinder the exercise of rights at local level, inducing permanent changes in local environment;
- Projects should produce tangible measurable outputs, so that – considering available resources and time - there are few choices for identifying feasible activities or projects. Most examples identified both in the Financing Agreement and in the Call for Proposals were actually not practical⁹.

⁹ Activities to be supported by the programme include, according to the Financing Agreement: Small-scale social projects, public works and space improvements; Participatory design and implementation of local initiatives for development; Micro-finance, micro-insurance and grass roots safety nets; Social entrepreneurship and pro-poor value chain development. The Logframe of the programme identifies three set of activities. i) Community based micro-grants. ii) Complementary grants to support umbrella NGOs, projects creating platforms for civil society/government dialogue, and/or other federating activities, as well as other actions that consolidate the civil society sector in its ability to address socio-economic issues. iii) The implementation of TA to provide a wide set of complementary services and undertaking strategic support activities.

- The obligation for NGOs to use 70% of the budget of the projects as sub-granting fund, implies the reduction of resources available for capacity strengthening, provision of technical assistance and mentoring, networking, research, capitalisation, knowledge management, and M&E.

As a consequence, programme activities **mostly consisted of the provision of small-grants** to different kinds of Community based organisations for carrying out small socio-economic development activities, and the **provision of capacity building activities, including short training sessions, mentoring and technical assistance**, mainly for the CSOs receiving the grants and mainly involving middle and large local CSOs.

As mentioned, the four sub-granting schemes have been carried out according to different approaches, in some cases **testing new approaches and different strategies to engage with local CSOs**¹⁰. This feature of the programme, as discussed in the focus groups during this evaluation, could eventually increase its relevance as an initiative testing new approaches for engaging with CSOs in social and economic development. However, **such possibility has been until now very much limited by the lack of Knowledge Management and Communication activities**. These have been reduced to those carried out by the NGOs in the framework of each project¹¹. Communication and visibility activities at programme level included just a training workshop with the participation of the NGOs managing the projects¹²; while interaction among the main stakeholders of the programme included just the meetings of the Steering Committee¹³ and few more “ad hoc” meetings organised by the EUD.

Even more than the various factors mentioned above, a strong limitation of the relevance of programme activities was induced by **the focus of the programme implementation mechanism on the granting and sub-granting scheme**. The attention of all stakeholders – and in particular of project staff – was focusing on the effectiveness and efficiency of the sub-granting scheme and toward the reduction of risks related to the management of sub-grants by local CSOs, having different degree of capacity and different features. Thus, based on the discussions held with both NGO representatives and project field staff, rather than focusing on the role of CSOs and to their contribution to local development, or on the development of different support mechanisms adapted to different CSOs categories and different local conditions:

- the projects activities and the training and assistance provided to local CSOs were centred on project formulation (so to have a minimal quality level in the answer to calls for proposals), and on project management/financial management (so to reduce financial risk).
- the targeting strategies have been aimed at selecting the organisations and projects scoring higher in assessment procedures looking at their technical quality, at their activity records and in some cases at their relationships with public entities¹⁴ (this proved to be

¹⁰ CARE project tests a “community monitoring” mechanism that could eventually lead to the creation of local governance mechanisms for the joint management of development initiatives. PLAN project involves the dissemination of “right-based” approaches and methodologies, potentially leading to a better integration between service delivery and policy/governance engagement. StC project tests a multi-layers mechanism for capacity building at local level, potentially fostering local partnerships. ACF project tests a modality to involve local authorities at district level, potentially allowing for improved engagement between CSOs and public entities.

¹¹ A variety of communication activities have been carried out in the framework of each project, including the organisation of events for the signature of contracts, the launching of “Facebook” pages and websites, the publication of bulletins, the development of a set of individual communication channels with relevant stakeholders, particularly at local level.

¹² The workshop focused on the use of different media and the formulation of communication plans.

¹³ At the time of the MTE, the Programme Steering Committee met three times, involving the EUD, the MOIIC, the MOSS, the Ministry of local Development and the four NGOs managing the grants.

¹⁴ For instance, in the districts targeted by ACF project, in Luxor Governorate, the projects have been funding in the targeted districts only one organisation, formally recognised by the MoSS as the local “Community Development Association”.

quite effective, despite the delays in issuing project approvals, MoSS rejected a negligible number of projects).

Another factor leading to a reduction of the relevance of programme activities is the limited capacity of the programme to deal with a very visible feature of the context in which CSOs operate, such as the introduction of control mechanisms over their activities, not only involving MoSS, but also the security authorities. According to many informants, it appears that the 4 INGOs and their partners have selected a safe course of action and activities that are none confrontational. The projects avoided the introduction of innovative approaches or working on contentious issues to ensure the ability to function in a highly controlled context.

The relevance of the activities supported through sub-grants

Differences in the strategies and actions led to different degrees of relevance among the micro-projects funded in the governorates, as it is evident in the following table. From the application of indicators concerning the relevance of the CBOs implemented projects visited during the mission, there is a strong correlation among the geographic area and the relevance of sub-granted actions, that suggests that relevance is depending upon the support strategies adopted by each project¹⁵.

Level of relevance for the projects visited in the different governorates (1 to 5)							
	Alex	Assiut	Beheira	BeniSuef	Luxor	Qena	Sohag
The actions strengthen the capacities of involved CSOs (1 to 5)	3	3	4	4	3	4	4
The actions improve engagement on rights and governance (1 to 5)	2	3	2	4	2	4	3
The actions improve engagement with other CSOs (1 to 5)	4	4	4	4	2	2	2
The actions improve engagement with public authorities (1 to 5)	3	2	3	4	3	3	3
The actions improve engagement with other actors (1 to 5)	2	2	2	4	2	4	4
The actions improve local coordination or governance mechanisms (1 to 5)	3	2	3	3	1	2	2

In none of the governorates the projects achieve the maximum score (score system is presented as Annex 1) indicating an optimal level of engagement on the issues related to CSO development. This is likely to be linked to the way sub-granting schemes were set up, as they were mostly selecting: the stronger local organisations, the better formulated projects focusing on “tangible socio-economic benefits”, safe activities as those that the organisations had been implementing even before the programme (training, support to women economic activities, small environmental projects, etc.).

The indicators that show the best scores are those regarding:

- the strengthening of involved CSOs (a high score in 5 out of 7 governorates)¹⁶;
- the improvement of the engagement among CSOs (4 out of 7 governorates).

¹⁵ In most governorates, just one project is present. In Assiut and Suhag, PLAN and Care activities overlap with the StC project, but within such project grants have been until now provided to 6 organisations only, which carried out training activities for other CSOs and implemented a local diagnostic study.

¹⁶ The production of socio-economic benefits by the projects was considered as part of the strengthening of the capacities of CSOs. This choice was based on the consideration that the resources available for the sub-grants were too limited in order to produce long-term changes in the local socio-economic setting, but relevant for improving the capacities of CSOs to engage in socio-economic development. Despite the fact that the projects – as will be discussed later – generate an impact on local communities, they are seldom increasing the capacities of CSO to this respect. In almost 80% of projects, CSOs are just continuing to do what they were doing with other funds from governmental agencies (as MoSS or the SFD) or from other donors (as other international and national NGOs, UN agencies or bilateral aid agencies).

The second case is more interesting: engagement among CSOs in fact appear stronger where the projects include actions such as the involvement of local CSOs to strengthen the capacities of other ones (StC) or the involvement of local CSOs to monitor the projects of the others (CARE).

The indicators that show the worst scores are those regarding the engagement on rights and governance, as well as the engagement with other actors. However, also in these cases, despite the fact that the relevance of actions in most governorates is low, there are some governorates showing a stronger relevance. This proves that rather than from “external conditions” (as for instance it could be the limited space for action on these issues) the factors are likely to be internal to the project, more related to the support provided during project formulation and project implementation, as well as the experience of the implementing CBOs. In some cases, CBOs have chosen to adopt a rights-based approach on child and women empowerment issues using collaborative approaches with local authorities. In general, those who have chosen a more “daring” approach have for years enjoyed a solid working relationship with government and have continued to use safe topics such as women and children economic and social rights.

In one case just the minimum score was reached, meaning that the “issue” was not even considered in the project. However, in all cases the relevance of the funded actions vis-à-vis the need to improve local coordination and governance mechanism appears to be low. **The CfP is likely to be a tool that is not suitable to address such a need, since it increases competition among CSOs, rather than improving cooperation** (during the field visits just 1 small project was identified as carried out by a consortium of CSOs).

Last but not least, the Financing Agreement and consequently the 4 INGO supported projects lacked a collective vision and implementation strategy. Whether this allowed for the introduction of different models, yet it reduced the relevance of the programme as a whole as each INGO chose to implement what they already know or excel at with limited attention to innovation and improvement of CSOs capacities across different aspects.

4.2. Effectiveness

Effectiveness focuses on the implementation of the foreseen actions and on the achievement of expected results. The MTE focused on the following evaluation questions.

- *To what extent the activities planned have been implemented?*
- *To what extent the expected results and outputs have been achieved?*
- *To what extent the achievement of expected results appears feasible in the available time?*
- *Which obstacles emerged in the implementation, and which solutions have been identified?*
- *Which facilitating factors emerged in the implementation, and how it could be possible fully exploiting them in the future implementation period?*
- *To what extent institutional and organisational mechanisms proved to be effective for fostering the implementation of the action? In particular, looking to differences emerging among different organisational approaches*

The effectiveness of the four projects

As the set of four sub-granting projects, regarding effectiveness the programme shows good performance. The INGOs supported projects of ACF, CARE and PLAN are well advanced in their activities and the targets established in the project proposals were achieved to a great extent.

The StC project is less advanced in its activities, due to the late start as MOSS approval was granted almost 12 months after the signature of the grant contract.

MoSS approval actually represented an obstacle also in the implementation of all projects: while some sub-grants were approved in a very short time, most of them waited for a longer period to be approved. Still a large number of projects are waiting for the authorisation (107

of the 2nd CfP of StC, over 70 among those selected by CARE, the projects selected following the last CfP of Plan and ACF).

Late authorisation by MoSS led to delays in the starting of the activities carried out by the sub-granted CBOs that resulted in a reduction of the activities or in the number of beneficiaries. However, this seems not to impact in a meaningful way on the whole effectiveness of the programme.

The **only critical situation is that of StC project**: the project end has been extended to December 2019, but a delay like the one experienced in relation to the 6 sub-grants already signed would generate a delay in the implementation which risks the completion of some envisaged activities.

The main **facilitation factor identified for overcoming the issues related to MoSS authorisation has been fostering the involvement of governors and of MoSS directorates at the local level in the sub-granting selection committees**, and the involvement of governors in public initiatives (as at the signature of contracts). However, such measures, which helped the rapid approval of projects in 2016, has been evaluated by all key informants as ineffective in the current context, in which final decisions are taken at the central level in Cairo where it is believed that the final say remains with the security apparatus and not necessarily under the influence of MoSS.

The effectiveness of the programme in front of the logframe

When looking at the **expected results for the programme as a whole**, effectiveness is more limited, as the activities did not allow the full achievement of expected results, mainly for reasons related to the implementation mechanisms:

Financing Agreement Expected results	
<p>i) Community-level socio-economic projects are implemented with measurable benefits for the targeted population</p>	<p>Most activities fostered are focusing on training and on the creation of income generation opportunities, however the available time would not allow for the consolidation of capacities and even less for the consolidation of micro-enterprises or other economic activities.</p> <p>Even more, the small scale of activities and of the economic activities proposed to beneficiaries - in most cases - create very small improvements in the lives of beneficiaries that would not change in a significant way the income and social conditions of beneficiaries. Improvements will mainly concern individuals, while communities have been targeted in a limited measure.</p>
<p>ii) Capacities of civil society are enhanced towards assisting targeted communities in identifying, designing and implementing priority projects for socio-economic developments.</p>	<p>Looking at the visited projects, less than in the 50% of initiatives is possible to identify a significant improvement of the capacities of CSOs.</p> <p>Most CSOs have been continuing to do what they were already doing, with additional funding.</p> <p>The short time for micro-grants implementation implies that involved CSOs would not have in most cases the opportunity to adopt new modality to support communities.</p>
<p>iii) Partnerships are established with the private sector and local governments for identifying and implementing solutions to local socio-economic challenges and improving local governance</p>	<p>In few cases (in particular within 1 of the 4 INGO supported projects, and likely in less than 30% of micro-projects) partnerships have been set with other actors, such as private sector and local governments. In the other cases, limited engagement has been fostered at local level with other actors. In even a lesser percentage of cases, partnerships have been established among CSOs. In most of the cases, the relationship with local government already existed before the beginning of the project</p> <p>There were no activities aimed at fostering the building of coalition among local actors.</p>

The effectiveness at sub-grants level

The table below show the scores obtained by the small projects implemented by the CBOs regarding effectiveness. The great majority scored very high: small project activities have in almost all cases been carried out without major issues. In just 2 cases it was noted that sub-grants have been cancelled because of issues related to financial management. In Beni Suef the young people involved in the community monitoring activities stated that they were 85% satisfied with the initiatives implemented by the CBOs.

Level of effectiveness for the projects visited in the different governorates (1 to 5)							
	Alex	Assiut	Beheira	BeniSuef	Luxor	Qena	Sohag
The activities have been carried out (1 to 5)	3	4	3	5	5	5	5
The activities produced expected outputs (1 to 5)	4	5	4	5	5	5	5
The Activities achieved expected results (1 to 5)	4	4	4	5	5	5	5

Only in Alexandria and Assiut some indicators have lower scores (however still satisfying in Assiut). The Alexandria score is linked to the delay in the approval of StC projects in Alexandria, i.e. activities have not started yet, while that of Assiut is due to the fact some CSOs did not complete the activities in a timely fashion and did not achieved fully the expected results.

The high level of effectiveness in the sub-grant albeit positive is also **worrying**. The fact that activities were carried out without major problems implies that they were **neither challenging for the implementing organisation, nor producing major changes** – that would generate stronger resistance - in their environment. It is evident from the sample visited that most sub-grants focused on traditional service delivery and income generating activities with limited attention to rights and citizenship.

The factors hindering effectiveness

Obstacles emerging in project implementation, identified by stakeholders consulted during the field visits and by the NGO staff during interviews, include:

- ✚ The excessive workload on project staff in almost all projects, due to the limitation of available resources in front of a wide set of planned activities, including the management of information sessions, to the selection of proposals, the communication with stakeholders and local authorities, the monitoring of sub-grant implementation, the support to beneficiary organisations, etc.
- ✚ The number of targeted CBOs and the size of targeted geographic areas. Despite differences in the approaches and implementation mechanisms, all four INGOs supported projects target a high number of CBOs (113 in the case of StC, 107 in the case of PLAN, 49 in the case of ACF, 130 in the case of CARE), presupposing an even higher number of CBOs participating in the CfP. Moreover, the targeted geographic areas are very large, comprising villages that often are more than 100 Km far one from the other. This resulted in an increase of stress on project staff and a limitation in the capacity to provide adequate TA and training.
- ✚ The articulation of the budget limiting the resources for capacity strengthening, training and technical assistance to the 30% of the total, which is the main cause of the excessive workload identified above as projects has to resort to a limited human resources structure.
- ✚ The procedures for obtaining the MoSS authorisation, which, because of their indeterminate timing, hindered the possibility adequately planning the implementation of activities.
- ✚ Short duration for the implementation of most projects caused difficulties in matching the implementation of the activities by the beneficiary organisations with capacity strengthening actions, and reduced the possibility to start and follow-up organisational change processes (this has been possible to a certain extent only in the case of the

CSOs involved in community monitoring – in CARE project – and in the 6 CSOs involved as intermediary organisations – in StC project).

- ✚ The changes of actual costs due to the devaluation of Egyptian Pound (EGP) and to the time between project formulation and project start. During the implementation of the sub-grants selected in the first CfP the EGP was devaluated. As a consequence, the value of the resources available was reduced to about 30%, without any possibility to increase it, and with impacts on the implementation of activities, such as the reduction of the original number of beneficiaries, the reduction of equipment and goods to be procured, the reduction in the number of involved staff. While these changes in the original design of activities have not been creating conflicts among organisations, they produced stress on both the supporting staff and the beneficiary organisations.
- ✚ New taxes, increasing the financial burden on beneficiary organisations have also affected the effectiveness of the activities. The CSOs involved in the projects are not exempted from taxes, while these are not considered in the projects budget and in the sub-grants. There is therefore, particularly for the CSOs participating to the most recent CfP an additional financial burden in addition to that foreseen in the budget as community or organisational contribution. In the case of CARE project, in particular, there is a double contribution by the beneficiaries, aimed at fostering the development of ownership by both the local community and the beneficiary organisation. The increase of cost of activities was managed by the 28 organisations met during the field visit, by decreasing the scope of the activities or by decreasing the number of beneficiaries.
- ✚ The de-facto adoption of a “One-Size fits all” approach to training and capacity strengthening activities. While the 4 INGO supported projects identified modalities to manage the grants reducing the risks related to beneficiary organisations capacities (in all the project, the management capacities of beneficiary organisations are assessed and consequently limits are imposed regarding the budget for activities), training and support activities – as well as the Calls for Proposals – were not adapted to the different groups of CSOs. Large NGOs having activities in several governorates receive the same support (and the same training activities) as small CBOs, without any reference to the role and social function they play. Lack of adaptation of activities to the different kinds of needs and capacities of the organisations resulted in unnecessary efforts towards some entities and in the lack of resources to support other ones.

In order to address these challenges, participating CBOs have adopted two modalities of: either increasing the resources initially earmarked as contribution by the involved organisation (in some cases mobilising further resources through the involvement of final beneficiaries, or through the identification of further funding sources) and reducing activities and the number of beneficiaries.

4.3. Efficiency

Efficiency criterion mainly refers to the economic and financial resources and their management. The following questions were considered.

- *To what extent needed economic resources have been available for project implementation in the due time? Which factors influenced such situation?*
- *To what extent available resources respond to emerging needs? Are there resources that would be not used or – on the contrary – resource shortage?*
- *To what extent the programme has been leveraging additional resources, for supporting project activities and for widening their impact?*
- *To what extent resource management, project day-to-day management, and steering mechanisms have adequately supported project operation? Which factors influenced the identified situation?*

The efficiency at the programme and project level

From the perspective of financial resources, the programme mechanisms have created a somehow rigid frame, leaving little space for change: four projects, in which 70% of the budget has been devoted to micro-grants. Considering this budget allocation, the programme

can be considered **as very efficient, as a very small part of available resources have been employed for management, technical assistance and general expenses.**

However, the reality is not exactly like it appears. In fact, the above articulation of the budget has been considered by all organisations involved in the management of the 4 projects as a major obstacle in the implementation of activities. The fact that only the 30% of projects' budgets has been available for covering both general management expenses and the operational costs, resulted in a reduction of training and capacity strengthening activities, of technical assistance activities for supporting the sub-grantees, of M&E and communication, etc. Despite the fact that in some cases CBOs were requested to allocate 30% of the budget in their proposals for supporting actions addressing their own capacity strengthening needs.

The following critical aspects emerge regarding efficiency.

The high efficiency of the four projects corresponds to both:

- a) a reduction of the relevance of the projects themselves;
 - b) a reduction of the performances of the programme, particularly regarding the achievement of expected results and the generation of impact on CSOs capacities. A large number of the involved CSOs – as this was observed in 15 over the 28 projects visited during the MTE - have not been changing in a significant way. This includes the absence of change in the types and modality of implementation of activities, as well as the organisational and governance structures and mechanisms of the CSOs.
- The delays in MoSS approvals of the projects at the different levels implied a “no-cost extension” in all the four projects that while not involving an additional cost for the EU, implies a growth of actual costs that will be sustained by the CSOs.
 - Both the delay in MoSS approvals and changes in the external environment (devaluation of the Egyptian Pound, high economic inflation, and application of VAT) resulted in an increase of the actual cost of activities for the beneficiary CSOs and the need to mobilise additional resources to implement the CBOs implemented projects. Projects' staff in Sohag and Assiut esteemed that CSOs had an additional cost corresponding to almost 20% of the budget.
 - The large geographical areas targeted by the four projects¹⁷ necessitated the use of a large amount of resources for transports (both in term of transport cost and of worktime of the staff) and the reduction of the time actually spent in assisting beneficiary CSOs.
 - The selection of proposals from international NGOs based out of Egypt and having a main implementing partner based in Cairo and a set of local partners in the project areas indicates an increase of the transaction cost (i.e. the costs related to communication, transfer of resources, management of relations among partners, setting of internal control mechanisms, etc.).

Despite these facts, according to all consulted entities, at project and at small-project level, **efficiency continues to be satisfactory.**

- Almost all projects that have already started have been managed effectively and without major financial issues.
- Only few of selected small-projects were not approved by MoSS (3).
- In few cases (3 CBOs implemented projects among the over 400 currently in progress or already finalised), the beneficiary CSOs have not been able to deliver the expected activities and their project were suspended.
- According to interviewed project staff at least 80% of CBOs implemented projects have been implemented without major problems concerning the use of resources.
- Only in the case of 1 macro-project (StC) there are worries about the possibility to spend the available budget as foreseen, since a possible delay in the approval of the 107

¹⁷ In some cases, like Assiut, Sohag or Beni Suef, including villages in a radius of over 100 km.

projects selected in the framework of the 2nd CfP could lead to delays in their implementation.

The efficiency at sub-grants level

The table below shows the scores obtained by the CBOs implemented projects regarding efficiency. Only in few cases, CBOS implemented project show low scores: actually only in the cases in which delays due to approvals or due to other external factors impacted the implementation, requiring additional resources.

Level of efficiency for the projects visited in the different governorates (1 to 5)							
	Alex	Assiut	Beheira	BeniSuef	Luxor	Qena	Sohag
Activities have been carried out according to planning (1 to 5)	4	4	4	4	5	5	5
Outputs have been achieved in planned time (1 to 5)	4	4	4	4	5	5	5
Activities have been carried out without requesting additional resources or efforts (1 to 5)	3	4	3	3	5	5	4
Activities did not experience major delays (1 to 5)	4	4	4	3	5	5	5

The high level of efficiency should not be considered positive in a programme that focuses on capacity strengthening, as it signals two main issues.

- a) The fact that the main focus of capacity strengthening activities and technical assistance is mainly to reduce risks related to the inappropriate use of funding. In particular:
 - field visits and monitoring activities carried out by project staff have been largely focusing on supporting beneficiary CSOs for procurement, use and reporting of financial resources, book-keeping and other financial measures;
 - Project selection has been based on assessment schemes aimed at minimising the risks related to resource management¹⁸, rather than at building the capacity of CSOs to engage on local development, local governance and policy dialogue with public authorities¹⁹;
 - the focus of training activities on budgeting and on the setting up of adequate accounting and reporting systems (this however, was considered by at least half of the 28 visited projects as an important advancement in the functioning of organisations).
- b) The fact that little learning has been generated through small-grants, and that beneficiary CSOs initiatives have been carried out more as “the implementation of blue-prints” than as actions for following-up and guiding socio-economic change processes. This is clearly visible through a comparative analysis of small-grants. Problems and delays in the implementation of activities and in the use of resources only emerge within the initiatives that deal with setting up new mechanisms for environmental management and productive activities that strongly depend on external factors and within those that “challenge” the existing employment/social/family setting parameters²⁰.

4.4. Sustainability

Sustainability refers to the extent to which programme activities will continue after its finalisation as well as the provision of funded services and income generating activities. The MTE focused on the following questions.

¹⁸ For instance, by classifying beneficiary CSOs based on their financial management capacities.

¹⁹ Consequently, according to project staff almost 80% of supported projects are carried out by CSOs already having experience in grant management. An estimate that appears confirmed by the field visits carried out during the mission: only five of the 28 visited organisations were not having, in addition of the grant provided through the Programme, other grant-based activities.

²⁰ It is the case of the CBOs implemented projects fostering the employment of women out of their houses or in innovative work areas, which had to mobilise additional resources for awareness raising and for recruiting final beneficiaries.

- To what extent conditions exist for assuring the continuity of the funding and support activities carried out by the 4 main implementing NGOs and their main partners?
- To what extent conditions exist for assuring the continuity of the work of GROs and of their micro-projects?

Sustainability is not a main feature of the programme:

- The programme itself has been designed as a **“one-time” grant scheme**, without considering how the activities could eventually continue.
- The **four INGOs supported projects were designed as activities to be implemented within the grant scheme**, without necessarily continuing after the finalisation of the programme. Moreover, in at least three of the four cases, the projects represent just an occasional engagement for the involved NGO. In some cases, the projects represented opportunities to enlarge the geographic areas of action and the partnerships with other CSOs, in others just opportunity to further and sustain already existing interventions of the organisations involved. Small-grants were designed as the main activity of the projects, it is hard to envisage that this form of engagement can be sustainable in the absence of follow-up grants schemes.

The sustainability of the projects and the expectations related to sub-grants

The development and focus on sustainability does seem to have taken a large portion of the thinking during the design of the 4 INGOs supported projects of which the programme consists. None of them has defined exit strategies. The only sustainability source identified is the launching of income generation activities, however the limited time for sub-grant implementation would not easily allow for processes including both the consolidation of productive activities and the analysis and exploration of markets.

In the case of one of the four projects, sustainability strategy is based on the increased capacity of CSOs to formulate projects to be submitted to other donors. Two linked assumptions constitute the foundation of this strategy: a) that donors will be available in all places and b) that the formulation of one project and the participation in the trainings will make a CSO able to identify and acquire funding for other projects.

Despite the complete lack of attention to sustainability in the programme and project design, in over 15 of 28 visited CBOs implemented projects, the involved CSOs expect to continue their activities after the end of the project. CBOs have listed three main strategies that they intend to pursue as follows:

- **the CBO’s implemented small project itself consists of the establishment (or the improvement) of a self-supporting economic activity** (in this case, only a part of produced resources goes to the employed women/ beneficiaries and a legitimate question exist about the extent these activities will be able to continue in the absence of a real entrepreneur approach and in the absence of adequate markets).
- **the local CBOs are just extending their activities**, which are supported through other funding sources (this is a common situation, as explained by almost 80% of cases. The programme only provided additional resources for existing and activities of the CBO).

Engaging with Cooperatives

The CARE project support initiatives identified and proposed by cooperatives, in addition to those supporting women and the engagement of youth in community monitoring. Engaging with cooperatives is a relatively new activity for CSOs in Egypt, since until recently cooperatives were semi-public entities, focusing almost exclusively on the marketing of products and in the distribution of agricultural inputs.

Currently cooperatives are involved in a change process, by engaging with members in the provision of services of different kinds (for instance, fostering access to innovation, to mechanisation, to partners). These new functions and activities make cooperatives a more interesting CSO partner.

Engaging with cooperatives proved to be a promising perspective, since these entities are representing much more than in the past their constituencies, and are able to identify strategies and modalities to assure sustainability of their activities (as they have been doing this also previously).

- the fact that the project includes the **establishment of a joint initiative with other actors** (however we found such a situation in just 1 case out of about 20 analysed).
- the fact that projects consist of the **purchase of equipment** by the CSOs, that will use them in further projects and activities (in at least two cases of those analysed, the projects included just that, without including other activities).

However, even when these strategies have been supported by the INGOs responsible for the main projects through some specific activities, the future of the action remains unclear.

In particular, in economic activities directly involving the CSOs the modality of implementation is clearly flawed as it lacks an analysis of the scale and of the possibility to scale up, the analysis of market opportunities, the analysis of product quality and of standards required by buyers out of the communities, the identification and training of entrepreneurs that can lead the activity itself, and so on. These lacking elements create in the activities promoted an inherent limit concerning the possibility to grow and then the possibility to reach full autonomy and sustainability. This renders many of the economic activities observed rather futile on the long run as the mind-set of the actions continue to be of “charitable” approach as opposed to a well-tested business model linked to market realities.

The sustainability of the CBOs implemented projects

The table below show the scores obtained by the CBOs implemented project regarding sustainability.

In only one case the maximum score has been reached, by the CBOs implemented projects in Sohag, in relationship to the mobilisation of support from other actors that could be expected to continue to provide help. Three further projects reached in relation to the same indicator a relatively high score. These are the projects supported by StC and by CARE, since both the activities of the 6 CSOs, supported by StC as intermediate capacity building organisations, and the activities of Community Monitoring, supported by CARE, require cooperation among a variety of actors.

In the other cases, most indicators are low. This is due to the lack of exit strategies that could be considered relevant in relation to the activity carried out and in relation to the context.

Level of sustainability for the projects visited in the different governorates (1 to 5)							
	Alex	Assiut	Beheira	BeniSuef	Luxor	Qena	Sohag
Clear and relevant strategies exist (1 to 5)	3	3	3	4	4	4	3
Project activities continue after the end of the project (1 to 5)	3	2	3	4	4	4	3
A 2nd phase was planned without EU resources (1 to 5)	3	2	1	3	4	4	3
Support from other actors is visible (1 to 5)	4	2	4	3	2	4	5

Only in Qena, Luxor and Beni Suef governorates CBOs implemented projects can be expected to continue because of the mobilisation of additional resources for the future and because of the availability of external support (included by the grants scheme managing entity).

4.5. Impact

While the impact of a programme is emerging in a longer time, already during its implementation an action generates changes in its social, political, economic or physical environment. In the context of the MTE the following questions were considered.

- *Are there undesired effects and consequences produced at local level, regarding the relationships among stakeholders and the social, environmental and economic setting?*
- *Are there visible changes in the local social, political, economic and physical (natural and man-made environment)?*

- *Are there visible changes at the national and regional level that can be connected to the action and that concern CSOs institutional capacities and relationships; the relationships between CSOs, the state and private sector; CSO related policies?*
- *To what extent likely impact has been enlarged by the visibility and communication measures set up in the framework of the projects?*

Measuring programme early impacts appears difficult, both because projects are still in progress and because of the little information available on the activities carried out and their outcomes. In addition to that, the possibility to look at the programme impact was hindered by the fact that collecting primary data is not possible under the existing legal framework.

The impact of the programme and project activities at central level

As mentioned, communication among all stakeholders has been limited, and external communication activities have been not yet carried out (except for the information day and the launching of the CfP) at programme level and at national level. The four INGOs' supported projects only engaged in communication through their websites and *Facebook* pages and through the organisation of events at the governorates' level (ex. ceremonies for launching the CfP and signing the contracts with the involvement of local authorities).

Consequently, there is not any visible impact on the way CSOs are represented, on the trust among public authorities and CSOs or on improved public trust of CSOs, particularly at national level. At local level, representatives of CSOs in 6 governorates (Luxor, Assiut, Sohag, Quena, Beni Suef, Alexandria and Beheira) mentioned the fact that the **already existing relationship between CSOs and the government agencies further improved**. Such perspective was also shared by the representatives of MoSS met in Assiut, Sohag and Qena.

A further "invisible impact" on communication might be related to the fact that most local CSOs involved in the implementation of the small-projects have their Facebook pages, which function as a strong mechanism to disseminate among their stakeholders information on the programme activities.

The impact of the project activities at local level

The most visible impact of activities shows in small changes in the livelihood and in the social position of the individuals involved in the implementation of training activities and the support to income-generating activities.

- Out of few sub-grants supporting environmental activities and supporting awareness raising activities on children and women rights (mainly in the governorate of Sohag and Qena, supported by PLAN) and the 6 initiatives for CSO capacity building activities supported by StC in Alexandria, Beheira and Sohag, most sub-grants support initiatives focusing on training and equipment purchase for income-generation and employment show a positive impact even if small. All these activities have a visible impact in the short term, however it is difficult to measure this impact except by stating the number of direct beneficiaries, as for most other activities it is almost impossible to identify a clear economic

The risk of disempowering final beneficiaries

Instead of empowering their beneficiaries in some cases training and job creation processes risk disempowering them.

A similar situation was observed in at least 3 small-projects but could easily emerge in other ones.

In such cases, the CSO creates a productive unit that is fully managed by the CSO board and leaders and that employs the beneficiaries as part-time employees. Beneficiaries receive a percentage of the income generated by their products, but not participate in the unit management, in the marketing of products and not even in the analysis of production cost and benefits.

In such way, despite generating some income and some benefits at household level, beneficiaries are not empowered, but kept in a dependency relationship that would eventually results in the inability to find alternative solutions when the CSO changes its agenda and activities.

output.

- In few cases these activities result in permanent employment in private sector companies²¹, but normally they provide to beneficiaries the opportunity to carry out part-time economic activities, functional to support family income or to reduce the need to purchase goods on the market (thus reducing the need for monetary income at family level). The great majority of training courses carried out in the framework of funded projects concentrate on few activities (production of small craft, sewing, maintenance of electric appliances, bakery), consequently there is a limited space for expansion of the activities and of the income they could generate.
- In most cases, the activities proposed by projects are replicable only at the micro-level, since scaling-up them would require a capital and a set of entrepreneurial capacities that are not available (and that cannot be produced through short initiatives). Scaling-up the activity would also require identifying competitive advantages that have not been defined yet. Economic activities have been identified by the CSOs or by their expected beneficiaries based on those they were already familiar with, as there were no activities aimed at supporting sub-grantees in identifying new economic niches.

A further important impact identified is on the **social status of the CBOs implemented small-project beneficiaries**. This appears true for the projects concerning women economic empowerment and the integration of people with disabilities. Beneficiaries interviewed during the evaluation acknowledge that they are more able as a result of project interventions to engage into economic activities, in some cases out of their houses. Even if data for the measurement of this impact lacks, it will be important to measure that in the framework of the final evaluation of the project.

A third impact concerns the **recognition of rights** (and in particular, citizens' rights, children's rights and women's rights) at community level. Clearly small and micro-projects are unable to generate in a short time such processes. However, at least 80 projects of the 500 supported through the programme included the adoption of a right-based approach as a key element and can be expected to generate local processes that would eventually lead to such impact.

Changes in CSOs were among the most important expected impacts. However, because of the implementation modalities at project level, they can be expected to emerge in relatively few cases. Based on the visited CBOs implemented projects, on the selection procedures adopted by the 4 INGOs supported projects, and based on the discussion held with project staff, impact can be expected

Factors reducing the impact on CSO change and development

- According to project staff almost 70% of CSOs involved in the projects have not been involved in training activities other than on project formulation and project management and grant management, with little impact on the organisational models, internal governance mechanisms and agenda setting.
- All but a few ones of involved CSOs have not been engaged in new activities, but received grants for implementing activities that already were carried out and only in few cases the projects were occasions for innovating implementation modalities.
- According to projects' staff, almost 60% of involved CSOs had already been receiving grants from other entities (national or international NGOs, the Social Fund for Development, different international donors), so that being accountable towards a donor is not a new thing.
- Despite the fact that all CSOs involved in one of the INGOs supported projects (thus about 150) have been experiencing "community monitoring"; this was mainly perceived as a donor (the INGO itself perceived as a donor) requirement and thus scarcely influencing the functioning of CSOs out of the limited space of the implementation of the project's small grant.
- Despite the focus on coalition and partnership, almost none of the involved CSOs has engaged in the fostering of a partnership-based initiative. Nonetheless, in a few cases (for instance 3 of the visited ones), partnerships have been set up for carrying out some activities.

²¹ This has been observed as regarding 30% of beneficiaries of 2 of the 28 visited projects. However, these were quite particular projects, supporting women employment by training them into specialised sewing activities (that would eventually allow them to work in tailors' shops, even if tailoring is prevalently a man's job) and supporting qualified employment for university students with disabilities.

in about 30% of supported local CSOs (that are about 450).

Despite what can be expected in most cases, based on the discussions in focus group meetings, in probably close to 30% of sub-grants there are impacts on the development of CSOs, through the introduction of innovations (in the practices, in the areas of engagement, etc.) and through the starting of processes regarding the recognition of new leaderships, mainly involving youth and women.

At least in three cases among the 28 visited, projects were not proposed or identified by the existing boards, but by young people and women that are outside the board and in some cases even outside the organisations. In these CSOs, which normally have an intermittent life²², this fact represents an important change, and can be seen as an indicator of a wider process related to the engagement of CSOs with local community and actors for managing and solving local problems (for engaging in local governance as a partner of local authorities and other stakeholders).

A similar situation, implying the recognition of young leaders, emerges in the “Community monitoring activities” carried out in the framework of CARE project. While the sub-grants for implementing community monitoring activities have been provided to 10 well established local NGOs, these created youth-groups to implement the activity. The role and capacity of youths had to be recognised both within the organisation responsible for the “community monitoring” and among those (120 organisations, including mainly agricultural cooperatives and women’s organisations).

The **mobilisation of local small and intermediate CSOs in the formulation of proposals** is likely to be the greater impact of the 4 INGOs supported projects. Out of about 450 CSOs involved in project implementation, there are many more that have been mobilised by the programme in the preparation of project proposals (a rough estimate, based on the proposals submitted to the various CfP, can be set at 650). All these organisations have been somehow involved in engaging with communities and in identifying needs and concepts that would be relevant for the CfP. This represents an important impact when considering that small and intermediate local CSOs are normally “identified” and selected by the larger ones to implement their activities, so that proactivity and the capacity to analyse local problems and identifying new initiatives are not among their most important strengths.

Environmental impact is not visible except in very few cases directly focusing on environmental issues. The scale and duration of the projects would not allow change in the local physical environment to emerge if not as direct effects of the activities carried out (i.e. cleaning of a locality, re-use of agricultural waste, re-use of domestic waste, etc.). Even in these cases, the changes tend to have a limited duration (the life of the CBO implemented project itself).

The impact of CBOs implemented small-projects

The table below shows the scores obtained by the CBO implemented small project regarding impact. Only in two cases, impact appears to reach a strong level, as signalled by the high score. In most of the others the impact appears moderate or limited. This is a consequence of both the approach adopted in the selection of sub-grantees (according to the discussions in the focus group meetings, 60% of grantees were already relatively strong, so that training and capacity strengthened fostered little change in their functioning), and of the way CfP

²² These CSOs are active when projects are there and “sleep” when there are not resources and projects, and their boards are mainly composed by respected persons in the community and by public officers that use them as a mechanism to distribute benefits, help their community and generate consensus. The initiative of youth and women marks a change in the leadership even when the promoters of the new initiatives are not involved in the board. Processes like these are very similar to the CSOs change processes emerging in the aftermath of 2011, which led CDA to assume a more active role in local development under the lead of new leaders and the enlargement of their constituency.

have been managed as well as the preparation process. Safe engagement areas and safe projects were preferred, without considering that in the limited time and with the limited resources available, they hardly could be able to generate change in local communities on a sustainable basis.

Level of impact for the projects visited in the different governorates (1 to 5)							
	Alex	Assiut	Beheira	BeniSuef	Luxor	Qena	Sohag
Organisational change of the involved CSO (1 to 5)	3	3	3	4	3	4	5
Change of rights exercise at local level (1 to 5)	2	3	2	4	1	3	4
Change of beneficiaries' economic conditions (1 to 5)	1	2	1	3	3	3	2
Change of beneficiaries' social conditions (1 to 5)	3	2	3	3	2	4	3
Reduction of CSO divide between service delivery/rights (1 to 5)	3	3	3	3	1	4	3
Increased trust among local actors (1 to 5)	4	3	4	4	2	3	4
Change of local physical environment (1 to 5)	1	1	1	1	2	1	2
Innovation of CSO activities/organisation/governance (1 to 5)	3	3	3	4	3	3	5

Unintended effects and consequences

In addition to the mostly positive impact considered above, there are few undesired and unintended outcomes that were identified by analysing the projects and that should to be mentioned and taken into consideration in the planning of activities.

- The first and most important one is the fact that **the projects, instead of fostering new ways of engaging with communities by small and intermediate CSOs, reinforce their traditional engagement modalities.** Such an impact was identified in at least 10 of the 28 visited micro-projects. Rather than engaging in making issues that emerge at local level visible and identifying new solutions to manage such issues, CBOs (and particularly CDA) continue to act – as they always have been doing – as service or goods providers, engaging with passive citizens as beneficiaries rather than as “their constituencies”. Not managing this risk would have a negative impact on the programme contrary to its objectives and logic. The **maintenance of old patron-client or service provider-beneficiary scheme, generating passive expectation and inefficiency in development dynamics**, instead of fostering local subjectivity in the definition of local solutions and local actions that can influence and increase the effectiveness of public action.
- A second impact which emerges in this context is the risk increasing the orientation of CSOs toward using grants as main funding mechanism and using “project-based activities” as main modality action. This would eventually increase dependency of CSOs on external donors and reduce their engagement in permanent activities and actions, such as those related to policy dialogue and participation in local governance.
- Another undesired impact consists of the **reinforcement of the tendency of CSOs to work alone, to not engage in coalition and platform and to not engage out of project-based initiatives.**
- Such impact is related to the use of Call for Proposals as main mechanism and is visible in the fact that virtually none of the micro-projects is aimed at supporting the initiative of a cluster or group of CSOs, entities or stakeholders. Each of CSOs receiving information about the micro-grant opportunity has been acting individually. This tendency is not only inducted by the CfP, but is

Gender approach

Despite the fact that – according to projects’ staff - over 60% of CBOs implemented projects target women as main beneficiaries, gender issues seem to be scarcely considered in the actions. Women participation does not go beyond a numerical representation of females and girls in the activities supported by the projects.

Few actions – mainly in Sohag – involve advocacy and awareness rising on women’s rights and on the dynamics that maintain women in a segregated or in a subordinate condition.

Virtually none of the actions aim to influence gender dynamics, so that skill-based training risks to have little impact on the actual condition of women and in their participation in both social and economic life.

reinforced by some features of the micro-grants (such as the very short implementation-time) and of the procedures set up for their selection (for instance, focusing on financial risks, rather than on engagement in civil society community).

- A further undesired impact is that both the way of defining the CfP and the lack of clarity of the MoSS authorisation process strengthen **the perception that the space of action and engagement of CSOs is determined by the mistrust relationships between state and CSOs**, despite the fact that many small-projects experiences show at least partially a different situation²³. Such perception leads CSOs to engage with government entities only on service-providers.
- The **consolidation of the representation of International NGOs as “donors” or as “donors’ intermediary”**. All the four projects comprising the programme have been proposed by INGOs, some of them not even having a strong local experience. Just in 1 of the 4, the local partners have been involved in the formulation of the proposal and know the articulation of the budget, in the others partners were involved once the proposal was almost defined, asking them to play a specific role in project implementation. In one of the projects, some local partners were actually selected through the first Call for Proposals, through a long process that included their evaluation (despite the fact that they are national CSOs with a long history and a wide set of activities). Moreover, while in 2 cases the experience and specific approach of the leading INGO strongly influence the project activities and the support to beneficiary CSOs, in the other 2 the added value given by the leading organisation is less visible.

Despite the fact that in other EU programmes in Egypt, there is a certain balance between INGOs and national CSOs, in this case the representation was reinforced that INGOs are more trusted by international donors and that they can represent – in a context in which funding is strongly controlled for national CSOs – a preferential channel for international funds.

Undesired effects and consequences are strongly related to the lack of communication at national level. However, they would not be reversed or contrasted by an action just focusing on making the projects visible and without dealing with more general dynamics related to CSO engagement in development and with EU engagement with CSOs.

4.6. EU added value

This criterion refers to the extent to which the Action adds benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only and to the extent to which the action contributes to the EU global cooperation action. Evaluation questions were:

- *To what extent visibility and communication measures contribute to EU cooperation and policies?*
- *To what extent the action contributes to EU / EU member states policies and actions related to CS engagement in development and policy in term of operational synergies?*
- *To what extent the action contributes to EU / EU member states policies and actions related to CS engagement in development and policy in term of knowledge?*

The EU added value appears at this stage of programme implementation to still be very limited. The four INGOs supported projects have not been interacting with other EU initiatives and even less with initiatives by the member states or by other CSOs.

Such a limited added value is very much related to:

- the lack of visible communication measures, out of those at local level;
- The fact that information and knowledge produced is still not formalised and remain unpublished;

²³ Particularly, projects implemented in Qena and Sohag show that is possible to engage with state institution fostering citizenship's rights and the improvement of public action. Entrance for engaging with public entities has been represented by children's and women's rights, by public services and the public space, by the management of environment related issues.

- Focus on sub-granting in the frame of the resources and time set at the launching of the 4 INGOs supported projects, reduced the resources available for any activity not directly related to grant-management.

There are steps that could be taken to remedy the situation in this case. It would be particularly important to **identify and disseminate good practices and lessons learnt**. Areas in which lessons learnt and good practices can be identified include:

- Social accountability and **Community monitoring**;
- The **integration between service delivery and policy/governance CSO engagement**;
- The possible **entry points to foster engagement between public authorities and CSOs**;
- The actions to promote **women’s rights and children’s rights** and the recognition of women’s potential new roles;
- The engagement with small and new CBOs through **intermediary local CSOs**;
- The fostering of **institutional change** and the recognition of new CSO actors at local level;
- **Grant related tools for CSO capacity building**.

Added value of CBOs implemented projects

The table below show the scores obtained by the small projects regarding the EU added value. Not surprisingly, the added value of the visited projects is very moderate. This is due to some main elements:

- the isolation of CBOs implemented projects even at the governorate level, and within the same macro-project²⁴, due both to the geographic dispersion and to the kinds of activities funded, that resulted in the fact that projects are not known out of their specific environment;
- the focus on implementation and on management of activities, that left little space for documenting practices and even less for communication and knowledge-sharing;
- the tendency of CSOs to use the sub-grants as additional resources for supporting activities they were doing (mainly focusing on service delivery) hence the testing and the introduction of innovative methods has been very limited.

Level of added value for the projects visited in the different governorates (1 to 5)							
	Alex	Assiut	Beheira	BeniSuef	Luxor	Qena	Sohag
Production of knowledge (1 to 5)	3	2	3	2	1	1	1
Innovation of practices (1 to 5)	3	2	3	3	2	3	2
Support to other EU actions (1 to 5)	2	2	2	2	1	1	1

4.7. Coherence with EU and member states policies

This criterion refers to the coherence of the Action itself, with the EU strategy in Egypt and with other EU policies and Member States Actions. The following question was considered.

– To what extent the action is coherent with EU / EU member states policies related to cooperation with Egypt, to the regional cooperation, and to the engagement with CS

As already discussed the programme appears in its implementation only partially coherent with EU strategies and policies, as there is limited focus on supporting CSOs in engaging with public authorities in governance and policy dialogue.

Even if some limits exist regarding the coherence with EU and member state policies – at least partially due to the efforts to adapt the action to the changing environment – during the

²⁴ Staff of different projects met each other just during training courses.

MTE it has been possible to identify different degree of coherence with the EU strategies and policies concerning the CS.

Direct references to the strengthening of CSO capacity to engage governance and policy dialogue – as key elements of EU policies on CSOs - were limited both in the CfP that selected the 4 main projects, and in the CfP issued in the framework of these projects. In fact, the first was mainly referring to the setting of grant schemes”, and the second were mostly putting in evidence “actions improving socio-economic conditions”. Despite that, 14 of the 28 visited CSOs micro-initiatives include elements related to CSO capacity and engagement areas that made them coherent with the EU strategies and policies concerning the CS.

Coherence of CBOs implemented projects

The table below show the extent to which, at governorate level, the small projects appear coherent with the EU strategy (focusing on building a space for action, engaging CSOs on policy dialogue and governance, and building the capacities of CSOs).

Level of coherence for the projects visited in the different governorates (1 to 5)							
	Alex	Assiut	Beheira	BeniSuef	Luxor	Qena	Sohag
Coherence with EU strategy (1 to 5)	4	4	4	4	2	4	4

In almost all governorates, projects have a moderately good level of coherence. In some governorates, the score depends on the features of projects selected according to the different strategies adopted. In some governorates projects focusing on rights exist, as well as projects improving local governance and fostering engagement among CSOs. In Luxor, the coherence is lower, because of the almost exclusive focus of the action on food security and on vocational training.

4.8. Visibility and Communication

Visibility and Communication has been the subject of a workshop involving the organisations involved in the management of the four main projects. In particular, the workshop focused on “designing a campaign that takes the best profit of the available resources”²⁵, focusing on tools and communication dynamics, but without a holistic and common agreement regarding the goals to be achieved.

A communication and visibility strategy remain to be produced and particularly is still to be discussed with stakeholders. Furthermore, communication actions are still to be identified and defined. This fact can offer an opportunity for increasing knowledge exchange among the four projects as well as for capitalising on the experiences.

5. A synthetic view of the evaluation findings

Based on the observations and consideration in the paragraphs above, it is possible draw some main emerging conclusion.

- The programme has been characterised by **a limited relevance of actions carried out**, mainly due to changes in the environment and context from programme formulation to its implementation and due to the limited capacity to adapt to changing conditions while maintaining the goals and components initially defined. In particular, this led to CSOs engagement in policy and governance, and a stronger focus on service delivery:

²⁵ Socio Economic Development and Civil Society Support Programme. Support on Communication and Visibility. Europeaid132633/C/SER/Multi, SPRING Egypt Communication Strategy.

- Reduced focus on local coalition building and networking.
 - The elimination of the technical assistance functions on methodology, information base, M&E and Knowledge management.
 - A shift from the capacity building of CSOs from capacity to engage with other actors to internal governance and project formulation and implementation.
 - A shift from being a programme focusing on strengthening local CSOs, to a programme focused on increasing the role of INGOs in supporting local socio-economic activities, with little engagement with national CSOs.
- **Despite that, the programme has potential added value**, related to its effectiveness and short term impacts:
- The short-term effects and the potential impact on livelihoods and social conditions at community level, in almost 400 communities in 7 governorates.
 - The direct and indirect effects on a relatively large number of local CSOs, which includes the mobilisation and revival of many dormant or inactive CSOs, the growth and recognition of new leaders, the acquisition of new skills and capacities.
 - The presence of experiences that can be translated into lessons learnt, both on the way CSOs could engage in local development and in local governance, and on how larger CSOs can support the development of smaller and weaker ones.
- **However, the programme also generated risk situations that could jeopardise the development of CSOs** and their effective engagement in development policies, in local governance and in policy dialogue with public authorities. In particular, the action risks:
- Reinforcing the tendencies toward dependency and the establishment of vertical partnerships.
 - Reinforcing the attitude of CSOs to focus on service delivery rather than on a wider engagement in development.
 - Creating frictions among national NGOs and INGOs and increasing the level of competition amongst local CSOs instead of fostering cooperation and coalition building.
- **Moreover, the programme has raised a strong expectation related to the continuity of grant schemes for supporting local CSOs**, both in the 7 targeted governorates and in the other ones. Such expectation forms a risk factor and an opportunity. Not responding to expectation can generate de-motivation and disenchantment that would hinder CSOs development at local level. Responding through the development of new initiatives could have a strong and long-term impact on the development of CSOs and their engagement in local development.

In this framework, a set of needs emerge. These have the potential to minimize emerging risks and capitalise on the opportunities presented by the action and maximize the potential benefits as follows:

- Generating and disseminating **information about the local impact**.
- Increasing **knowledge management at programme level**, by fostering knowledge and experience exchange among the four projects and their beneficiary CSOs.
- **Capitalising on the experience**, and in particular making lessons learnt and good practices visible.
- Increasing the **engagement with National and Local Authorities**, in order to foster new partnerships that build upon those already established in some governorates (ex. in Beni Suef) and to support the development of public authorities' capacities for engaging with CSOs.
- Increasing the **engagement with national CSOs and international NGOs that were not involved** in the programme so that lessons learnt could improve also their action.
- **Continuing the support to the many CSOs involved** with further capacity strengthening and through involvement in communication and knowledge sharing action, in order to transform the short-term support they received as a foundation of a

long-term process, potentially leading to the creation of partnership, coalitions and coordination mechanisms that are able to influence development policies at governorate and national levels.

Some opportunities exist that can be utilised in order to respond to these needs. In particular, these opportunities include:

- The EU thematic programmes that can offer a space for engagement with other CSOs/NGOs and for capitalising on the experience.
- The additional funds generated by the devaluation of the Egyptian Pound, that can be used – by removing the 30% limit in the projects budget – and allocating the surplus for increasing support to involved CSOs and to carry out knowledge management and communication activities.
- The surplus funds could also support the communication and visibility technical assistance, which is expected to restart its activities in the next months, and to increase knowledge management activities, as well as to increase the engagement with government entities and with other CSOs at national level.
- The possibility of developing a new SPRING Programme to provide sustainability and continuity to the action started within Component 3, while adapting the approach, increasing relevance and solving emerging problems.
- The existing regional initiatives for supporting CSOs that can provide resources for carrying out further capitalisation, knowledge management and networking activities.

6. Recommendations and operational indications

6.1. Operational Recommendations on Programme Implementation

In order to improve the implementation of the programme, it is possible to identify three sets of recommendation, addressed at the three main stakeholders of the programme itself: the EU, the Government of Egypt and the INGOs involved in the management of the four projects.

Recommendations to the EU Delegation

- Strengthening knowledge management activities aimed at fostering the sharing of experiences and knowledge among the NGOs managing the four projects.
- Launching knowledge management and sharing activities involving the beneficiary CBOs from the different projects.
- Making the use of the additional resources generated by the fluctuation of the Egyptian Pound exchange rate flexible: rather than increasing the number of grants/grantees, a stronger relevance of the programme can be fostered by increasing the assistance provided to beneficiary CBOs by the INGOs and by strengthening knowledge management and sharing activities.
- Shifting from a visibility and communication strategy focusing on “activities” and framing EU engagement in supporting the project, to a strategy and a set of activities focusing on the programme and projects objectives, and therefore aiming at changing communities’ perception of CSOs and their roles and at fostering the recognition of CSOs as governance actors.
- Strengthening networking and cooperation with other donors engaged in similar activities.
- Strengthening networking and cooperation among the INGOs involved in the programme and those involved in other EU programmes, including the thematic programmes and other bilateral programmes.
- Evaluating the possibility of a SPRING Component 3 second phase.

Recommendations to the Egyptian Government

- Facilitating and speeding the process of acquiring the approval of the projects by the MoSS considering: a) the fact that the projects were already evaluated and selected by a committee also involving government representatives; b) the fact that the use of funds is closely monitored by the INGOs responsible for each project; c) the fact that what is under implementation is a bilateral initiative approved by the Egyptian government since the beginning.
- Allowing and facilitating activities aimed at collecting information in the field. These activities are necessary both for allowing a stronger monitoring of the social and economic processes generated by the projects at the different level (including the identification of undesired effects and impacts, such as the emergency of conflict situation), and for better management of activities in cooperation with public authorities, and the final evaluation of the programme.

Recommendations to the Implementing INGOs

- Focusing on the long-term impact of socio-economic activities, by identifying and implementing actions that can allow the scaling up of those activities having the best long-term potential.
- Focusing on the issues related to the autonomy and sustainability of the CBOs receiving grants, by involving them in analysing how the risk of dependence can be avoided and mitigated, and how they can access other sources of local funds to enable them to continue to engage in local development.
- Identifying within the four projects the spaces for integrating “Social Accountability” actions and for developing “Community Monitoring Mechanism”, including through the dissemination and further development of practices that were tested in some of the projects (for instance, in the project implemented by CARE).
- Fostering initiatives for the sharing of knowledge and experiences among the beneficiary CSOs of the different projects, including exchange visits amongst and within governorates and districts.
- Increasing networking with NGOs and CSOs that are not involved in the projects: up to now the involvement of the CSO Community has been limited to the participation of the representative of the NGO Federation to the steering committee meetings, that does not appear to be sufficient to generate communication flows with most CSOs, however in all governorates other CSOs and NGOs exist that can be engaged in communication and networking activities.
- Passing from visibility and communication strategies focusing on the “activities” to be carried out, to a strategy and actions focusing on the programme achievement and projects objectives, thus not only trying to show up the activities implemented and their outcome but aiming at changing communities’ perception of CSOs and their roles.

6.2. Operational Recommendations for supporting the engagement of Civil Society Organisations in socio-economic development at local level

The evaluation exercise resulted in a set of recommendations that envisage a more rigorous approach to the engagement of CSO in socio-economic development at local level. This could be achieved through existing EU strategies and policies. These recommendations focus on three main areas: the development of CSO capacities; their involvement in public life, policy dialogue and governance; and the fostering of a more enabling environment for their engagement. These recommendations are mainly addressed to EUD, but are also to a large extent relevant for improving the engagement between the Government of Egypt and CSOs as well as for CSOs themselves.

Recommendations concerning the development of CSOs capacities

- Focusing on strengthening the capacities of CSOs to identify, define and play their roles, rather than disseminating capacities and skills related to a single model of ideal CSO (even more when this model is that of donor funded NGO).
- Avoiding funding initiatives that equals “capacity building” with training, or that propose training as a way to strengthen organisations.
- Fostering organisational, institutional and social change within CSOs, rather than the simple skill development.
- Supporting the identification and testing of sustainability models adapted to different scales of action, with the aim to reduce dependency on external donors (both international and national).
- Avoiding the use of “grant scheme” as the only modality of support and test new modalities, including those involving intermediate and local skilled NGOs to engage with CBOs mentoring them and incubating them.
- Reducing the focus on “financial risk” in activities that are aimed at capacity building or at CSO development.
- Avoiding the confusion of objectives - particularly avoid confusing poverty alleviation objectives with CSO development objectives, when these objectives are in the same action it should be clear which are achieved - and clarifying the theory of change of the activities of CSO.
- Supporting strategy setting and institutional development at the different levels.

Recommendations concerning the fostering of CSOs participation in public life, policy dialogue and governance

- Supporting CSOs initiatives that engage with public authorities in carrying out right-based activities and/or governance and social accountability actions.
- Supporting the adoption of a local development approach, actively involving all the stakeholders on the considered area and avoiding geographical dispersion of actions (that involves working at sub-governorate level).
- Supporting communication, networking and the development of platforms among CSOs and between them and public entities at different levels (for instance by supporting the development of “thematic clusters” for engaging in local development and urban management).
- Avoiding supporting short projects (even if funding is very small, longer duration of activities produce stronger impact, allow for the development of trust among stakeholders, and limit risks related to bureaucracy and to the complexity of regulations).
- Avoiding supporting initiatives that do not foresee any engagement with public authorities, particularly when concerning social services, health and education.
- Avoiding the use of one single approach at different levels: diversity among CSOs is not only related to their resource management capacity, but to their functions and their constitutive dynamics (thus for instance grants schemes can induce competition instead of facilitating cooperation, and excessive control and risk management orientation hinder small local initiatives).
- Supporting innovation and its dissemination at the different levels, by diversifying approaches and modalities in order to be able to use the most appropriate and adapted ones.

Recommendations concerning the fostering the development of an enabling environment for CSOs

- Fostering the recognition of the diversities among CSOs and of the fact that they play different roles and functions (forcing CSOs to engage in one only function or role produces damages).
- Fostering the integration among the functions related to service delivery, local development, rights, policy dialogue and governance.
- Supporting the identification and testing of entry points for policy dialogue and for a stronger and multidimensional engagement among CSOs and public entities.
- Strengthening public actors' capacities to deal with CSOs, at the different levels.
- Fostering Communication, networking and platforms among CSOs and between them and public entities at different levels (for instance by supporting the development of "thematic clusters" for engaging in local development and urban management).

Annex 1 – The indicators used in the MTE

Indicators for the analysis of the programme

EVALUTATION CRITERIA	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	INDICATORS
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent the action focus on the issues related to CSO engagement in development in Egypt? - To what extent the action provides an answer to the problems identified as basis for setting the action objectives? - To what extent the action considers the issues that emerge at local level and that the stakeholders recognise? 	Presence of objectives and actions focusing on factors that influence the socio-economic conditions at community and regional level
		Presence of objectives and actions focusing on factors influencing the participation of CSOs in local development and development policy setting, implementation and monitoring at local/grassroots level
		Presence of objectives and actions focusing on factors influencing the adoption of right-based approach by CSOs
		Presence of objectives and actions focusing on factors influencing the trust among CSOs, public authorities and private sector
		Presence of issues or problems related to CSO participation to development, particularly at local level, that are recognised by local stakeholders but are not considered in the projects' design
		Coherence between the identified objectives and the identified actions at project level
		Coherence between the identified objectives and the features of implemented actions at project level
		Coherence between the identified objectives and the implementation and governance mechanisms at project level
		Internal coherence of logical framework (coherence between objectives, expected results, activities, resources)
		Effectiveness
Correspondence between actual outputs and expected results/output		
Correspondence between actual beneficiaries and expected beneficiaries (both quantitatively and qualitatively)		
Actual functioning of implementation, management and steering mechanisms (including: management structure, steering committee, direction and coordination, M&E)		
Emerging obstacles and risk factors		
Emerging facilitation/supporting factors		
Coherence between the objectives and actions identified in project design and the implementation plans defined after project start (including the comparison among LF)		
Coherence among the planned modalities for partnership setting and the actual partnership processes emerging in project implementation		
Plans, activities and resources identified for the implementation of the project during the final period		
Compliance of visibility and communication activities with EU guidelines		
Existing communication and visibility plan		
Coherence between the designed and the actual communication and visibility activities		
The reach of the communication activities in comparison with planning		
Efficiency	- To what extent needed economic	Timeliness and delays in financial resources

EVALUTATION CRITERIA	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	INDICATORS
	<p>resources have been available for project implementation in the due time? Which factors influenced such situation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent available resources respond to emerging needs? Are there resources that would be not used or – on the contrary – resource shortage? - To what extent the programme has been leveraging additional resources, for supporting project activities and for widening their impact? - To what extent resource management, project day-to-day management, and steering mechanisms have adequately supported project operation? Which factors influenced the identified situation? 	<p>availability</p> <p>Presence of functioning administrative and financial management mechanisms at central and local level</p> <p>Resources that are expected to be not spent, and their foreseen utilisation</p> <p>Activities that suffer a shortage of resources</p> <p>Obstacles met regarding the availability and use of resources and how they have been overcome</p> <p>Ratio between the resource spent for project implementation and those spent for management and administrative functions</p> <p>Additional resources that have been leveraged in support of the project activities</p> <p>Availability of a functioning monitoring mechanism concerning the use of resources and the management of activities</p>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent conditions exists for assuring the continuity of the funding and support activities carried out by the 4 main implementing NGOs and their main partners? - To what extent conditions exists for assuring the continuity of the work of GROs and of their micro-projects? 	<p>Existence of defined exit strategies for the main 4 INGOs supported projects</p> <p>Existence of defined exit strategies for the funded micro-projects</p> <p>Activities actually in process for implementing the exit strategies at different levels</p> <p>Resources already identified for assuring the continuity of activities at the different levels</p> <p>International, private and public actors mobilised at the different levels for supporting the continuity of activities and of their outcome (see above partners and additional leveraged resources)</p> <p>Presence of mechanisms and resources that will allow supported GRO to maintain the organisational and management mechanisms set up in the framework of project implementation (ex. permanent human resources, permanent funding sources, income from economic activities, etc.)</p>
Early signs of impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there undesired effects and consequences produced at local level, regarding the relationships among stakeholders and the social, environmental and economic setting? - Are there visible changes in the local social, political, economic and physical (natural and man-made environment)? - Are there visible changes at the national and regional level that can be connected to the action and that concerns CSOs institutional capacities and relationships; the relationships between CSOs, the state and private sector; CSO related policies? - To what extent likely impact has been enlarged by the visibility and communication measures set up in the framework of the projects? 	<p>Changes in the relationships among CSOs at national level (conflicts, cooperation, etc.), looking also at networking and resource/knowledge sharing mechanisms or initiatives</p> <p>Changes in the relationships among the CSOs involved in the project implementation at national and local level (including networking and resource/knowledge sharing mechanisms or initiatives)</p> <p>Organisational changes within CSOs involved in the project at the different level (change of institutional mechanisms and leadership, adoption of new approaches, adoption of new equipment, increase of permanent staff, change in the membership, etc.)</p> <p>Changes in the interaction between the CSOs and local authorities (local governors, local MoSS offices, etc.) for the organisations involved in the project</p> <p>Changes in the interaction between the CSOs and local authorities (local governors, local MoSS offices, etc.) for organisations not involved in the project</p> <p>Changes in the interaction between the CSOs and national authorities (MoSS, Ministry of Interiors, etc.) for the organisations involved in the project, including the permanent elimination of administrative obstacles hindering CSO activities</p>

EVALUTATION CRITERIA	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	INDICATORS
		<p>Changes in the interaction between the CSOs and national authorities (MoSS, Ministry of Interiors, etc.) for organisations not involved in the project, including the formulation of amendments to existing regulatory framework, the change in bureaucratic processes, and the setting of new programmes involving CSOs by authorities</p> <p>Changes in the relationships among CSOs and private sector at different levels</p> <p>New dialogue spaces set up in a permanent way at different level</p> <p>Permanent – long-term changes in economic activities in the local areas where the project is implemented (ex. new businesses, change in technologies, establishment of new business links, etc.)</p> <p>Permanent – long-term changes in access to social services at local level where the project is implemented (ex. new service facilities set by public institutions or other entities, adoption of new targeting mechanisms, adoption of new service delivery mechanisms, etc.)</p> <p>Permanent – long-term changes in natural and environmental management and setting in the local areas where the project is implemented (ex. new areas developed for agriculture, land distribution to farmers, land titles delivery, new water sources and water access opportunities, reduction in pollution levels, etc.)</p>
EU added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent visibility and communication measures contribute to EU cooperation and policies? - To what extent the action contribute to EU / EU member states policies and actions related to CS engagement in development and policy in term of operational synergies? - To what extent the action contribute to EU / EU member states policies and actions related to CS engagement in development and policy in term of knowledge? 	<p>Target reached by communication and visibility actions</p> <p>Presence of visibility and communication actions focusing on EU contribution/cooperation with Egypt</p> <p>Presence of visibility and communication actions focusing on EU engagement with CSOs</p> <p>Presence of visibility and communication actions focusing on CS dynamics</p> <p>Presence of visibility and communication actions focusing on the subject matter of interventions (including socio-economic conditions and processes and exercise of rights)</p> <p>Synergies with EU projects supporting CSOs (thematic, bilateral or regional initiatives)</p> <p>Synergies with EU member states projects supporting CSOs</p> <p>New knowledge and best practices identified in the framework of project implementation</p> <p>Policy recommendations defined through project implementation for EU/EU member states CSO support initiatives</p>
Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent the action is coherent with EU / EU member states policies related to cooperation with Egypt, to the regional cooperation, and to the engagement with CS 	<p>Inclusion within the projects of actions / organisational mechanisms / other features contributing to EU roadmap priorities</p> <p>Inclusion within the projects of actions / organisational mechanisms / other features contributing to EU Country strategy and programmes (NIP, etc.)</p> <p>Inclusion within the projects of actions / organisational mechanisms / other features relevant in relation to EU global policies on engagement with CS</p> <p>Inclusion within the projects of actions / organisational mechanisms / other features relevant in relation to EU regional policies</p>

Indicators for the analysis of the small-projects

Relevance	The action strengthens the capacities of involved CSOs	Institutional capacity and individual capacities are targeted, producing changes in strategy and governance	5	
		Institutional capacities or individual capacities are targeted, inducing improvements in CSO functioning	4	
		Capacity strengthening activities only focus on individual skills, influencing just project management	3	
		Capacity strengthening activities do not generate visible impact on the involved CSO	2	
		There are not visible actions strengthening the capacities of involved CSOs	1	
	The action improves engagement on rights and governance	The action engage the CSO together with other actors in local governance and in improving recognition and exercise of rights	5	
		The action engage the CSO in improving recognition and exercise of rights or in improving governance	4	
		The action engage the CSO in improving the exercise of rights	3	
		The action engage the CSO in creating awareness on rights	2	
		The action does not focus rights neither governance	1	
	The action improves engagement with other CSOs	The action include the establishment of new partnerships with other CSOs	5	
		The action improve existing partnership among CSOs	4	
		The action include informal cooperation among CSOs	3	
		The action include coordination among CSOs	2	
		The action does not include coordination or partnership among CSOs	1	
	The action improves engagement with public authorities	The action include the establishment of new partnerships with public authorities	5	
		The action improve existing partnership with public authorities	4	
		The action include informal cooperation with public authorities	3	
		The action include coordination with public authorities	2	
		The action does not include coordination or partnership with public authorities	1	
	The action improves engagement with other actors	The action includes the establishment of new partnerships with other actors (private sector, etc.)	5	
		The action improves existing partnership with other actors (private sector, etc.)	4	
		The action includes informal cooperation with other actors (private sector, etc.)	3	
		The action includes coordination with other actors (private sector, etc.)	2	
		The action does not include coordination or partnership with other actors (private sector, etc.)	1	
	The action improves local coordination or governance mechanisms	New local coordination and governance mechanisms are established in cooperation with public authorities and other actors	5	
		Existing local coordination and governance mechanisms are improved	4	
		New local coordination and governance mechanisms are established with CSOs	3	
		Existing local coordination and governance mechanisms involving CSOs are improved	2	
		Local coordination and governance mechanisms are not considered in the action	1	
	Effectiveness	Activities have been carried out	All activities have been carried out without changes	5
			All activities have been carried out without major changes	4

		Activities have been carried out with major changes	3
		Activities have been just partially carried out	2
		Most activities were not carried out	1
	Activities produced expected outputs	All activities produced expected outputs	5
		Outputs have been produced without major changes	4
		Major changes concern expected outputs	3
		Outputs have been just partially produced	2
		Most outputs were not produced	1
	Activities achieved expected results	All activities produced expected results	5
		Results have been produced with small changes	4
		Major changes concern expected results	3
		Results have been just partially achieved	2
		Most results were not produced	1
Efficiency	Activities have been carried out according to planning	All activities have been carried out according to plans	5
		All activities have been with minor changes in plans	4
		Activities required changes in planning	3
		Plans changed in their main features	2
		Planning was not respected at all and was not adapted	1
	Outputs have been achieved in planned time	All outputs have been produced out according to plans	5
		Outputs have been produced with minor changes in plans	4
		Producing outputs required changes in planning	3
		Plans changed in their main features	2
		Planning was not respected at all and was not adapted	1
	Activities have been carried out without requesting additional resources or efforts	All activities have been carried out without additional resources	5
		Additional efforts were needed without affecting activities	4
		Activities needed minor changes because of additional resource needs	3
		Activities needed major changes because of additional resource needs	2
		Activities were not implemented because of additional resource needs	1
	Activities did not experience major delays	All activities have been carried out without delays	5
		Small delays were experienced not requiring a change in activities	4
		Minor changes in activities were necessary because of delays	3
		Activities needed major changes because delays	2
		Activities were not implemented because of delays	1
Sustainability	Clear and relevant exist strategies exist	Strategies are clearly defined and based on realistic assumptions or on existing mechanisms	5
		Strategies are clearly defined, but assumptions and mechanisms would not result in total sustainability	4
		Strategies are not clearly defined or are based on uncertain assumptions	3
		Strategies are not defined clearly or are based on unrealistic assumptions	2
		There are not formal or informal sustainability strategies	1
	Project activities continue after the end of the project	Project activities are continuing after the end of the project and do not require inputs from external donors	5
		Project activities are expected to be maintained after the end of the project without inputs from external donors	4
		Project activities are continuing after the end of the project, requiring inputs from external donors	3
		Project activities are expected to be maintained after the end of the project, inputs from external donors would need to be looked	2

		Project activities are not continuing after the end of the project	1
	A 2nd phase was planned without EU resources	A second phase of the project is foreseen based on internal mechanisms, not requiring external inputs	5
		A second phase of the project is foreseen based on identified external inputs or existing agreements	4
		A second phase of the project is foreseen based on assumptions concerning access to external inputs from actors different from EU	3
		A second phase of the project is foreseen based on specific actions aimed at obtaining additional inputs from EU	2
		A second phase of the project would be possible only with access to additional inputs from EU, still not defined	1
		Support from other actors is visible	Support from other actors contributed to project activities to an important extent
	Support from other actors contributed to project activities to a small extent		4
	Support from other actors contributes to activities that are additional to those constituting the main project action		3
	Support from other actors was not contributing to the project		2
	Support from other actors was not even considered in project design or implementation		1
Impact	Strengthening of the involved CSO	CSO changed its strategies, governance and functioning mechanisms	5
		CSO is introducing important innovations concerning its strategies, governance or functioning mechanisms	4
		CSO is introducing small changes concerning its strategies, governance or functioning mechanisms	3
		Small changes have been or will be introduced concerning available resources and equipment	2
		No changes are visible or expected	1
	Improvement of rights exercise	Both exercise and recognition of rights improved for citizens at local level	5
		Exercise of rights improved for specific groups of people at local level	4
		Recognition of rights improved for specific groups of people at local level	3
		Awareness on the rights of specific groups of people increased at local level	2
		No changes in the recognition or exercise of rights are visible	1
	Improvement of beneficiaries' economic conditions	Economic conditions improved permanently changing the livelihood of beneficiaries	5
		Economic conditions improved permanently improving slightly the livelihood of beneficiaries	4
		Temporary improvements of the livelihood of beneficiaries are visible	3
		Temporary income is produced for beneficiaries without visible change in the livelihood	2
		Nor improvements of economic conditions are visible	1
	Improvement of beneficiaries' social conditions	Social status of beneficiary improved permanently to a large extent	5
		Social conditions improved permanently improving slightly the social status of beneficiaries	4
		Temporary improvements of the social conditions of beneficiaries are visible	3
		Temporary improvement is produced in access and participation in social life for beneficiaries	2
		Nor improvements of social conditions are visible	1
	Reduction of CSO divide between service delivery/rights	CSOs directly involved in the action integrate in strategic way service delivery action and	5

		rights/policy engagement	
		CSOs directly involved in the action occasionally integrate service delivery action and rights/policy engagement	4
		CSOs directly involved in the action engage permanently both in service delivery action and rights/policy or governance activities	3
		CSOs directly involved in the action occasionally engage in service delivery action and rights/policy or governance activities	2
		CSOs directly involved in the action only engage in service delivery action	1
	Improvement of trust among local actors	Change are visible in the trust level among all development actors, resulting in new partnerships or actions	5
		Changes in trust level are visible, but just involve improved communication	4
		Small changes in trust level are recognised by all involved actors, but do not determinate change in behaviours or action	3
		Small changes in trust level are just recognised by some involved actors, but are not visible to the others	2
		No change is visible or recognised by involved actors	1
	Improvement of local physical environment	Large permanent improvements have been produced in local environmental conditions	5
		Small permanent improvements have been produced in local environmental conditions	4
		Large temporary improvement have been produced in local environmental conditions	3
		Small temporary improvement have been produced in local environmental conditions	2
		No visible improvement have been produced in local environmental conditions	1
	Innovation of CSO activities/organisation/governance	Radical innovation have been introduced in the activities and in the internal governance of involved CSOs	5
		Incremental innovation have been introduced in the activities and in the internal governance of involved CSOs	4
		Processes for innovating activities or the internal governance have been initiated in the of involved CSOs	3
		New technologies or new equipment have been introduced by involved CSOs	2
		No innovation is visible	1
EU Added value	Production of knowledge	Knowledge is formally defined and available for the public	5
		Knowledge is formally defined and available for the stakeholders of the programme	4
		Knowledge is formally defined and available for the project implementing organisation	3
		Knowledge is still not formally defined and available, but information is available	2
		No knowledge or information was produced	1
	Innovation of practices	New practices have been identified, are formally defined and can be disseminate to the public	5
		New practices have been identified, are formally defined and have been shared among programme stakeholders	4
		New practices have been identified, are formally defined and have been shared within the project implementing organisation	3
		New practices have been identified, but are not formally defined	2
		No new practices have been identified	1

	Support to other EU actions	Synergies have been identified and implemented with other EU actions	5
		Action coordination exists with other EU actions	4
		Knowledge produced is shared with other EU actions	3
		Information exchange exists with other EU actions	2
		No linkages exist with any other EU actions	1
EU Coherence	Coherence with EU Strategies (enabling environment, participation to policy dialogue/governance, networking, knowledge management, advocacy...)	The project contribute to all priorities included in EU strategies	5
		The project contribute to at least some of priorities included in EU strategies	4
		All priorities identified in EU strategies have been included in project design, but not visible contribution is visible	3
		Some priorities identified in EU strategies have been included in project design, but not visible contribution is visible	2
		There are no linkages between project design and EU strategies	1

Annex 2 - Documentary references and sources

ACF Egypt, Signed Contract, Grassroots Socioeconomic Programme for Local Communities Development Clusters in Egypt - 'GRASP Egypt', 26 July 2016

ACF, Egypt: 37 grant agreements signed with grassroots organisations in Luxor, (06/12/17) (www.accioncontraelhambre.org/en/egypt-37-grant-agreements-signed-grassroots-organisations-Luxor)

ACF, Interim financial report, Grassroots Socioeconomic Programme for Local Communities Development Clusters in Egypt - 'GRASP Egypt', 26 September 2017

ACF, Interim narrative report, Grassroots Socioeconomic Programme for Local Communities Development Clusters in Egypt - 'GRASP Egypt', 26 September 2017

ACF, Project of social and economic development of local communities through NGOs – “GRASP Egypt” (08/09/17) (www.accioncontraelhambre.org/en/project-social-and-economic-development-local-communities-through-NGOs-grasp-egypt)

Alexandria and Baheira Governorates (ENPI/2016/374-380). Summary of Progress of the Action, 26 July 2017

CARE, Interim Financial Report. Towards socio-economic wellbeing and women empowerment in Upper Egypt (Hayat Kareema) (Grant Contract No: ENPI/2016/374-374), 30 April 2018

CARE, Interim Narrative Report. Towards socio-economic wellbeing and women empowerment in Upper Egypt (Hayat Kareema) (Grant Contract No: ENPI/2016/374-374), Interim Narrative Report. Reporting period: 27 April 2016 – 31 March 2017

CARE, Interim Narrative Report. Towards socio-economic wellbeing and women empowerment in Upper Egypt (Hayat Kareema) (Grant Contract No: ENPI/2016/374-374), Reporting period: May 2017 – April 2018

CARE, Signed Contract, EN PI/2016/374-374, Towards socio-economic wellbeing and women empowerment in Upper Egypt (Hayat Kareema), 18 April 2016

Concord, CONCORD EU Delegations Report 2017. Towards a more effective partnership with civil society, 2017

Concord, EU Funding Delivery Mechanisms. New trends in Europeaid funding and what they mean for CSOs,

EuropeAid/132633/C/SER/Multi, Specific Terms of Reference. Communication and Visibility of the Socio-Economic Development and Civil Society Support Programme (Egypt). Framework Contract COM 2013 – Lot 7 Governance and Home Affairs

EuropeAid/132633/C/SER/Multi, Specific Terms of Reference. Mid-Term Evaluation. Supporting Civil Society Support in socio-economic development at local level (Egypt). Framework Contract COM 2013 – Lot 7 Governance and Home Affairs

European Commission, A new response to a changing Neighbourhood. Joint Communication to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions, 2011

European Commission, Addendum No 2 to the Financing Agreement No ENPI/20112/024-570, ENPI/20112/024-571, ENPI/20112/024-572. Socio-economic development and civil society support programme, 12/01/2017

European Commission, An Agenda for Change, 2014

European Commission, Annex to the Commission Decision on the Socio-economic development and civil society support programme in Egypt under the SPRING programme. Action Fiche for Egypt, 26 September 2011

European Commission, Commission Implementing Decision of 17.12.2015, modifying the Decision C(2014) 7170 adopting a Single Support Frame 2014 – 2016

European Commission, Commission Implementing Decision of 26/09/2011, Support for partnership, reforms and inclusive growth (SPRING) 2011-2012 in favour of the southern Neighbourhood region to be financed under Article 19 08 01 01 of the general budget of the European Union

European Commission, EU Country Roadmaps for Engagement with Civil Society, June 2017

European Commission, EU response to the Arab Spring: the SPRING Programme. MEMO/11/636, Brussels, 27 September 2011

European Commission, Financing Agreement No ENPI/20112/024-570, ENPI/20112/024-571, ENPI/20112/024-572. Socio-economic development and civil society support programme, 02/12/2013

European Commission, Socio Economic Development and Civil Society Support Programme Component 3: Supporting civil society in socio-economic development at local level. Guidelines for grant applicants. Budget line: 21.035100. Reference: EuropeAid/150362/DD/ACT/EG, (15/7/2015)

European Commission, [The roots of democracy and sustainable development: Europe's engagement with civil society in external relations \(COM\(2012\)0492\)](#)

European Neighbourhood Instrument, Egypt. Memorandum of understanding between the European Union and the Arab Republic of Egypt regarding the Single Support Framework 2014 – 2015 (14/3/2015)

European Neighbourhood Instrument, Egypt. Memorandum of understanding between the European Union and the Arab Republic of Egypt regarding the Single Support Framework 2017 – 2020 (14/3/2015)

European Parliament – Directorate-General for External Policies, A stable Egypt for a stable region: Socio-economic challenges and prospects, DROI – 2017

European Parliament – Directorate-General for External Policies, Shrinking space for civil society: the EU response, 2018

European Parliament, DG for external policies, Policy Department, *Shrinking space for civil society: the EU response*, 2017

European Union, Support for partnership, reforms and inclusive growth (SPRING) 2011- 2012 in favour of the southern Neighbourhood region to be financed under Article 19 08 01 01 of the general budget of the European Union, COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING DECISION of 26/09/2011

Hélène Michou, EU-Egypt Bilateral Relations. June 2016, EuroMed Rights (Tunis)

<https://care.org.eg/>

<https://www.facebook.com/Egyptianngosupport/>

<https://www.facebook.com/hayatkareema/>

<https://www.facebook.com/SCEgypt/>

Khalid El Ashmawy, The social and economic empowerment of women in Egypt: toward a new development paradigm, Egypt Network for Integrated Development, 2016

Mohamed Elgati, Foreign Funding in Egypt, AFA – FRIDE, HIVos, 2013

NGO Support Centre – Save The Children, The Sub-Grants Operational Manual of The Strengthening Local Actors for Socio Economic Development Project, Cairo, March 2018

Plan Danmark, Children and Youth Socio-Economic Development Fund. Supporting grassroots CSOs for area-based interventions in the poorest villages of Qena and Sohag (<http://webbase.cisu.dk/Bevilling/Detail/16-1792-EU-apr?parentUrl=>)

Plan Danmark, Interim financial report. Children and Youth Socio-Economic Development Fund. Supporting grassroots CSOs for area-based interventions in the poorest villages of Qena and Sohag, 31 March 2017

Plan Danmark, Interim narrative report. Children and Youth Socio-Economic Development Fund. Supporting grassroots CSOs for area-based interventions in the poorest villages of Qena and Sohag, 31 March 2017

Plan Danmark, Narrative report. Children and Youth Socio-Economic Development Fund. Supporting grassroots CSOs for area-based interventions in the poorest villages of Qena and Sohag, 31 March 2018

Plan Danmark, Signed Contract. Children and Youth Socio-Economic Development Fund. Supporting grassroots CSOs for area-based interventions in the poorest villages of Qena and Sohag, 13 April 2016

Reham Rizk, Hala Abou-Ali, Informality and socio-economic well-being of women in Egypt, ERF - The Economic Research Forum, 2015

Roadmap Facility, 2017 "EU country Roadmaps for engagement with CSOs", Brussels, European Union

Save the Children Italia, Strengthening local actors for socio economic development. Assiut, Sohag, Alexandria and Baheira Governorates (ENPI/2016/374-380). Amended Description of the Action, 2016

Save the Children Italia, Strengthening local actors for socio economic development. Assiut, Sohag, Alexandria and Baheira Governorates (ENPI/2016/374-380). Amended Budget, 2016

Save the Children Italia, Strengthening local actors for socio economic development. Assiut, Sohag, Alexandria and Baheira Governorates (ENPI/2016/374-380). Amended Logic Framework, 2016

Save the Children Italia, Strengthening local actors for socio economic development. Assiut, Sohag, Alexandria and Baheira Governorates (ENPI/2016/374-380). Explanatory Note Addendum, 2016

Save the Children Italia, Strengthening local actors for socio economic development. Assiut, Sohag, Alexandria and Baheira Governorates (ENPI/2016/374-380). Interim Narrative Report, 26 May 2017

Save the Children, The sub-grant manual for NGOs. Strengthening local actors for socio economic development. Assiut, Sohag, Alexandria and Baheira Governorates (ENPI/2016/374-380)

Save the Children, Lists of selected grass-root NGOs in the targeted governorates. Strengthening local actors for socio economic development. Assiut, Sohag, Alexandria and Baheira Governorates (ENPI/2016/374-380)

Save the Children, List of proposed interventions/initiatives by the grass-root NGOs in the targeted governorates classified by sector. Strengthening local actors for socio economic development. Assiut, Sohag, Alexandria and Baheira Governorates (ENPI/2016/374-380)

Save the Children, List of trainings offered to NGOs, Government, and Private Sector partners. Strengthening local actors for socio economic development. Assiut, Sohag, Alexandria and Baheira Governorates (ENPI/2016/374-380)

Save the Children, The communication plan. Strengthening local actors for socio economic development. Assiut, Sohag, Alexandria and Baheira Governorates (ENPI/2016/374-380)

Yousri Moustafa, Enabling environment for Civil Society in the Arab Region, NPA – SIDA, 2017

Annex 3 –Stakeholders consulted

Stakeholders representatives and key informants in Cairo

Name	Organisation	Position	Contact
Kareem Adel	Action Against Hunger	Programme Manager	kmohamed@ay.acfspain.org
Lucia Oliveira	Action Against Hunger	Country Director	loliveira@ey.acfspain.org
Mariana Pinto	CARE Osterreich	Regional Programme Manager	Mariana.pinto@care.at
Hazem Fahmy	CARE International in Egypt	Country Director	Hazem.Fahmy@care.org
Howaida Nagy	CARE International in Egypt	Initiatives Manager	Howaida.nagy@care.org
Osama Youssef Abdou	CARE International in Egypt	Agriculture and Natural Resources Programme Director	Osama.abdou@care.org
Samar Mahmoud Al-Ahdal	Ministry of Investment and International Cooperation	Responsible for the Cooperation with European Union & Austria European Sector	sabdelwahed@miic.gov.eg
Ashraf Eid	Save the Children	Responsible for rural development projects	Ashraf.eid@savethechildren.org
Kevin Fitzcharles	Save the Children	Country director	Kevin.fitzcharles@savethechildren.org
Khaled El Sayed	Save the Children	Programme coordinator	khaled.elsayed@savethechildren.org
Iva Tanku	PLAN	Program quality and Delivery Manager	iva.tanku@plan-international.org
Mohamed Gaballah	PLAN	Project director	Mohamed.Gadallah@plan-international.org
Yasmine Refai	CARE International in Egypt	Documentation, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	Yasmine.refai@care.org
Maurizio Giachero	European Union Delegation in Cairo	Programme manager	Maurizio.Giachero@eeas.europa.eu
Giovanna Ceglie	UNIDO	Regional director	G.CEGLIE@unido.org
Sally Girgis	UNIDO	Programme Officer in Sohag and Qena	S.GIRGIS@unido.org
Giuliana Sardo	COSPE	Deputy Country representative	giuliana.sardo@cospe.org
Georges Drouet	Consultant – ARS	Responsible of Communication and Visibility activities for SPRING Component 3	pi@3-1416.org
Doua Hussein	Consultant Gender and Development		h.douaa@gmail.com
Felice Longobardi	AICS	Director of the Cairo Office	felice.longobardi@aics.gov.it
Angela Lella	AICS	Programme officer	angela.lella@esteri.it

List of Stakeholders Interviewed during the Field Mission

Location	INGO	Name of CBO	Project Name/Description	Persons involved in the meetings
Luxor	ACF	Raed		Haitham Abdel Azim Roaya Amer Mohamed Saber
Luxor	ACF	Rowad El Mostakbal/Mahameed	Nutrition and awareness to Pregnant women	Ayman Rashwan Sherren Tantawy Eman Youssef Evon Fakhoury Warda Ahmed Shaimaa Abdel Reheem Ola Abd raboh Asmaa Abd Raboh Hanaa Abd El Maksoud

				Asmaa Mahmoud Rehab Ayman
Luxor	ACF	Islamic Charitable Organization	Environmental/agricultural recycling (recycling sugar cane waste)	Fathy El-Shazly Abdel Dayem El Dardiri
Luxor	ACF	Women and Child CDA in Rozaygat	Textile production unit	Emad Abo Bakr Mohamed Youssef Gihan Atiya Ahlam Abdel Gawad Sabah Mostafa Ayat Mohamed
Luxor	ACF	Islamic Youth Association	Waste Management collection	Ahmed Mohamed Mahmoud Mohamed
Luxor	ACF	Charitable Islamic Care	Goat Raising	Gamal El-Din Mahmoud Abdel Sameea
Luxor	ACF	El Ber w El Rahma	Beehive management and Honey production	Boghdady Mohamed Hussein Eman Ramadan
Luxor	MoSS	Luxor District	Officer responsible for NGO follow up	Samia Mohamed
Luxor	MoSS	Armant District	Officer responsible for NGO follow up	Hussein El-Daw
Luxor	ACF	Nile Palace Charitable	Textile and Carpets Production	Atiyat Khairy Sara Ahmed Mona Salem
Luxor	ACF	El-Masry Association for Training and Development	Training on crafts and vocations	Mostafa Batiti Heba Fathy Khaled Nahas
Luxor	ACF	El-Masry Association for Training and Development	Focus Group with End-Beneficiaries	(12 participants) soap making; wood work; electronics maintenance
Luxor	MoSS	Esna District	Officer responsible for NGO follow up	Ahmed Abeed
Qena	Plan	El-Awary Association	Promoting Children Rights and Women's awareness	Hoda El-Awary Mahmoud Shafik Ahmed Hussein Akram Mohamed
Qena	Plan	El-Awary Association	Focus Group with End-Beneficiaries	Mothers of children who participated and women who received training (20 women)
Qena	Plan	El-Awary Association	Focus Group with End-Beneficiaries	Performance and open discussion by children who attended the programme
Qena	Plan	Community Development Association – Hegaza	Supporting women in learning carpentry and producing furniture for export	Ahmed Moussa Abeer Mohamed Salah Ahmed Fawzy Ahmed Fatma Ahmed
Qena	Plan	Community Development Association – Hegaza	Focus Group with End-Beneficiaries	Discussion with the girls and women engaged (7 women/girls)
Qena	Plan	Nour Foundation	Promoting the rights and integration of people with special needs including employment creation	Nagah Hashem Samah Anwar Moemen Hassan Fatma Hashem
Qena	Plan	Nour Foundation	Focus Group with End-Beneficiaries	Discussion with trained and employed people
Qena	Plan	Environment and Development Association – Dandara	Illiteracy eradication and employment creation through training	Hassab Allah Mohamed Yasser Abdel Mawgood Heba Mona Khaed Mohamed Souma Hassan
Sohag	Plan	Horus Association	Promoting children rights and literacy	Nashat Fakhry Ibrahim Gaid
Sohag	Plan	Agriculture Development Association	Promoting children rights and literacy (theater production on rights)	Hussein Ali Mahmoud Michel Nagdy Khalifa Shehata
Sohag	Plan	Nour El-Islam Association	Waste management and introduction of fees for	Sheikh Khalaf Hussein Mohamed Gamal

			citizens + children club to learn about the environment	Yousra Khalaf
Sohag	Plan	Nour El-Islam Association	Focus Group with End-Beneficiaries	Discussion with workers who joined the waste management collection team
Sohag	Plan	Tatweer for Development	Training young people and women with employment creation	Wael Abo Rehab Ahmed Mohamed Sayyed Marwa Mahmoud
Sohag	Save the Children	Sohbet Kheir	Umbrella NGO	Representatives of various projects
Sohag	Save the Children	Women and Children protection Association	Umbrella NGO	Representatives of various projects
Assiut	CARE	Beity for Community Development	Training and job placement for marginalized women	Randa Refat Eman Mohamed
Assiut	CARE	Agriculture Cooperative Nawara	Bought a tractor and rent it out to small farmers	Salah El-Din Ali
Assiut	CARE	Community Development in Sahel Selim	Education and Women Empowerment	Marwa Ali Shaimaa Shawky Eman Nabil Rabab Mahmoud
Assiut	CARE	Future Development Association	Community Monitoring	Rahma Taman Mohamed Hussein Essam Khalifa
Assiut	CARE	Future Development Association	Community Monitoring	FGD with youth engaged in community monitoring
Assiut	CARE	Ataa Without Limits	Partner NGO	Nasser Hamdy
Alexandria	Save the Children	Woman and Development	Umbrella NGO	Various projects
Alexandria	Save the Children	Isharaket Amal	Umbrella NGO	Various projects
Alexandria	Save the Children	Family Planning Association	Umbrella NGO	Various projects
Beni Sueif	CARE	Environmental Protection Union	Community Monitoring	Focus group Discussion with youth engaged in the activity
Beni Sueif	CARE	Environmental Protection Union	Community Monitoring	Tarek Abdel Gelil Samir Sayed Mohamed Kamal Perihan Mohamed Salwa Ahmed Walaa Mohamed
Beni Sueif	CARE	Ayadi El-Kheir Association	Duck raising and production/trading + training and job placement in export packaging facility	Hamdy Salah Waleed Salah Sherif Khalil Anwar Nabil Manal Naguib Ayman Sobeih Said Hanafy Nagwa Abdel Moneim
Beni Sueif	CARE	Agricultural Cooperative	Establishment of a veterinarian health centre for live cattle	Salwa Ghanem Abdel Al Sadek Abbas Abdel Fatah Mohamed Abdel Al Hala Ibrahim Mahmoud Mostafa.

Annex 4 – Profiles of the evaluators

Gianfrancesco COSTANTINI

Gianfrancesco Costantini has 30 years of experience on research and technical assistance on issues related to civil society and local authorities' participation development policies, focusing on issues like partnership, policy and multi-stakeholders dialogue, governance innovation. Mr. Costantini experience includes working in research, as well as in project, programme and policy identification, formulation, monitoring & evaluation, log-frame elaboration and development of indicators for measuring project/programmes performance as well as to analyse social processes. Key areas of expertise for Mr. Costantini include the design and implementation of mapping studies, particularly focusing on CSOs, other NSA (such as private and informal sector and research institutions) and LAs: over 10 mapping studies have been carried out in last 5 years in Africa, Middle East, East Asia, Austral, Central and East Africa and Central America.

Organisation development and knowledge management, brokering processes and information dissemination dynamics among civil society organisations and in local authorities have been the focus of several projects, carried out since 1985. Most projects carried out include communication activities, including through electronic means and social media, seminar, e-conferences and workshops and Mr. Costantini has been actively involved in the design, management and coordination of these activities.

Mr. Costantini activities have been carried out Worldwide – in many countries of African sub-regions (Sahel and West Africa, Central Africa, East Africa and Austral Africa), Asia, North, South and Central America, Europe and Oceania. Activities have been carried out in collaboration with NGOs at different levels, the European Union (including DEVCO, many EU Delegation and bodies of the EU, including the DG Employ, the DG Research and DG Regional Development), the UN specialised agencies and UNDP, the World Bank, the African Development Bank and Inter-American Development Bank, some bilateral aid agencies.

Nahla HASSAN FOUAD

Nahla Hassan Fouad is an international development consultant with over 15 years of experience in research and evaluation (qualitative research, research design, coordination and implementation), as well as in capacity building of civil society organization and local authorities, institutional development, monitoring and evaluation of international development programmes.

She has a strong understanding of political, civic, gender and socio-economic contexts in the MENA region, as well as an in-depth knowledge of the civil society and grass-root organizations in Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Tunisia and Morocco. Her work has focused on human rights with a focus on women and children rights, refugees and IDPs, as well as on the management of issues related to conflict.

Activities resulted in a strong sectoral knowledge of dynamics related to civil society and local authorities strengthening, institutional development, local governance, labour rights, education, health, child protection, communication and media relations

In recent years, she has been conducting mid-term and final project evaluations in Egypt, Jordan, Tunisia, Morocco, Iraq, Lebanon and Syria. These experiences allowed for the development of an in-depth knowledge both of EU funding and management mechanisms, and of those of other donors and international aid organisations, including international agencies (ILO, UNODC, UNICEF, etc.), bilateral agencies (GIZ, DANIDA, USAID, Italian Cooperation) and NGOs (StC, CMN- Jordan; Drosos, etc.).

Annex 5 – Terms of Reference

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid-Term Evaluation

Supporting civil society in socio-economic development at local level

FWC BENEFICIARIES 2013 - LOT 7 Governance and Home Affairs EuropeAid/132633/C/SER/multi

Contracting Authority: European Delegation to Egypt

1. BACKGROUND	2
1.1 RELEVANT COUNTRY / REGION / SECTOR BACKGROUND	2
1.2 THE ACTION TO BE EVALUATED	2
1.3 STAKEHOLDERS OF THE ACTION	2
1.4 OTHER AVAILABLE INFORMATION	2
2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT	3
2.1 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	4
2.2 REQUESTED SERVICES	4
2.3 PHASES OF THE EVALUATION AND REQUIRED DELIVERABLES	6
2.4 MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION	9
2.5 LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT	10
3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED AND ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY	10
3.1 NUMBER OF REQUESTED EXPERTS PER CATEGORY AND NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS PER EXPERT OR PER CATEGORY	10
3.2 EXPERTISE REQUIRED	10
3.3 PRESENCE OF MANAGEMENT TEAM FOR BRIEFING AND/OR DEBRIEFING	11
4 LOCATION AND DURATION	11
4.1 STARTING PERIOD	11
4.2 FORESEEN DURATION	11
4.3 PLANNING	11
4.4 LOCATION(S) OF ASSIGNMENT	12
5 REPORTING	12
5.1 CONTENT, TIMING AND SUBMISSION	12
5.2 COMMENTS	12
5.3 LANGUAGE	12
5.4 NUMBER OF COPIES	13
5.5 FORMATTING OF REPORTS	13
6 INCIDENTAL EXPENDITURE	13
7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION	13
ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	14
ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM ...	15
ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..	16
ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE	18
ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID	19

BACKGROUND

1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background

The SPRING programme (Support for Partnership, Reforms and Inclusive Growth) is an instrument made available by the EU to the Southern Neighbourhood partners addressing challenges and opportunities in the context of the changes originated by the Arab Spring.

The focus of the SPRING programme in Egypt, which tops up the ENPI country allocation, is the promotion of a sustainable inclusive growth and economic development. Egypt's SPRING allocation for 2011-2012 amounts to EUR 90 million.

The SPRING Programme in Egypt is structured around the 3 following components:

- 1- Enhancing access of children to education and fighting child labour
- 2- Upgrading Informal Areas in the Greater Cairo Region
- 3- Supporting civil society in socio-economic development at local level

These three components are in line with one of the three sectors of intervention targeted by the Single Support Framework 2014-2015 endorsed by the Arab Republic of Egypt in March 2015. The initiatives funded under this programme complement the actions implemented under Sector I Poverty Alleviation, Local socio-economic development and Social Protection, and more specifically actions supporting socioeconomic development at the local level targeting those most in need through generating and strengthening sustainable economic activities.

1.2 The Action to be evaluated

This specific assignment covers Component 3 of the Programme. The **Socio Economic Development and Civil Society Support Programme** Financing Agreement with an allocation of EUR 10 million was signed on 27 November 2013 between the European Commission and the Ministry of International Cooperation of Egypt. The overall objective of Component 3 is to improve the socio-economic conditions and rights of the poorest and those most in need of the population. Concretely, it aims at improving the socioeconomic conditions of those most in need groups, in particular children exploited through child labour, girls who do not enjoy their rights to education, women-headed households and the poorest segments of the population. It also aims at strengthening the capacity of the civil society organizations, in particular at grass-root level, engaged in community service delivery in rural and less privileged communities, also in support to the rights of those in need and their empowerment in the context of the current transition.

The specific objectives are:

- i) To improve socio-economic conditions in targeted areas through the participation of civil society;
- ii) To establish workable mechanisms needed for the effective participation of grassroots civil society in local development;
- iii) To build on the ongoing efforts to increase mutual trust between civil society, government and the private sector.

1.3 Stakeholders of the Action

Three contracts with an initial operational duration of 2.5 years have been signed end of May 2016 and the implementation has just started. A fourth contract was signed a bit later in July 2016. The total EU contribution allocated to these four contracts is 9.6 MEUR.

- Towards socio-economic wellbeing and women empowerment in Upper Egypt (Hayat Kareema) - CARE - (ENPE2016/374-374)
- Children and Youth Socio-Economic Development Fund - Supporting grassroots CSOs for area-based interventions in the poorest villages of Qena and Sohag - PLAN (ENPI/2016/3 74-3 77)
- Strengthening local actors for socio economic development - Save the Children (ENPI/2016/3 74-3 80)
- Grassroots Socioeconomic Programme for Local Communities Development Clusters in Egypt - 'GRASP Egypt' - Fundación Acción Contra El Hambre - (ENPI/2016/375950)

Contracts' main activities consist of establishing a micro-projects scheme involving financial and technical support to local civil society organisations (CSOs), community development associations (CDAs), grassroots organisations (CBOs) and cooperatives working on socio-economic sectors and of setting up effective partnerships between grassroots CSOs, local authorities and the private sector in the most deprived regions of the country.

Between 350 to 500 micro-projects should be implemented in 7 Governorates (Alexandria, Assiut, Baheira, Beni-Suef, Qena, Luxor and Sohag).

One of the main challenges of the implementation is to develop a harmonised approach and a sound coordination in order to ensure a programme approach vs a project approach.

1.4 Other available information

In August 2017, the Financing Agreement "Socio Economic development and civil society programme" which encompasses the three components of the SPRING programme has been extended and the end date for the implementation phase has been set to 27 May 2020, allowing the four main beneficiaries of component 3 to extend their contracts.

The four NGOs have all been facing delays in implementing their projects and obtaining the necessary approvals from the Ministry of Social Solidarity (MoSS) and would then need a longer implementation time in order to reach the objectives.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

<i>Type of evaluation</i>	<i>mid-term</i>
Coverage	The Action in its entirety
Geographic scope	Egypt
Period to be evaluated	Entire period of the programme

2.1 Purpose of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority²⁶ of the European Commission²⁷. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the quality and the **results**²⁸ of Actions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches**²⁹. From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek to **identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effects links** between inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union and the interested stakeholders with:

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the "Supporting civil society in socio-economic development at local level", paying particular attention to its intermediate results measured against its objectives;
- key lessons and recommendations in order to improve current (if relevant) and future Actions.

In particular, this mid-term evaluation will provide decision-makers in the Government of Egypt and the European Union (EU) with an overall independent assessment presenting sufficient information to make an informed judgement about the performance of the programme (its efficiency, effectiveness and the likelihood for the programme to achieve its stated objectives) and to take decisions about any required adjustments for the last two years of implementation. It will also identify key lessons. The mid-term evaluation mission and the subsequent recommendations of the assignment shall contribute to the improvement of the programme.

2.2 Requested services

2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Action using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and early signs of impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Action adds benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);
- the coherence of the Action itself, with the EU strategy in Egypt and with other EU policies and Member State Actions.

²⁶ COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - http://ec.europa.eu/smartregulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

²⁷ SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", http://ec.europa.eu/smartregulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf

²⁸ Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighborhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf.

²⁹ COM (2011) 637 final "Increasing the impact of EU Development Policy: an Agenda for Change" - http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/acp/dv/communication_/communication_en.pdf

The specific Evaluation Questions as formulated below are indicative. Based on them and following initial consultations and documental analysis, the evaluation team will propose in their Inception Note a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed with the approval of the Inception Note, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

2.2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

An indicative list of Evaluation Questions is presented hereafter. The contractor is expected to critically reflect on them during the Inception and desk phase, discuss them with the Project Manager and propose a final version for approval in their Inception Note.

The evaluation questions will be identified in the first instance by the evaluation team during the Inception phase. The questions should include in their coverage the following main areas of analysis:

Efficiency

The assessment of efficiency will focus on the following:

- A review of the main project activities and an assessment of progress made against the logframe indicators. To what extent have the activities undertaken achieved the planned results?
- Did any unplanned results arise from the activities?
- The appropriateness and quality of the logframe, in particular indicators and targets (including disaggregation by gender, where relevant).
- The quality of the Annual Work Plans in relation to the programme description and the logframe, including the extent to which annual work plans were successfully adapted to the changing context and to emerging findings during implementation.
- The quality of day-to-day management, for example (i) management of the budget, including an analysis of under/over expenditure; (ii) management of personnel; (iii) whether management of risk is adequate, i.e. whether flexibility and timeliness was demonstrated in response to changes in circumstances; (iv) respect for deadlines; (v) relations/coordination with local authorities and institutions, beneficiaries, other stakeholders and donors; role of the Steering Committee in guiding the project.
- Contributions from local institutions and government: were they provided as planned, could reallocation of responsibilities have improved performance, are communications good, is continuity ensured?
- Quality of the monitoring system, its accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of the baseline information.
- The quality of information management and reporting, and the extent to which key stakeholders are kept adequately informed of the project progress (including beneficiaries/target groups).

Effectiveness

The assessment of effectiveness will focus on:

- To what extent the planned results have been delivered and received, as perceived by the key stakeholders? How unplanned results may have affected the outcomes?

- To what extent the intended beneficiaries are actually benefiting from the project results?
- To what extent the achieved/expected results will contribute to the achievement of the planned specific objectives?
- Validity of assumptions and risk assessments and their effect on the achievement of the specific objectives.

Sustainability

The analysis of sustainability will focus on:

- Is local ownership ensured?
- To what extent the main stakeholders remain in agreement with the objectives and approaches of the project?
- What is the prospect for the sustainability of the benefits from the project, including financial viability, recurrent cost financing, and asset maintenance?
- Are the institutional changes likely to stay in place and be supported by adequate government funding?
- What is the level of policy support provided by the project and the responsiveness of the authorities?

Recommendations

Based on the assessments made for the above mentioned criteria, the MTR is expected to:

- Identify the reasons for deviations, and possible future constraints which must be overcome for the successful implementation of the project;
- Provide recommendations for any required change/modification to the project in order to support the effective implementation and the delivery of a sustainable benefit stream; □ Provide recommendations for the exit strategy.

Communication and visibility on EU funding

The analysis of communication and visibility will focus on:

- Project contribution to promote EU visibility;
- Awareness of the project stakeholders (including final beneficiaries) on the EU contribution;
- Compliance with the Delegation Agreement provisions;
- Appropriateness of communication and visibility budget.

A methodology to carry out the assignment does not need to be included in the offer. Only the CV of the experts should be included.

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required deliverables

The evaluation process will be carried out in three phases: an Inception and Desk Phase, a Field Phase, and a Synthesis Phase. Deliverables in the form of reports should be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table below.

The submission of deliverables by the selected contractor will be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module, an evaluation process management tool of the European Commission; the selected consultant will have access to online guidance in order to operate with the module.

2.3.1 Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted during each phase (not necessarily in chronological order) and lists the deliverables to be produced by the team, including the key meetings with the Contracting Authority. The main content of each deliverable is described in Chapter 5.

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Deliverables and meetings
<u>Inception & Desk Phases</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial document/data collection and definition of methods of analysis • Background analysis • Reconstruction of Intervention Logic incl. objectives, specific features and target beneficiaries • In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions) • Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase • Methodological design of the Field Phase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception Note
<u>Field Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial meetings at country level with the four beneficiaries as well as the national authorities • Gathering of primary evidence with the use of the most appropriate techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection and analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing meeting with the EUD • Debriefing with the EUD
<u>Synthesis phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Final Report • Final Report

2.3.2 Inception and Desk Phase

INCEPTION

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying its key issues.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex II).

Further to a first desk review of the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of EU support to Egypt, the evaluation team, in consultation with the Project Manager, will reconstruct the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated. A phone discussion with the project manager, if necessary, will allow to arrive at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility.

Based on the reconstructed Intervention Logic the evaluators will finalise the evaluation methodology, the Evaluation Questions, the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, and the planning of the following phases.

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures defined. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Project Manager.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception Note**; its content is described in Chapter 5.

DESK

The aim is to conduct most of the documental analysis needed for carrying out the evaluation. The analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing literature relevant to the action, especially evaluations and research studies carried out by civil society, Government, other donors (especially EU Member States) and/or the private sector. This is to ensure a more robust approach to identifying information gaps and to ensure complementarity with evaluations that have already been done.

The analysis of the relevant documents shall be systematic and reflect the methodology developed and approved during the Inception Phase.

The activities to be conducted during this phase should allow for the provision of preliminary responses to each evaluation question, stating the information already gathered and its limitations. They should also identify the issues still to be covered and the preliminary hypotheses to be tested.

The evaluation team shall furthermore define the evaluation tools to be used during the Field Phase and describe the preparatory steps already taken and those to be taken for its organisation, including the list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.

2.3.3 Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Inception Note by the Project Manager.

The Field Phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Inception and Desk phases and bringing further information through primary research.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Project Manager.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the EU Delegation.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government authorities and agencies. Throughout the mission the evaluation team shall use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team shall summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the EU Delegation.

2.3.4 Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation of the Final Report and entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to finalise the answers to the Evaluation Questions and prepare the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present in a single Report plus Annexes their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the agreed structure (see Annex III); a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well.

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.

The evaluation team will deliver and then present the **Draft Final Report** to the EU Delegation to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations.

The Project Manager consolidates the comments and sends them to the evaluation team for revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the Quality Assessment Grid will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required.

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team should explain the reasons in writing.

2.4 Management and Steering of the evaluation

2.4.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Project Manager of the EU Delegation.

The Project Manager main functions are:

- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.
- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.
- To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Project Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.
- To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.

2.4.2 At the Contractor level

The contractor is expected to oversee the quality of the process, the evaluation design, the inputs and the deliverables of the evaluation. In particular, it shall:

- Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that for each evaluation phase specific tasks and deliverables for each team member are clearly defined.
- Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.

2.5 Language of the specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

3 EXPERT'S PROFILE

3.1 Number of requested experts per category and number of working days per expert or per category

The assignment will be carried out by one Category I expert, acting as Team Leader, and one Category II expert. The number of working-days is 25 for the Category I expert and 20 for the Category II expert.

3.2 Expertise required

Expert I Team Leader (category I expert), for 25 working days:

- Education

The expert should have at least a Master's Degree in a domain relevant to the assignment (preferably in the following sectors: Business or Public Administration, Economics, Law, or Social Sciences) or, in its absence, a Bachelor Degree and additional equivalent professional experience of at least three years in development cooperation projects (the equivalent experience must be above the general experience duration fixed below).

- Experience

General professional experience:

- At least 12 years' experience in development cooperation.

Specific professional experience:

- In interventions financed by the European Union;
- In capacity building;
- In working with civil society organisations;
- In carrying out monitoring and evaluation of development cooperation programmes; EU led project/programme evaluation will be an asset;
- In working in countries of the European Neighbourhood. Experience in Egypt will be an asset.

- Language skills

- Fluent in English. Knowledge of Arabic will be an asset.

Expert II (category II expert), for 20 working days:

- Education

The expert should have at least a Master's Degree in a domain relevant to the assignment (preferably in the following sectors: Business or Public Administration, Economics, Law, or Social Sciences) or, in its absence, a Bachelor Degree and additional equivalent professional experience of at least three years in development cooperation projects (the equivalent experience must be above the general experience duration fixed below).

- Experience

General professional experience:

- At least 6 years' experience in Development Cooperation.

Specific professional experience:

- In institutional development, especially at the level of local authorities;
- In working with civil society organisations;
- In carrying out monitoring and evaluation of development cooperation programmes; EU led project/programme evaluation will be an asset;
- Experience in interventions financed by the European Union will be an asset;
- In working in countries of the European Neighbourhood. Experience in Egypt will be an asset.

- Language skills

- Fluent in English. Knowledge of Arabic will be an asset.

3.3 Presence of management team for briefing and/or debriefing

The presence of member(s) of the management team is not required for briefing or debriefing purposes.

4 LOCATION AND DURATION

4.1 Starting period

Provisional start of the assignment: April 2018.

4.2 Foreseen duration

Maximum duration of the assignment: 6 months.

It is assumed that the consultants will work on the basis of a five-day week.

4.3 Planning³⁰

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill-in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception Note). The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment.

³⁰ Including the period for notification for placement of the staff as per art 16.4 a)

Attention is drawn to the fact that sufficient forward planning is needed in order to ensure active participation and consultation with government representatives and national stakeholders.

4.4 Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will take place at home, with field visits in Egypt.

5 REPORTING

5.1 Content, timing and submission

The reports must match quality standards. The text of the report should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of Action is required (to be attached as Annex).

The evaluation team will submit the following reports:

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
Inception Note	5-7 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology for the evaluation Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators Data analysis and collection methods Work plan Field visit approach 	End of Inception Phase
Draft Final Report	20-25 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> 	End of Synthesis Phase
Final report	20-25 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted 	2 weeks after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.

5.2 Comments

For each report, the Project Manager will submit comments within 15 calendar days. The revised reports incorporating comments received from the Reference Group shall be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for non-integration of certain comments.

5.3 Language

All reports shall be submitted in English.

5.4 Number of copies

The final version of the Final Report will be provided in 2 paper copies and in electronic version in Pdf.

5.5 Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing.

6 INCIDENTAL EXPENDITURE

> Per Diems

In addition to the expert's fees for the services requested, the budget must include Per Diems for nonresident experts according to the contractual provisions. Per diems are payable only for non-resident experts. If the original place of residence is Greater Cairo, she/he will not be entitled to per diems, except for the overnight stays spent outside Greater Cairo. The calculation of the number of per diem is based on the requirements stated in this ToR (home based work is excluded).

> Travel costs

One field mission to Egypt for the two experts is foreseen. A round trip flight to Egypt indicatively costs 600 EUR from Europe. For other destinations the more direct route and economic air fare rates are applicable.

> Inter-city Travel

The indicative cost for renting a car during field missions, including vehicle operating costs, is 60 EUR per day. An internal round trip flight ticket indicatively costs 100 EUR. A maximum of 5 inter-city travels are foreseen in Egypt.

> Others reimbursable costs (workshops/events costs, translation/interpretation, administrative support, visibility products and all the costs proposed in the strategy)

The Contractor will propose a cost-effective budget (implementation of the strategy and support to the implementing partners) considering when feasible and in coordination with the implementing partners the use of the implementing partners resources.

Translation from/to Arabic and English indicatively costs 7.50 EUR per page.

> Other

The contractor shall ensure that the expert is adequately equipped with necessary personal computer and communication facilities.

7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The quality of the final report will be assessed by the Project Manager using the quality assessment grid provided in Annex V, which is a tool to review the quality of the Draft and the Final report. Its compilation will support/inform the Performance Assessment required in CRIS, in particular with reference to the third criterion 'Quality of Service' (and should the score be 2 or 3 a synthesis of the QAG comments can be pasted in the Comment box of the Performance Assessment).

ANNEXES

Annex I: Specific Technical Evaluation Criteria

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FWC BENEFICIARIES 2013 - LOT 7 Governance and Home Affairs EuropeAid/132633/C/SER/multi

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighing between technical quality and price. Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

Criteria	Maximum
<i>Total score for the proposed team of experts</i>	<i>100</i>
OVERALL TOTAL SCORE	100

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 80 out of 100 points, will be automatically rejected.

Annex II: Information that will be provided to the evaluation team

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Action to be evaluated
- Country Strategy Paper Egypt and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered
- Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors
- Action identification studies
- Action feasibility / formulation studies
- Action financing agreement and addenda
- Action's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports
- EC's Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Reports, and other external and internal monitoring reports of the Action
- Action's mid-term evaluation report and other relevant evaluations, audit, reports.
- Relevant documentation from national/local partners and other donors
- Any other relevant document

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action.

Annex III: Structure of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The consultant is requested to deliver two distinct documents: the Final Report and the Executive Summary.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 5. Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The cover page of both deliverables shall carry the following text:

"This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission".

Executive Summary

A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations.

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

1. Introduction

A description of the Action, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

2. Answered questions / Findings

A chapter presenting the Evaluation Questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence and reasoning.

3. Overall assessment (*optional*)

A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive. This practice allows better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission.

If possible, the evaluation report identifies one or more transferable lessons, which are highlighted in the executive summary and can be presented in appropriate seminars or other dissemination activities

4.2 Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

5. Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations.
Detail of tools and analyses.
- Evaluation Matrix
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)
- Relevant geographic map(s) where the Action took place
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

Annex IV: Planning schedule

[Add as many rows as needed]

		Indicative Duration in working days ³¹		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Expert ...	Indicative Dates
Inception and Desk phases: total days				
•				
•				
•				
Field phase: total days				
•				
•				
•				
Synthesis phase: total days				
•				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

³¹ Add one column per each expert

Annex V: Quality assessment grid

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Project Manager using the following quality assessment grid; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team.

The rates have the following meaning:

- *Very weak* – criteria mostly not fulfilled
- *Weak* – criteria partly fulfilled
- *Average* – criteria mostly fulfilled but not up to expectations
- *Good* – criteria entirely fulfilled as expected
- *Very good* – criteria entirely fulfilled in a clear and original way

In relation to the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated as:	Rating
1. Meeting needs:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the report describe precisely what is to be evaluated, including the intervention logic? • Does the report cover the requested period, and clearly includes the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the project / programme? • Has the evolution of the project / programme been taken into account in the evaluation process? • Does the evaluation deal with and respond to all ToR requests? If not, are justifications given? 	
2. Appropriateness of the design:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the report explain how the evaluation design takes into account the project / programme rationale, cause-effect relationships, impacts, policy context, stakeholders' interests, etc.? • Is the evaluation method clearly and adequately described in enough detail? • Are there well-defined indicators selected in order to provide evidence about the project / programme and its context? • Does the report point out the limitations, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method? 	
3. Reliability of the data:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the data collection approach explained and is it coherent with the overall evaluation design? • Have data collection limitations and biases been explained and discussed? • Are the sources of information clearly identified in the report? • Are the data collection tools (samples, focus groups, etc.) applied in accordance with standards? <input type="checkbox"/> Have the collected data been cross-checked? 	
4. Soundness of the analysis:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the analysis based on the collected data? • Does the analysis focus well on the most relevant cause/effect assumptions underlying the intervention logic? • Is the context taken into account adequately in the analysis? • Are inputs from the most important stakeholders used in a balanced way? • Are the limitations of the analysis identified, discussed and presented in the report, as well as the contradictions with available knowledge, if there are any? 	
5. Credibility of the findings:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the findings derived from the qualitative and quantitative data and analyses? • Is there a discussion whether the findings can be generalised? <input type="checkbox"/> • Are interpretations and extrapolations justified and supported by sound arguments? 	
6. Validity of the conclusions:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the conclusions coherent and logically linked to the findings? • Does the report draw overall conclusions on each of the five DAC criteria? • Are conclusions free of personal or partisan considerations? 	
7. Usefulness of the recommendations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the recommendations consistent with the conclusions? • Are recommendations operational, realistic and sufficiently explicit to provide guidelines for taking action? • Are the recommendations drafted for the different target stakeholders of the evaluation? • When necessary, have the recommendations been clustered and prioritised? 	
8. Clarity of the report:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the report include a relevant and concise executive summary? • Is the report well-structured and adapted to its various audiences? • Are specialised concepts clearly defined and not used more than necessary? Is there a list of acronyms? • Is the length of the various chapters and annexes well balanced? 	

	Rating
Considering the 8 previous criteria what is the overall quality of the report?	

Comments on meeting needs (1):
Comments on appropriateness of the design (2):
Comments on reliability of the data (3):
Comments on soundness of the analysis (4):
Comments on credibility of the findings (5):
Comments on validity of the conclusions (6):
Comments on usefulness of the recommendations (7):
Comments on clarity of the report (8):
Comments on the overall quality of the report