



ADAPTATION FUND

Project Performance Report

Overview

| | |
|---|---|
| Period of Report (Dates) | 9/29/2022 - 9/29/2023 |
| Project Title | Building Resilient Food Security Systems to Benefit the Southern Egypt Region- Phase 2 |
| Project Summary | |
| Database Number | AF00000234 |
| Implementing Entity (IE) | UN World Food Programme |
| Type of IE | Multilateral Implementing Entity |
| Country(ies) | Egypt, Arab Republic of |
| Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water) | 15 villages in 5 Governorates in Southern Egypt: Assiut, Aswan, Luxor, Quena, and Sohag |
| Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point | Anisorc Brito |

Project Milestones

| | |
|---|-----------|
| AFB Approval Date | 9/23/2020 |
| IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date | 2/10/2021 |
| Start of Project/Programme | 9/20/2021 |
| Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable) | |
| Original Completion Date | 9/18/2024 |
| Revised Completion Date after approval of extension request (if applicable) | |

Were there any approval condition for this Project?

No

List each approval condition, if any, and report on the status of meeting them

| | |
|---|--|
| Category of condition | |
| Condition or Requirement | |
| Current Status | |
| Planned actions, including a detailed time schedule | |

List (only) inception report/ extension request(s)/ MTR that have been prepared for the project and provide date(s) of submission for each

NA

List the Website address (URL) of project

<http://www.climatechange-eg.org/Default.aspx>

Project Contacts

| National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator | Name | Email | Date |
|---|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| National Project Manager | Ms. Amani Gamaleldin | safa.ashoub@wfp.org | 9/29/2023 |
| Government(s) DA | Mr. Sherif Abdel Rehim | adaptation_fund_eg@yahoo.com | 9/29/2023 |
| Executing Agency | Dr. Ali Hozayen | hozayen2004@hotmail.com | 9/29/2023 |
| Executing Agency | Mr. Emad Abdallah | project_manager@pmu-eg.com | 9/29/2023 |

Financial Data

| Disbursement of AF grant funds | |
|--|----------------|
| Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$) | \$1,671,248.00 |
| Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$) | \$702,797.04 |
| Project disbursement rate (%) | 58.59 |
| Project execution rate (%) | 24.64 |
| Add any comments on AF Grant Funds | |
| Investment Income (\$) | \$0.00 |
| Cumulative Investment Income since inception (\$) | \$0.00 |

| Expenditure Data | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Output | Amount (\$) |
| 1.1 | \$45,987.73 |
| 1.2 | \$28,820.04 |
| 1.3 | \$125,793.49 |
| 1.4 | \$218,139.30 |
| 1.5 | \$193,479.54 |
| 1.6 | \$0.00 |
| 1.7 | \$49,002.20 |
| 2.1 | \$6,358.99 |
| 2.2 | \$14,028.27 |
| IE fee (\$) | \$48,748.50 |
| Execution cost (\$) | \$68,367.37 |

| Planned Expenditure Schedule | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Output | Projected Cost (\$) | Estimated Completion Date |
| 1.1 | \$69,100.00 | 9/30/2024 |
| 1.2 | \$3,400.00 | 9/30/2024 |
| 1.3 | \$599,900.00 | 9/30/2024 |
| 1.4 | \$335,000.00 | 9/30/2024 |
| 1.5 | \$30,800.00 | 9/30/2024 |
| 1.6 | \$193,800.00 | 9/30/2024 |
| 1.7 | \$119,200.00 | 9/30/2024 |
| 2.1 | \$1,500.00 | 9/30/2024 |

| | | |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------|
| 2.2 | \$22,500.00 | 9/30/2024 |
| IE fee (\$) | | \$125,176.61 |
| Execution cost (\$) | | \$97,466.00 |

Actual co-financing (if the MTR or TE have not been undertaken this reporting period, do not report on actual co-financing)

| | |
|---|--------|
| Does this Project have Co-Financing ? | No |
| How much of the total co-financing as committed in the Project Document has actually been realized? (\$) | \$0.00 |
| Estimated cumulative actual co-financing as verified during Mid-term Review (MTR) or Terminal Evaluation (TE). (\$) | \$0.00 |
| Add any comments on actual co-financing in particular any issues related to the realization of in-kind, grant, credits, loans, equity, non-grant instruments and other types of co-financing. | |

Risk Assessment

Identified Risks

List all Risks identified in project preparation phase and what steps are being taken to mitigate them

| Identified Risk | Current Status | Steps taken to mitigate risk |
|--|----------------|---|
| Poor performance of some partner NGOs due to weak capacity | Moderate | <p>The project Executing Entity is a government-affiliated entity which has been responsible for the execution of AF Phase 1 project as well as the implementation of similar activities funded by different donors in Upper Egypt. Following completing the assessment of partner CDAs, including the identification of capacity needs, some capacity building activities were delivered aiming to support implementation of direct support activities to beneficiaries at the community level. WFP and the EE recognised and agree on the the need to augment the PMU capacities to keep up with the increasing size of implementation that involve other donors and subsequent growing number of partner NGOs they are engaged with. Hence, mitigation actions include: continuous engagement of the WFP CO team with the PMU team as part of the oversight responsibilities ensured that the capacity strengthening support was provided throughout the project duration and extended to the CDAs as needed. WFP have been meeting with PMU and EACDP leadership on a weekly basis in addition to daily interactions at a technical level. Moreover, WFP Senior Management holds periodic meetings with the executing agency to follow up on scheduled implementation and guide and address any issues faced to ensure a smoother and more effective process and the meeting of agreed upon commitments. As a result of this close follow up, the staffing structure of the PMU has been adjusted and training needs have been identified. Furthermore, partner CDAs received continuous capacity-building and hands-on support with each intervention. For the relatively new innovations such as horticulture and aquaponic production, implementation has been delayed to allow for sufficient sensitization and buy-in, discussions with concerned authorities and capacity building of participating stakeholders.</p> |

| | | |
|---|-----------------|---|
| <p>Economic crisis: Difficulties in supply of goods such as canal lining materials, fertilizers, etc. due to specialized nature of these goods and/or large volumes requested</p> | <p>Moderate</p> | <p>"The availability of fertilizers and other inputs continues to be a struggle for several countries in the region as a result of the conflict in Ukraine, currency devaluation and fuel shortage. In Egypt, the market for fertilizers is operating with high demand and shortage in supply. Since November 2022, the Egyptian Pound was devalued 3 times and lost over 40% of its value which pushed the Egyptian economy to face foreign exchange shortages and restrictions on imports for prolonged periods. This affected prices stability as well, and weakened the ability of some suppliers, especially in the Project region, to commit to long term contracts, or high value bulk procurements. The UN Treasury updates the exchange rate for all countries twice a month. WFP Egypt CO adopts the most recent rate when exchanging the currency from USD to EGP and making transfers to the EE. This helped reduce potential fund losses due to difference between the rate used in WFP commitments (Purchase Orders) to the PMU and the updated rate. With regards to inflation, the project team has worked on a revised budget and workplan which takes into account the impacts of inflation on project costs. This plan is being updated regularly in response to the volatility of the market. In effort to diversify its sources of goods, the PMU has entered into MoUs with suppliers of fertilizers and animals for in-kind loans, which is treated in the local market as a form of long-term agreement, to facilitate the purchase of the such items required for project operation in bulk. The PMU has established a new base of suppliers from Cairo such that the purchases can be done in bulk then distributed to the villages as needed. The PMU has been revising the terms of reference of its procurements as per the national regulations to accommodate for the challenges faced in procurement from the local market in the governorates or from the region of Upper Egypt. Examples of mitigation measures adopted, include shorter tendering time and increase the amount of downpayment.</p> |
| <p>Non-sustainability of the project activities due to institutional or financial factors</p> | <p>Moderate</p> | <p>"The institutional setup of the MALR and EACDP has not changed since project inception and no risks were anticipated to occur. On the financial side, as a result of the currency devaluation and other economic challenges, inflation has reached an all time high in 2023 and has affected the cost of goods and material required for project implementation becoming considerably higher than the estimates used in the budget presented in the project proposal back in 2020. The project employed different mechanisms that aimed at leveraging level of participation and ownership of the stakeholders in all activities. This include steering committees at different administrative levels that support in various stages of implementation from planning until delivery and providing feedback on progress. Furthermore, interventions were implemented with gradual increase in beneficiaries' cost-sharing towards a more sustainable model, especially in agricultural and irrigation interventions. Moreover, the PMU strived to demonstrate the most economically feasibility model of the project interventions to the beneficiaries that were more suitable to each community uniqueness. The Project strived to mainstream its interventions into existing initiatives and national campaigns of the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, through established central and regional committees, and capacity building of Government staff.</p> |

Critical Risks Affecting Progress (Not identified at project design)

Are there any critical risks with a 50% or > likelihood of affecting progress of project? Yes

Identify Risks with a 50% or > likelihood of affecting progress of project

| Identified Risk | Current | Steps taken to mitigate risk |
|-----------------|---------|------------------------------|
|-----------------|---------|------------------------------|

| | Status | |
|--|----------|--|
| Delay in project implementation due to the delay in start than originally planned. | Moderate | 'An inception workshop was held in Sept 2021 marking the project official start date. However, the legal agreement between the WFP and MALR was concluded only in April 2022 with the first Project Steering Committee meeting held later in Aug 2022. This resulted in a delay in the launch of execution on the ground until Sept 2022. Nevertheless, preparatory activities have been initiated before end of Year one of the Project to enable faster implementation upon start. This includes identification of targeted villages, conducting capacity assessment for potential CDA partnerships in the project governorates to have a shortlist ready for mobilization upon project start. Furthermore, partner NGOs were supported to in the recruitment of project personnel at the field level. A one week mission was conducted by WFP CO to the PMU office to discuss how to progress with the work taking into account the remaining time before the official date of project closure, highlighting the importance of advancing on different outputs during Year 2 of implementation. Moreover, while the required official agreements (MOU and SOP) were still being discussed and finalized, preparatory activities were undertaken to minimize the launching period and avoid further delays. Since then, progress has been observed in the pace of implementation of different activities with some outputs that have been delayed currently in the process of being initiated. Yet, the CO has conducted an assessment at the end of year 2 and is requesting a No-Cost extension to allow the EE to implement the activities with more elaboration and building local ownership especially for the innovative elements which require longer time to convince the local stakeholders. |
| Price volatility due to global inflation and exchange rate fluctuations | High | 'Prices volatility affected by devaluation of EGP vs USD caused by different economic and political crises and high inflation has resulted in increased prices and unavailability of certain goods, increasing administrative burden on the project team procurement/other units. This has also led to price adjustments and delay in in implementation of activities. Following measures were put in place to mitigate the risk: 1- Regular monitoring of market prices. 2- Monitoring and sharing national statistics of relevance on a quarterly basis. 3- Bulk procurement and long term agreements while assessing the possibility of negotiating prices and payment terms with suppliers and pegging to the USD. |

Risk Measures

Were there any risk mitigation measures employed during the current reporting period? If so, were risks reduced? If not, why were these risks not reduced?

The project employed the following mitigation measures during the reporting period: 1) regular monitoring of market prices and its implication on activities budget, 2) periodic assessment of cooperating partner in execution of the activities (the PMU), and partner CDAs to identify and provide necessary capacity strengthening, 3) maintain an updated list of suppliers that passed due diligence screening for procure key goods and services from inside and outside the region, 4) monitoring the official UN exchange rate to minimise its impact on the project cost.

ESP Compliance

Section 1: Identified ESP Risk Management

Was the ESP risks identification complete at the time of funding approval? Yes

| 1.Compliance with the law | |
|--|---|
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | No |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | |
| 2.Access and equity | |
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | Yes |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | Yes |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | Low risk since the project involves asset creation. - The project activities will be located so as not to obstruct access to existing schools, health or vet facilities, water or sanitation. The activities will also not be affecting peoples access to sources of energy in the villages (electricity and butane gas). The project will work with farmers to better manage their land resources with each farmer maintaining ownership of his land. - Decisions made on joint management of resources such as consolidated land and water canals are to be made democratically among the farmers through voting. - While water is not 'owned' by farmers in rural Egypt as such, the project activities are foreseen to enhance equitable access to water through the water saving techniques that reduce losses and increase access of farmers in downstream plots. |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact | - To minimize risks, the project was designed in a participatory manner with clear and transparently |

| | |
|---|---|
| that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | publicized targeting for each of the activities to ensure the eligibility of the people to benefit from it and the effective reaching out to the target group. Assets such as the aquaculture ponds will be communal assets that will be owned and managed by the local partner NGO. Water users associations are receiving training on the joint management of new assets and means to ensure their sustainability.J22 - Other household level assets such as the plastic-covered tunnels will be owned by the beneficiaries (each will own his/her greenhouse). These beneficiaries will be reached by the transparent targeting mechanism. Thus access and equity issues are not foreseen. - Additionally, a solid grievance mechanism is partially in place (annex 2 of the project proposal) and will be fully in place in Q2 of second year of the project, to ensure channels for voicing concerns and grievances- including those related to access and equity, in case any occurs. |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | Number of disputes reported and grievances received. |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | 0 |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | The community mobilization is ongoing to openly and transparently inform communities of the project activities and assess the eligibility of interested beneficiaries to participate in agricultural and other activities. |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | The project activities obstruct access to existing schools, health or vet facilities, water or sanitation. The activities affect peoples access to sources of energy in the villages (electricity and butane gas). Farmers struggle to manage their land resources and agricultural practices collectively with other neighbour farmers and each farmer to maintain ownership of his/her land. |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | Local NGO - the Community Development Association (CDA) is heavily involved in implementation of the project activities to sustain the project benefits and ensure provision of services to all community memebers. Furthermore, water users' association are established to organise particpant farmers in agricultural consolidation groups and provide democratic decision making platform to joint manage their resources such as consolidated land and water canals. |
| 3.Marginalized and vulnerable Groups | |
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | Yes |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | Yes |

| | |
|--|---|
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | Low risk Vulnerable groups, namely women, youth, people with disability, and the elderly might be sidelined or excluded from decision making on design and implementation of activities as per the predominant local customs and norms. This could lead for them to miss opportunities to benefit from the project investments. |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | Vulnerable groups, namely women, youth, the disabled, and the elderly were consulted to ensure that their identified threats, challenges and priorities are reflected in project design. Additionally, the use of existing grievance mechanism (partially in place) will be promoted to affected groups. |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | Number of disputes reported and grievances received. |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | N/A |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | N/A |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | Vulnerable population has limited access to productive assets. |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | Investments are made in off-farm agricultural activities and livestock production to diversify sources of income to include opportunities accessible to the youth, rural women and elderly small-scale producers. |
| 4.Human rights | |
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | No |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | |
| 5.Gender equality and women's empowerment | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | Yes |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | Yes |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | Medium risk of women being unable to benefit from the project. - Land cultivation is predominantly an activity performed by males in Southern Egypt. Accordingly, the majority of those involved and benefiting from the project's field agricultural activities will be men. - Also conservative norms in the project areas could impede women's ability to participate in project activities, exacerbating gender inequality. |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | To promote women's participation and create a stronger gender-sensitive impact that is observant of local customs and traditions, several measures will be undertaken: - Women are specifically targeted to benefit from activities where their participation is culturally acceptable, primarily animal raising loans and the agro-processing activities. This will enhance their access to finance and enable them to generate income, contributing directly to their financial empowerment. - Women only sessions will be organized to overcome women usually shying away from participation in mixed sessions. In mixed sessions, female-friendly spaces were created. - In trainings where women are to be involved, the distance to training venues will be minimized and flexible timing of sessions set in consultation with them. - Home visits will be organized as WFP coordinator and WFP Gender Focal point Socio-economic officers of the Project team M&E officer. To facilitate access to the house as well as openness in these talks, the visits will be undertaken by female volunteers under the oversight of the local partner NGOs. - Women will be specifically targeted to benefit from activities where their participation is culturally acceptable, primarily animal raising loans and the agro-processing activities. This will enhance their access to finance and enable them to generate income, contributing directly to their financial empowerment. - Working with the local partner NGOs to encourage women participation in the Project support committees at the village level - To the extent possible, encouraging nomination of women in the different steering committees |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | All data collected by the project is disaggregated by gender and all reports produced by the project are gender-sensitive. |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | 52% of the beneficiaries reached to date are women |

| | |
|--|--|
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | Community mobilization has been as inclusive as possible. Home visits were conducted to ensure women are equally aware of project activities and opportunities. |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | Women being unable to benefit from the project. - Land cultivation is predominantly an activity performed by males in Southern Egypt. Accordingly, the majority of those involved and benefiting from the project's field agricultural activities will be men. - Also conservative norms in the project areas could impede women's ability to participate in project activities, exacerbating gender inequality. |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | To promote women's participation and create a stronger gender-sensitive impact that is observant of local customs and traditions, several measures will be undertaken that prioritise women targeting especially in access to finance and off-farm activities. Cultural context and protection of women will be considered in organised sessions. Furthermore, local partner NGOs will be encouraged to recruit female staff and appoint female focal points in the Project support committees at the village level. |

6. Core labour rights

| | |
|--|----|
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | No |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | |

7. Indigenous people

| | |
|--|----|
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | No |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. | |

| | |
|--|----|
| Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | |
| 8.Involuntary resettlement | |
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | No |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | |
| 9.Protection of natural habitats | |
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | No |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require | |

| | |
|--|---|
| management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | |
| 10.Conservation of biological diversity | |
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | Yes |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | Yes |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | Low risk Activities promoting agricultural and livestock production, including aquaculture aim to increase output per land unit. This increase in productivity will be achieved through use of high yielding seed varieties, promoting use of machinery and introducing and new or uncommon species of crops and animals. In consequence, greater volume of wastes from agricultural production is expected that will find its way to land, water and air if not treated appropriately. |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | The project promotes efficient use of natural resources using low impact interventions and helps farmers to reduce their use of agriculture inputs. It also does not involve hunting or fishing activities. The ducks, goats, bees, fish and crop varieties introduced in the communities will be selected to be non-invasive or of minimal influence on local genetic resources in the communities. Government and local entities mandated with environmental control and resources management (e.g. agriculture, irrigation, and environment directorate) are members of local steering committee of the project activities which are held periodically to contribute to design and planning of interventions and follow-up implementation. |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | Environmental screening conducted and the recommendations applied. |

| | |
|--|--|
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | N/A |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | N/A |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | Overexploitation of natural resources and introduction of new or uncommon species of crops and animals. In addition to pollution from wastes from agricultural production. |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | The project will promote efficient use of natural resources using low impact interventions and support farmers to adopt sustainable production approaches. The ducks, goats, bees, fish and crop varieties introduced in the communities will be selected to be non-invasive or of minimal influence on local genetic resources in the communities. Government and local entities mandated with environmental control and resources management (e.g. agriculture, irrigation, and environment directorate) are members of local steering committee of the project activities which are held periodically to contribute to design and planning of interventions and follow-up implementation. |

11. Climate change

| | |
|--|----|
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | No |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | |

12. Pollution prevention and resource efficiency

| | |
|--|-----|
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | Yes |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require | Yes |

| | |
|--|---|
| management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | <p>Medium risk due to the introduction of units for aquaculture. - Although the units to be introduced by the project are small scale, the quality of the discharge wastewater from these units could be low, leading to soil pollution if not properly managed. - On the positive impact side, the project is expected to reduce use of fertilizers in the project areas. It is also not expected to introduce new fertilizers or pesticides, herbicides or fungicides in the project. The project will help farmers reduce their diesel consumption in irrigation and shall not involve use of vehicles or generators. It shall not lead to the annual use of more than 100,000 litres of diesel. The project also helps farmers realize efficiency in surface water irrigation and does so in a manner that introduces improvements in local waterways.</p> |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | <p>Environmental screening and/or assessments will be done for the aquaculture ponds and processing to identify recommendations for reducing potentials of pollution. - The recommendations will be included in the development of technical training manuals and operational guidelines for the 2-5 acres aquaculture ponds and processing to identify site specific recommendations for reducing potentials of pollution/release of pollutants through water discharge. The recommendations shall be integrated in the design of the ponds and units and operators shall be trained to follow the operational recommendations. Water quality kits will be used to periodically monitor the water quality and avoid the release of high level of contaminants. - Issues to be ensured in these materials include: that no exotic species are introduced, location is avoiding ecosystem sensitive areas, conservation areas or reserve etc. the pond design factors in resilience to extreme climatic events; the intake and out-take water quality are complaint with national standards, non-contaminating feed pallets. The materials will be developed by expertise certified and registered by the Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency.</p> |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | Environmental screening conducted and the recommendations applied. |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | 0 |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | The activity has not yet started. The screening will be conducted during Year 2 |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | Although the units for aquaculture to be introduced by the project are small-scale, the quality of the discharge wastewater from these units could be low, leading to soil pollution if not properly managed. |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | Environmental screening and/or assessments will be done for the aquaculture ponds and processing to |

| | |
|--|--|
| | identify recommendations for reducing potentials of pollution. |
| 13.Public health | |
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | No |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | |
| 14.Physical and cultural heritage | |
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | No |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that | |

| | |
|--|----|
| will be taken | |
| 15.Lands and soil conservation | |
| Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? | No |
| During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L) | |
| List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. | |
| List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. | |
| State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator | |
| Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period | |
| Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s) | |
| Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken | |

Section 2: Monitoring for unanticipated impacts / corrective actions required

| | |
|---|-----|
| Has monitoring for unanticipated ESP risks been carried out? | Yes |
| Have unanticipated ESP risks been identified during the reporting period? | No |
| If unanticipated ESP risks have been identified, describe the safeguard measures that have been taken in response and how an ESMP has been prepared/updated | |

Section 3: Categorisation

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is the categorisation according to ESP standards still relevant? | Yes |
| If No, please describe the changes made at activity, output or outcome level, approved by the Board, that resulted in this change of categorization. | |

Section 4: Implementation arrangements

| | |
|---|--|
| What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures? | The IE monitors the ESP measures as part of the overall oversight responsible. WFP has also assigned one staff member (Engineer) as a Environmental and Social |
| Have the implementation arrangements been effective during the reporting period? | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures? | ESP aspects have been observed and considered in all project activities conducted to-date. WFP has conducted an Environmental Screening of the project and is taking related actions as a result. |
| Have the implementation arrangements at the EEs been effective during the reporting period? | Yes |

Section 5: Projects/programmes with unidentified sub-projects (USPs). This section needs to be completed only if the project/proramme includes USPs.

| | |
|---|--|
| Have the arrangements for the process described in the ESMP for ESP compliance for USPs been put in place? | |
| Is the required capacity for ESMP implementation present and effective with the IE and the EE(s)? Please provide details. | |
| Have all roles and responsibilities adequately been assigned and positions filled? | |
| Has the overall ESMP been updated with the findings of the USPs that have been identified in this reporting period? | |

| Identified USPs in the reporting period | Application of ESMP to the USP | ESP risks identified for the USP | Has an impact assessment been carried out? | Consultation held for risks and impacts identification for USP | Gender disaggregation to identify risks and impacts | Safeguard measures identified for the USP | Monitoring indicator(s) for each impact |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

Section 6: Grievances

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to environmental and social risks and impacts? | Partially |
| Were grievances received during the reporting period? | No |

| List all grievances received during the reporting period regarding environmental and social impacts; gender related matters; or any other matter of project/programme activities | For each grievance, provide information on the grievance redress process | Provide the status/outcome |
|--|--|----------------------------|
| | | |

Comments

GP Compliance

Section 1: Quality at entry

Was an initial gender assessment conducted during the preparation of the project/programme's first submission as a full proposal? Yes

Does the results framework include gender-responsive indicators broken down at the different levels (objective, outcome, output)? Yes

List the gender-responsive elements that were incorporated in the project/programme results framework

| Gender-responsive element | Level | Indicator | Baseline | Target | Rated result for the reporting period |
|---|--------|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Output 1.1. Community level mobilization and climate adaptation planning | Output | Number of people participating in awareness sessions and mobilized to participate in project activities in targeted communities | 125,000 (70,000 men and 55,000 women) | 195,000 (107,250 men and 87,750 women) | Satisfactory |
| Output 1.4. Adaptation in cultivation and crop diversification promoted | Output | Number of people benefiting from demonstration farms, enhanced extension services, and farm-to-farm visits to enhance their resilience and reduce climate risks | 37,000 (90% men) | 47,000 (90% men and 10% women) | Poor |
| Output 1.5. Building resilience through livestock and poultry production | Output | Number of people trained on risk reduction in small ruminants and poultry; animal nutrition or alternative fodder production | 30,000 (90% women) | 50,000 (10% men and 90% women) | Satisfactory |
| Output 1.5. Building resilience through livestock and poultry production | Output | Number of men and women benefiting from small loans | 30,000 (90% women) | 50,000 (10% men and 90% women) | Satisfactory |
| Output 1.6. Introduction of plastic-covered tunnels for intensifying production | Output | Number of men and women trained on production and harvesting of vegetables in plastic-covered tunnels | Currently there are no demonstration or training units available | 150 (75 men and 75 women trained) | Poor |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|---|--|--------------|
| Output 1.7. Introduction of aquaculture | Output | Number of men and women trained on fish production at established aquaculture units | Currently there are no demonstration and training units available | 1,100 (730 men and 370 women trained) | Satisfactory |
| Output 2.1. Capacity building of governmental staff and local academic institutions | Output | Number of official engaged in capacity strengthening activities, disaggregated by sex | 800 (50% f) | 1,600 (50% f) | Satisfactory |
| Output 2.1. Capacity building of governmental staff and local academic institutions | Output | Number of students engaged in capacity strengthening activities, disaggregated by sex | 2,000 (1,000 male and 1,000 female students) | 3,000 (1,500 male and 1,500 female students) | Satisfactory |

Section 2: Quality during implementation and at exit

List gender equality and women's empowerment issues encountered during implementation of the project/programme. For each gender equality and women's empowerment issue describe the progress that was made as well as the results.

| Gender equality and women's empowerment issues | Rated result for the reporting period | Provide justification of the rating provided |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| Enhancing outreach to women and their participation in events | Satisfactory | Women only sessions were organized to overcome women usually shying away from participation in mixed sessions. In mixed sessions, female-friendly spaces were created. This helped reach 10,050 women out of 14,574 (total number reached in community mobilization) 584 women (50%) were engaged through capacity strengthening activities to government staff, technical schools and universities facilitated by the Project. 1000 Women student were reached through different knowledge sharing products which were produced to facilitate effective communication with beneficiaries and stakeholders and different media channels were used that included print-outs, social media, tv/radio, and organised events. |
| Targeting of Women through specific project activities | Satisfactory | Women were specifically targeted to benefit from activities where their participation is culturally acceptable, primarily small-scale livestock production. This aimed to enhance their access to finance and enable them to generate income, contributing directly to their financial empowerment. In trainings, where women are the primary target, the distance to training venues was minimized and flexible timing of sessions was set in consultation with them. 2,254 women were reached out of 20,000 targeted. In Capital loans assets and revolving cycles , 5,219 women were reached out of 20,000 to get capital loans assets to enhance the financial status of women who are able to participate in limited activities which usually include poultry, egg or dairy production or raising small ruminants. In aquaculture activity, 370 Women were reached through trainings on |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | aquaculture production in their house units. This activity facilitated women access to additional alternative food and income-generation opportunity and enhanced their access to agricultural and livestock productive assets. |
|--|--|---|

Section 3: Implementation arrangements

| | |
|---|--|
| What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP | The IE monitored the GP measures as part of the overall oversight responsible in line with developed gender analysis and action plan (annex 3 of the Project proposal) and compliant with AF and corporate gender policies. During year 2, capacity strengthening for the EE staff on GP requirements and recommendations was provided, from beneficiaries selection until gender disaggregated reporting on progress of implementation. |
| Have the implementation arrangements at the IE been effective during the reporting period? | Yes |
| What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP? | Gender sensitivity and equality aspects have been observed and considered in all project activities conducted to-date, in line with developed gender analysis and action plan (annex 3 of the Project proposal). |
| Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period? | Yes |
| Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented? | No |

Section 4: Grievances

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to gender equality and women's empowerment? | Partially |
| Were grievances received during the reporting period? | No |

| List all grievances received through the grievance mechanism during the reporting period regarding gender-related matters of project/programme activities [6] | For each grievance, provide information on the grievance redress process used | Provide the status/outcome used |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | | |

Comments

WFP has worked on the enhancement of its grievance mechanism to provide the opportunity for beneficiaries, CDAs, contractors and other stakeholders to report on any issues faced during implementation. This is part of WFP's commitment to its Accountability to Affected Population.

Rating

| Implementing Entity | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------------|----------|--------|
| Project components/outcomes | Alignment | Expected Progress | Progress | Rating |
| | | | | |

| | with AF outcomes | | to date | |
|---|------------------|---|---------|---------------------------|
| Outcome 1. Enhanced resilience of target rural communities in Southern Egypt in the face of anticipated climate impacts on food production through knowledge and technology transfer. | Outcome 6 | 23% increase in the percentage of target communities in Southern Egypt demonstrating knowledge of climate change and variability and means to reduce risk to their livelihoods. | Delayed | Marginally Unsatisfactory |
| Outcome 2. Climate adaptation institutionalised in government and non-governmental stakeholders' practices | Outcome 2 | 15 NGOs and 10 governmental entities develop needed capacities to deliver services for climate risk reduction in rural communities | Delayed | Marginally Unsatisfactory |

Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section

| Name | Email |
|---|---------------------|
| Ms. Safa Ashoub - Project Coordinator at WFP Egypt Country Office | safa.ashoub@wfp.org |

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

The project has implemented several activities in its second year based on a revised workplan. This year was marked with several challenges that are external to the project, nevertheless, they have affected its performance significantly. Most notably is series of currency devaluation and its subsequent effect on local markets such as the frequent prices fluctuations of construction materials and other agricultural inputs. This in turn has affected the procurement and ability of suppliers to commit to delivery terms. Furthermore, shortage of certain materials due to the embargo on imported goods also restricted the Project ability to solicitate some needed material. These challenges impeded ability to implement in large batches as originally planned but rather breakdown the implmnetation on smaller batches. This resulted in increasing the load on procurements to handle larger number of 'smaller' procurements. The Project took number of actions to improve its procurement performance, such as revising the contracting terms, maintaing an updated lists of suppliers, and reaching to suppliers with higher capacity from Cairo. in some critical cases, procurements of some life goods were prioritised and preceeded trainings to deal with shortage of supply until additional suppliers were identified, such as animals for the in-kind loans and HH-units of aquaculture. In turn, the necessary skills trainings to recipients of these items will be implemented within the first month of receiving the asset. To make up of the delay at the Project start, activities were being implemeneted in parallel where and when possible, such in the case of conducting trainings and establishment and delivering of assets. Nonetheless, unstable economic situation and onset of conflicts around Egypt is highly expected to remain a risk to implementation.

Executing Entity / Project Coordinator

| Project components/outcomes | Alignment with AF outcomes | Expected Progress | Progress to date | Rating |
|--|----------------------------|--|------------------|---------------------------|
| Outcome 1. Enhanced resilience of target rural communities in Southern Egypt in the face of anticipated climate impacts on food production | Outcome 6 | 23% increase in the percentage of target communities in Southern Egypt demonstrating | Delayed | Marginally Unsatisfactory |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|--|---------|---------------------------|
| through knowledge and technology transfer. | | knowledge of climate change and variability and means to reduce risk to their livelihoods. | | |
| Outcome 2. Climate adaptation institutionalised in government and non-governmental stakeholders' practices | Outcome 2 | 15 NGOs and 10 governmental entities develop needed capacities to deliver services for climate risk reduction in rural communities | Delayed | Marginally Unsatisfactory |

Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section

| Name | Email | Institution |
|-------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Mr. Emad Abdallah | project_manager@pmu-eg.com | Head of the Project Management Unit (PMU), EACDP |

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

PMU staff assigned for this project are recruited and assumed their responsibilities in the project governorates. Additional capacity strengthening was conducted during Year 2 of project implementation.

Other

| Project components/outcomes | Alignment with AF outcomes | Expected Progress | Progress to date | Rating |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------|
| <p>Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section</p> | | | | |

Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section

| Name | Email |
|---|-------|
| <p>Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.</p> | |

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

Overall Rating

Overall rating

Marginally Unsatisfactory

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

PMU staff assigned for this project are recruited and assumed their responsibilities in the project governorates. Additional capacity strengthening was conducted during Year 2 of project implementation.

Project Indicators

List of indicators

| Type of Indicator (indicators towards Objectives, Outcomes, etc...) | Indicator | Baseline | Progress Since Inception | Target for Project End |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Objectives | Proportion of Southern Egypt farming communities that are more climate resilient through adoption of adaptation techniques | 40% | To be measured at project end | 70% |
| Outcomes | Percentage of target communities in Southern Egypt demonstrating knowledge of climate change and variability and means to reduce risk to their livelihoods. | 77% | To be measured at project end through surveying the targeted communities | 100% |
| Outputs | Number of people participating in awareness sessions and mobilized to participate in project activities in targeted communities | 125,000 (70,000 men and 55,000 women) | 139,574 (74,524 men - 65,050 women) | 195,000 (107,250 men and 87,750 women) |
| Outputs | Number of functioning early warning units established | 49 | 64 | 59 |
| Outputs | Number of people using the system | 200,000 | 350,000 | 300,000 |
| Outputs | Number of acres benefiting from improved irrigation efficiency using low-cost solutions | 8000 | 8137 | 11000 |
| Outputs | Number of water users' associations established and operationalized | 100 | 104 | 150 |
| Outputs | Number of people, disaggregated by sex, benefiting from demonstration farms, enhanced extension services, and farm-to-farm visits to | 37,000 (90% men) | 39,173 (90% men) | 47,000 (90% men and 10% women) |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|--|
| | enhance their resilience and reduce climate risks | | | |
| Outputs | Number of men and women trained on risk reduction in small ruminants and poultry; animal nutrition or alternative fodder production | 30,000 (90% women) | 32,254 (89% women) | 50,000 (10% men and 90% women) |
| Outputs | Number of men and women benefiting from small loans | 30,000 (90% women) | 35,219 (91% women) | 50,000 (10% men and 90% women) |
| Outputs | Number of plastic-covered tunnels established | 0 | 0 | 30 plastic-covered tunnels established |
| Outputs | Number of men and women trained on production and harvesting of vegetables in plastic-covered tunnels | 0 | 30 (20 men and 10 women) | 150 (75 men and 75 women) |
| Outputs | Number of aquaculture units established | 0 | 100 (HH units) | 5 medium size and 100 small size aquaculture units established |
| Outputs | Number of men and women trained on fish production at established aquaculture units | 0 | 293 (195 men and 98 women) | 1,000 (730 men and 370 women) |
| Outcomes | Number of key institutions with enhanced capacities to deliver services for climate risk reduction in rural communities | 49 NGOs and 20 governmental with capacities to deliver services for climate risk reduction | 15 CDAs trained on skills of effective communication, reporting and documentation. | 64 NGOs and 30 governmental entities develop needed capacities |
| Outputs | Number of capacity strengthening activities to government staff facilitated by the Project | 30 | 39 | 60 |
| Outputs | Number of official engaged in capacity strengthening activities, disaggregated by sex | 800 (50% female) | 984 (45% female) | 1600 (50% female) |
| Outputs | Number of capacity strengthening activities to schools and universities | 50 | 90 | 70 |

| | | | | |
|---------|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| | facilitated by the Project | | | |
| Outputs | Number of students engaged in capacity strengthening activities, disaggregated by sex | 2,000 students (1,000 male and 1,000 female) | 2,400 (1,200 males and 1,200 females) | 3,000 students (1,500 males and 1,500 females) |
| Outputs | Number of knowledge materials produced on risk reduction in agriculture | 18 (8 documentaries and 10 flyers/booklets) | 30 | 33 |
| Outputs | Number of success storied documented | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| Outputs | Number of online messages | 50 | 50 | 100 |
| Outputs | Number of TV and radio programs aired | 10 | 11 | 15 |
| Outputs | Number of social media channels established/used | 7 | 13 | 10 |
| Outputs | Number of events organized and presentations made | 20 | 21 | 40 |

Comments

1 Since the established targets included the baseline, the reported progress since start of this phase of the project also includes the baseline value. * In response to the increased need for access to climate information and early warning services, 15 early warning units were established in all the Project villages instead of only 10 as originally planned, marking the activity with 150% progress rate but with no negative implications on the budget. ** As a result of the 5 additional early warning units installed in 5 villages (50% over target), greater number of community member were reached and facilitated access to weather information (within same budget) *** The number of participants in each event was much less than anticipated in the project design, average 10 versus 50 students, however, there is no negative implications on the budget of the output.

Lessons Learned

| Implementation and Adaptive Management | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| Describe any changes undertaken to improve results on the ground or any changes made to project outputs (i.e. changes to project design) | Opportunities | The project team at WFP has been continuously collaborating with the team at the PMU (EE) to revise and update workplan as needed in response to the impacts of inflation and restricted access to supplies. The project deliverables remain unchanged as of this report. Nonetheless, we are constantly evaluating how to manage and maintain the assets in a way |

| | | |
|---|---------------|--|
| | | that suits the local community and ensures lasting positive impact. |
| Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts? | Opportunities | The measures taken to ensure compliance with the environmental and social safeguards were effective in all aspects. The project followed the national environmental regulations and obtained the necessary permits and approvals from the relevant authorities for establishment of assets. The project also implemented a grievance redress mechanism and a stakeholder engagement plan (as detailed in "Annex 2 - Stakeholders Engagement and Grievance Mechanism" of the the Project document) to address any concerns or complaints from the affected communities. |
| How have gender considerations been taken into consideration during the reporting period? What have been the lessons learned as a consequence of inclusion of such considerations on project performance or impacts? List lessons learned specific to gender, detailing measures and project/programme-specific indicators highlighting the role of women as key actors in climate change adaptation. | Opportunities | Gender considerations have guided the project design since proposal development stages. This includes the integration of home visits as a more culturally appropriate tool for community mobilization that focuses on women, which have been implemented during this reporting period. In depth assessment of the effectiveness of these measures will be better assessed when the implementation of the outputs related to in-kind loans has progressed over 50%. It will also be assessed at project end when measuring the percentage improvement in the knowledge of communities, including women. |
| Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays? | Challenges | Field work started later than planned at the time of the inception activities until the WFP and EACDP teams concluded the legal agreements and conduct the first Steering Committee meeting. These legalities restricted PMU ability to conclude its agreements with partner CDAs sooner and start |

| | | |
|--|-------------------|--|
| | | <p>the execution on the ground as originally planned. In response, WFP has worked with the PMU at one end on improving the PMU capacities to execute the project. While the PMU made an early start on the assessment exercise required to select the villages and CDAs using its resources until agreements were signed and able to conclude agreements with 15 CDAs. Prices volatility and shortage of supplies also restricted the PMU ability to proceed with original procurement plans, and deliver as needed. Moreover, WFP and the PMU adopted a flexible project implementation approach that depends on more regular review and adjust course in response to changing priorities, resources or external factors.</p> |
| <p>What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?</p> | <p>Challenges</p> | <p>Among the lessons learned for the project team was to make sure the legal documents are translated, reviewed, and cleared by the different teams as early as possible. The WFP also revisited its corporate guidance to facilitate the paperwork required when engaging with partners and expedite the MoU/SoP drafting and approval cycles. Active stakeholders engagement and community participations in different institutions of the project was important to ensure developing of practical and effective solutions that are widely accepted, enhance problem-solving skills of participants from NGOs, private sector and public institutions, developing local networks of actors, and leverage ownerships and integration. It was important in design and implementation of the interventions to increase dependency on locally sources materials and services to have more resilient implementation</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | to external shocks and stressors. |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|

Has the project already reached mid term or project completion?(yes/no).

Yes

| Climate Resilience Measures | |
|---|--|
| What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing climate adaptation measures that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change? | '- Engaging local communities and stakeholders In the planning and implementation of adaptation actions can increase their ownership, participation and sustainability. - Integrating climate adaptation into existing local plans and programmes can enhance coherence, efficiency and effectiveness of the interventions. - Building on existing capacities, knowledge and practices can facilitate the adoption and scaling up of adaptation measures. - Monitoring and evaluation of adaptation outcomes and impacts can provide feedback, learning and accountability for the adaptation actions. - Solutions should not address the underlying drivers and root causes of vulnerability and exposure separately but rather introduce integrated package of Solutions to the smallholders HH that tackle for example water, energy and land management, or income diversification, access to productive assets and enabling services as In the example of In-kind animal loans. |
| What is the potential for the climate resilience measures undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area? | The Project has shown how different types of climate resilience measures can work in various situations and sectors to help beneficiaries (mainly small-scale producers of both genders) cope with the factors that make them vulnerable. The Project supported CDAs as agents of change who could spread the project's innovations to in supported communities and beyond. The Project has built partnerships and networks with relevant stakeholders and institutions to exchange knowledge and best practices. Capacity building activities were provided to government staff for awareness and integration of the project activities in local plans and programmes. Advocacy activities have begun under the documentation and dissemination output of the project for policy and institutional dialogue to promote the adoption and scaling up of climate resilience measures at local, regional and national levels. |
| Readiness Interventions (Applicable only to NIEs that received one or more readiness grants) | |
| What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in accessing and implementing climate finance readiness support that would be relevant to the preparation, design and implementation of future concrete adaptation projects/programmes? | NA |
| How have the outputs (such as manuals, guidelines, | NA |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>procedures or the experience from providing peer support, etc) from employing readiness grants been used to inform institutional capacity needs, gender issues, and environmental and social aspects in developing and implementing concrete projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?</p> | |
| <p>Concrete Adaptation Interventions</p> | |
| <p>What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?</p> | <p>The importance of stakeholder engagement and participation. By involving the communities, local authorities, and other relevant actors in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of activities, buy-in for new initiatives takes time but when ensured, it confirms the sustainability of any actionthe interventions can be more responsive to the needs, preferences, and capacities of the beneficiaries. Another lesson learned is the need to ensure integration of adaptation interventions with other development objectives and policies, such as poverty reduction and water saving. This can enhance the co-benefits, synergies, and sustainability of the adaptation outcomes. Another lesson learned is the need for robust methods, indicators, and data collection systems that can capture the changes in vulnerability and resilience over time, especially in the context of complex and evolving crisis in the region and globally.</p> |
| <p>What is the potential for the concrete adaptation interventions undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?</p> | <p>The Project developed practical and affordable solutions that are relevant, feasible, and cost-effective, for adapting to different environmental challenges in various contexts and scales. These solutions are incorporated in national policies and programmes for wider implementation and impact. The Project also documented and shared its results and lessons through various media channels, such as TV, radio, print outs, streaming services and social media.</p> |
| <p>Knowledge Management</p> | |
| <p>How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?</p> | <p>Different steering committees are established to facilitate knowledge sharing and guiding implementations and providing feedback at different levels of local, regional, and national.</p> |
| <p>Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what chanelns of dissemination have been used?</p> | <p>information and knowledge products by the Project are being disseminated through various channels that include steering committees meetings, social media and community meetings.</p> |
| <p>Please list any knowledge products generated and include hyperlinks whenever possible (e.g. project videos, project stories, studies and technical reports, case studies, tranining manuals, handbooks, strategies and plans developed, etc.)</p> | <p>Underdevelopment</p> |
| <p>If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.</p> | <p>Underdevelopment</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Describe any difficulties there have been in accessing or retrieving existing information (data or knowledge) that is relevant to the project. Please provide suggestions for improving access to the relevant data. | None. |
| Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed? | N/A |
| Innovation | |
| Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project. | The project's solar-powered irrigation solution, which is operated by well-established WUAs, has a high demand as it addresses the complex issue of water-energy-food production. Also, introduced heat-tolerant high yielding seeds was successful with tangible and relatively quick returns on smallholders' livelihoods. |
| Complementarity/ Coherence with other climate finance sources | |
| Has the project been scaled-up from any other climate finance? Or has the project build upon any other climate finance initiative? | Yes |
| If you answered yes, kindly specify the name of the Fund/Organization. | Building Resilient Food Security Systems to Benefit the Southern Egypt Region - Phase 1 |

Results Tracker

Goal: Assist developing-country Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting the costs of concrete adaptation projects and programmes in order to implement climate-resilient measures.

Impact: Increased resiliency at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change.

Is this the mid-term or terminal project performance report? Midterm

Impact: Increased resiliency at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change

Core Indicator: No. of beneficiaries

| | | Total | % of female beneficiaries | % of Youth beneficiaries |
|----------------------|---|-------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Baseline information | Direct beneficiaries supported by the project | | | |
| Baseline information | Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project | | | |
| Baseline information | Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Target performance | Direct beneficiaries | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------|------|------|
| at completion | supported by the project | | | |
| Target performance at completion | Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project | | | |
| Target performance at completion | Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Performance at mid-term | Direct beneficiaries supported by the project | 14574 | 69 | 45 |
| Performance at mid-term | Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project | 18900 | 20 | 20 |
| Performance at mid-term | Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries) | 33474 | 44.5 | 32.5 |
| Performance at completion | Direct beneficiaries supported by the project | | | |
| Performance at completion | Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project | | | |
| Performance at completion | Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries) | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Outcome 1: Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats

Indicator 1: Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis

| | Number of targeted stakeholders - Total | Number of targeted stakeholders - % of female targeted | Hazards information generated and disseminated | Overall effectiveness |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------|
| Baseline information | | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | 784 | 25 | Drought | 5: Very effective |
| Performance at completion | | | | |

Output 1.1 Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated

Indicator 1.1: No. of projects/programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments

| No. of projects/programme that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments | Sector | Scale | Status |
|--|--------|-------|--------|
| | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Baseline information | | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | | |

Output 1.2 Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems

Core Indicator 1.2: No. of Early Warning Systems

| | No. of adopted Early Warning Systems | Category targeted | Hazard | Geographical coverage | Number of municipalities |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Baseline information | | | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | | | |

Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate-induced socioeconomic and environmental losses

Indicator 2: Capacity of staff to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events from targeted institutions increased

| | Number of staff targeted - Total | Number of staff targeted - % of female targeted | Sector | Capacity level |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--------------|------------------|
| Baseline information | | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | 186 | 25 | Multi-sector | 4: High capacity |
| Performance at completion | | | | |

Output 2.1 Strengthened capacity of national and sub-national centres and networks to respond rapidly to extreme weather events

Indicator 2.1.1: No. of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events

| | Total staff trained | % of female staff trained | Type |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--------|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | 186 | 25 | Public |
| Performance at completion | | | |

| completion | | | | |
|---|--------|----------|--------------|--------------------|
| Indicator 2.1.2: No. of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks | | | | |
| | Type | Scale | Sector | Capacity Level |
| Baseline information | | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | Public | National | Multi-sector | 3: Medium capacity |
| Performance at completion | | | | |

Output 2.2. Increased readiness and capacity of national and sub-national entities to directly access and program adaptation finance

Indicator 2.2.1: No. of targeted institutions benefitting from the direct access and enhanced direct access modality

| | Number of beneficiaries | Scale | Sector | Capacity Level |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Baseline information | | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | | |

Outcome 3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes

Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses

| | Percentage of targeted population applying adaptation measures | Sector |
|----------------------------------|--|--------|
| Baseline information | | |
| Target performance at completion | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | |
| Performance at completion | | |

Output 3.1: Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities

Indicator 3.1.1: Percentage of targeted population awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses

| | No. of targeted beneficiaries | % of female participants targeted | Level of awareness |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | |

Output 3.2: Stenghtened capacity of national and subnational stakeholders and entities to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning

Indicator 3.2.1: No. of technical committees/associations formed to ensure transfer of knowledge

| | No. of technical committees/associations | % of women represented in committes/associations | Level of awareness |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | |

Indicator 3.2.2: No. of tools and guidelines developed (thematic, sectoral, institutional) and shared with relevant stakeholders

| | No. of tools and guidelines | Type | Scale |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------|-------|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | |

Outcome 4: Increased adaptive capacity within relevant development sector services and infrastructure assets

Indicator 4.1: Increased responsiveness of development sector services to evolving needs from changing and variable climate

| | Project/programme sector | Geographical scale | Response level |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | |

Core Indicator 4.2: Assets produced, developed, improved or strengthened

| | Sector | Targeted asset | Changes in asset |
|--|--------|----------------|------------------|
|--|--------|----------------|------------------|

| | | | (quantitative or qualitative) |
|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | |

Indicator 4.1.1: Vulnerable development sector services and infrastructure assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability

Indicator 4.1.1: No. and type of development sector services to respond to new conditions resulting from climate variability and change

| | Number of services | Type | Sector |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|------|--------|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | |

Outcome 5: Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress

Indicator 5: Ecosystem services and natural resource assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress

| | Natural resource improvement level | Sector | Type |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|------|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | |

Output 5: Vulnerable ecosystem services and natural resource assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability

Core Indicator 5.1: Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated

| | Natural asset or Ecosystem (type) | Total number of natural assets or ecosystems protected/rehabilitated | Unit | Effectiveness of protection/rehabilitation |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|------|--|
| Baseline information | | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Performance at completion | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|

Outcome 6: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas

Indicator 6.1: Increase in households and communities having more secure access to livelihood assets

| | No. of targeted households | % of female headed households | Improvement level |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | 15 | 16 | 4: High improvement |
| Performance at completion | | | |

Indicator 6.2: Increase in targeted population's sustained climate-resilient alternative livelihoods

| | No. of targeted households | % of female headed households | % increase in income level vis-à-vis baseline | Alternate Source |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Baseline information | | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | 5216 | 10 | From 20% to 30% | Livestock production |
| Performance at mid-term | 293 | 10 | From 20% to 30% | Aquaculture |
| Performance at mid-term | 0 | 10 | From 20% to 30% | Cultivation |
| Performance at completion | | | | |

Output 6 Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability

Indicator 6.1.1: No. and type of adaptation assets created or strengthened in support of individual or community livelihood strategies

| | Number of Assets | Type of Assets | Sector | Adaptation strategy |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Baseline information | | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | 15 | Financial capital | Multi-sector | Community-based adaptation |
| Performance at completion | | | | |

Core Indicator 6.1.2: Increased income, or avoided decrease in income

| | Number of households (total number in the | Income source | Income level (USD) |
|--|---|---------------|--------------------|
|--|---|---------------|--------------------|

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|------|
| | project area) | | |
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | 2173 | Cultivation | 2197 |
| Performance at completion | | | |

Outcome 7: Improved policies and regulations that promote and enforce resilience measures

Indicator 7: Climate change priorities are integrated into national development strategy

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Integration level |
| Baseline information | |
| Target performance at completion | |
| Performance at mid-term | |
| Performance at completion | |

Output 7: Improved integration of climate-resilience strategies into country development plans

Indicator 7.1: No. of policies introduced or adjusted to address climate change risks

| | No. of Policies introduced or adjusted | Sector | Scale | Type |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| Baseline information | | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | | |

Indicator 7.2: No. of targeted development strategies with incorporated climate change priorities enforced

| | No. of Development strategies | Regulation | Effectiveness |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | |

Outcome 8: Support the development and diffusion of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies

Indicator 8: Innovative adaptation practices are rolled out, scaled up, encouraged and/or accelerated at regional, national and/or subnational level

| | Sector of innovative practice | Geographic Scale | Type |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | |

Output 8: Viable innovations are rolled out, saled up, encourages and/or accelerated

Indicator 8.1: No. of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies accelerated, scaled-up and/or replicated

| | No. of innovative practices/ tools technologies | Sector | Status | Effectiveness |
|----------------------------------|---|--------|--------|---------------|
| Baseline information | | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | | |

Indicator 8.2: No. of key findings on effective, efficient adaptation practices, products and technologies generated

| | No. of key findings generated | Type | Effectiveness |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|---------------|
| Baseline information | | | |
| Target performance at completion | | | |
| Performance at mid-term | | | |
| Performance at completion | | | |