



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 05/28/2003	
PROJ ID: P004981		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name: Eg-red Sea Coastal	Project Costs (US\$M)	5.6	5.3
Country: Egypt	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	4.8	4.5
Sector(s): Board: ENV - General agriculture fishing and forestry sector (76%), Central government administration (24%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)		
L/C Number:			
	Board Approval (FY)		92
Partners involved :	Closing Date	09/30/1996	06/30/2002
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
Robert C. Varley	Christopher D. Gerrard	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
<p>The project served the goals of the Global Environment Fund (GEF) - to preserve biodiversity and prevent pollution . The overall objective was to strengthen Egyptian government institutions to carry out integrated multi -sectoral CZM (Coastal Zone Management) activities, with particular reference to tourism development along the Red Sea coast . The project was to develop and implement policies, plans and regulations for sound environmental management and protection of the shared marine resources of the Red Sea coastal zone . There were three further more specific sub-objectives which were to develop and implement: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. public-private partnerships that sustain the environment and common marine resources; 2. solutions for the establishment, management and recurrent funding of marine protected areas and marine recreational resources; 3. a GIS (Geographical Information System) to inventory coastal and marine ecosystem and resource use, which would be available to governments, universities and private sector interests . 			
b. Components			
<p>Total project costs at appraisal were \$ 5.73 million comprising:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cairo and Red Sea Project Offices (25%) 2. CZM Plan (13%) 3. Environmental Impact Assessment (4%) 4. Pollution Control (10%) 5. Recreation Area Management (18%) 6. Protected Area (23%) 7. CZM Program Review (3%) 8. Scientific Advisory Committee and Network (2%) 9. Contingencies (2%). 			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
<p>To allow the project to become effective it was de-linked from a larger \$130 million Private Sector Tourism Infrastructure and Environmental Management Project (LN36050) in 1994. Three agencies were responsible for implementation - the Tourism Development Authority (TDA), Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA) and the Red Sea Governate (RSG.)</p>			
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project achieved its overall objective by developing and implementing policies, plans and regulations to manage coastal resources . The project succeeded in collecting and interpreting crucial information needed for the management of resources and implementation of a CZM plan . An Environment Unit has been established in TDA, and EEAA fully enforces the EIA regulations for tourism development . 2. Public-private cooperation has been established and includes environmental NGOs, investors' environmental 			

groups and Government agencies . The completed Visitor Center will be operated by a public-private partnership.

3. The objective of implementing practical solutions for management and recurrent funding of marine protected areas and recreational resources has not yet been achieved . The Red Sea Protected Area (RSPA) has not yet been implemented by EEAA and activities such as the hiring and training of rangers are only just starting . Coral protection activities are contingent upon the agreement of further USAID funding . Recurrent funding in general depends on donors, particularly USAID, and investors . A downturn in tourism has limited the potential of tourism-based cost-recovery mechanisms.
4. The GIS objective has been achieved fully - a digitized atlas of Red Sea marine/terrestrial resources and a comprehensive database of coastal and marine ecosystems (completed in 1998), is continually updated. Training of implementing agency staff has been completed and there have been major outputs of action plans, reports and documents .

4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:

The Project Management Group (PMG) was successful in bringing together the heads of TDA, EEAA and RSG as well as the project and operations managers . Project expertise was transferred to the implementing agencies and the establishment of a separate regulatory authority avoided .

5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):

1. Quality at entry was unsatisfactory and the project was at risk at one time . The design was complex but lacked an overall CZM framework to bring the components together, linking them to the objectives . There were too many studies and the project did not focus sufficiently on implementation on the ground . There were also inconsistencies between objectives that focused on data collection and interpretation for management of fragile resources, and the other project components .
2. The project was initially tied to a delayed tourism infrastructure project and did not become operational until 1995 when it was de-linked from that project. Weak project management compounded the early delays and the project did not become fully operational until 1997.

6. Ratings :	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Institutional Dev .:	Modest	Modest	
Sustainability :	Likely	Likely	Sustainability is likely if and when the tourism sector picks up, and when EEAA and TDA cost -recovery mechanisms become fully effective. In the meanwhile continued USAID financing of some operational costs will ensure continuity .
Bank Performance :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Borrower Perf .:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of ICR :		Satisfactory	

NOTE: ICR rating values flagged with '*' don't comply with OP/BP 13.55, but are listed for completeness.

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:

1. When multiple implementing agencies are involved an overall CZM framework is needed from the beginning to provide an overall structure and ensure consistency between the project objectives and activities /components. This also provides more opportunities for implementation of studies results on the ground .
2. Promotion of environmental awareness amongst stakeholders is a key element in protecting fragile natural resources.

8. Assessment Recommended? Yes No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

Satisfactory.