



**The European Union's "MED/2004/098-474" Project
for the MED Region**

**Service Contract for a Monitoring System of the
Implementation of Projects and
Programmes of External Co-operation Financed by the
European Community**

Lot 5: Mediterranean (MED) Region

***Synthesis Report for the
EUROMED WATER
Programme***

Final Version – 23 December 2005



This project is funded by
the European Union



A project implemented by
EPU-NTUA Consortium
ICCS-NTUA (EPU) - MWH - HSTPE -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2. PROGRAMME SYNOPSIS | 2 |
| 2.1. BACKGROUND OF THE PROGRAMME | 2 |
| 2.2. PROGRAMME INTERVENTION LOGIC | 2 |
| 2.3. PROJECTS UNDER THE PROGRAMME | 3 |
| 3. WORKPLAN | 5 |
| 3.1. INCORPORATION OF THE EUROMED WATER PROGRAMME IN THE WORKPLAN | 5 |
| 4. INSIGHTS OF THE PROGRAMME | 8 |
| 4.1. PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE BY MONITORING CRITERIA | 8 |
| 4.2. PROJECTS PERFORMANCE BY MONITORING CRITERIA AND PRIME ISSUES | 10 |
| 4.3. PERFORMANCE OF PROJECTS OVER TIME | 13 |
| 4.4. STRONG AND WEAK POINTS BY CRITERION | 13 |
| 4.5. ANALYSIS BY COUNTRY | 14 |
| 4.6. ANALYSIS PER TYPE OF PARTNER | 14 |
| 5. SPECIAL ISSUES | 17 |
| 5.1. DECONCENTRATION | 17 |
| 5.2. FOLLOW UP ON RECOMMENDATIONS | 17 |
| 5.3. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROACH | 19 |
| 6. SUCCESS STORIES IN 2005 | 20 |
| 7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 21 |
| 7.1. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS ON THE EUROMED WATER PROGRAMME, AS IMPLEMENTED | 21 |
| 7.2. LESSONS LEARNT | 21 |
| 7.3. RECOMMENDATIONS | 22 |

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: Monitoring Reports Produced

ANNEX II: Statistics of Projects Monitored

List of Tables

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| Table 1: | Projects under the Euromed Water Programme | 4 |
| Table 2: | Modifications of the M-Portfolio regarding Euromed Water projects | 5 |
| Table 3: | Portfolio of projects and monitoring plan of Euromed Water in 2005..... | 6 |
| Table 4: | Monitored projects in 2005 | 7 |
| Table 5: | Overview of the monitoring activity in 2005..... | 7 |
| Table 6: | Average ratings per each main criterion (Euromed Water)..... | 8 |
| Table 7: | Average ratings for main criteria | 10 |
| Table 8: | Performance of projects over time | 13 |
| Table 9: | Strong and weak points per main criterion and sub-criterion..... | 13 |

1. INTRODUCTION

In its Technical Proposal, the MED Monitoring Contractor proposed to elaborate and submit to the EC Synthesis Reports on the main Regional Programmes that have been subject to monitoring in 2005, presenting in brief the monitoring activity implemented with respect to these Programmes and its key-findings, and focusing in a synthetic way on the results of the monitoring. Experience from the past had shown that such synthetic reports were very welcome to the European Commission Task Managers.

An interim version of the Synthesis Reports would be presented to (and discussed with) the EC in the mid-term (i.e. after implementing a number of monitoring missions that can lead to safe preliminary conclusions), while the final version would be submitted at the end of the Monitoring Project Year, before preparing the Annual Report.

This approach has been approved by the AIDCO/A2 and AIDCO/A3.

In July 2005, when an adequate number of Monitoring Visits to the projects of the Euromed Water Programme had been implemented, the MED Monitoring Team proceeded to the elaboration of an interim version of the Synthesis Report on the Euromed Water Programme, in consultation with the Head of Unit AIDCO/A3 and with the Task Manager ROM in the AIDCO/A2.

The present Synthesis Report is the final version of the Synthesis Report on the Euromed Water Programme for the year 2005.

2. PROGRAMME SYNOPSIS

2.1. Background of the Programme

Water is a priority issue for all the Mediterranean partners and will gain importance as water scarcity becomes more pressing. In this respect, while launching the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, through the Barcelona Declaration in November 1995, the sustainable management of water resources was established as one of the priority areas under the Economic and Financial Partnership Chapter. The work programme annexed to the Barcelona Declaration points out the scope of co-operation in this area as follows:

- to take stock of the water situation,
- to identify ways of reinforcing regional co-operation,
- to make proposals for rationalising the planning and management of water resources, and
- to contribute towards the creation of new sources of water.

The next step was the first ministerial conference on Local Water Management, (Marseilles, 1996) which presented the general guidelines of a future water programme and also paved the way for the establishment of the Euro-Mediterranean Information System on the Know-How in the Water sector (EMWIS/SEMIDE). Then, the Euro-Mediterranean Meeting of Foreign Ministers in Stuttgart in April 1999 reiterated the priority assigned to the water sector within the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership.

The specific type of interventions was stated in the Ministerial Declaration and Action Plan of the 1999 Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Meeting (Turin, 18–19 October 1999) on Local Water Management. The European Council, The European Commission, Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Syria, The Netherlands, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the Palestinian Authority, participants in the Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on Local Water Management in Turin, agreed to reassert and complete the principles and areas for action of the Rome Mediterranean Charter for Water of 1992 and the Marseilles Declaration of November 1996 by the following points:

1. The importance of water resources in social, economic and environmental terms needs to be acknowledged at all levels and integrated into sustainable development policies;
2. Decision makers, institutions, water managers and users should be aware of the interaction and complementarity of their roles and encourage the development of a "culture system" directed to water that aims to change behaviour in order to achieve sustainable water management;
3. Good co-ordination, complementarity and synergy among existing organisations and activities in this field are indispensable;
4. A participatory approach should be encouraged, that involves the civil society, including water users and organisations at local, regional, sub-national and national level;
5. Greater priority should be given to sustainable water demand management within the framework of integrated water policy;
6. Water scarcity could be alleviated through mobilisation of non conventional water resources, such as reuse of wastewater or desalination, and sustainable methods of rain stimulation, whenever justified;
7. Improved water management in urban and rural areas, especially disadvantaged ones, needs special attention in order to provide access to clean water and to avoid inefficient use.

2.2. Programme Intervention Logic

The Euro-Mediterranean Regional Water Programme for Local Water Management – MEDA WATER- aims at the enhancement of regional co-operation in the areas of sustainable and integrated management of water resources.

The related Action Plan, approved in the 1999 Turin Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Meeting, promotes six areas of action and considers four horizontal themes when implementing the areas of action:

Areas of Action

- I. Integrated management of local drinking water supply, sanitation and sewage services;
- II. Local water resources and water demand management (quantity and quality) within catchment areas and islands;
- III. Prevention and mitigation of the negative effects of drought and equitable management of water scarcity;
- IV. Irrigation water management;
- V. Use of non-conventional water resources;
- VI. Preparation of national and local scenarios for the period until 2025 that enable precise objectives to be set and actions to be taken for sustainable water management.

In the above areas of actions, four horizontal themes were defined:

Horizontal Themes

- I. Strengthening institutional capacities and training;
- II. Exchange of information and know-how in a coherent manner;
- III. Transfer of know-how and technology;
- IV. Awareness raising, mobilisation and promotion of commitment by all beneficiaries.

Participation is open to all natural and legal persons of the 25 EU Member States and of the 10 Mediterranean Partners (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Syria, Tunisia, and Turkey).

2.3. Projects under the Programme

The table presenting all the Projects under the Euromed Water Programme is presented overleaf:

Table 1: Projects under the Euromed Water Programme

| | CRIS | Project title | Budget (€) | Coordinator | Partner countries | Short description |
|---|-------|---|--------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | 59610 | ADIRA | 2.729.259,00 | <i>Fraunhofer Institute for Solar Energy Systems (Germany)</i> | Germany, Egypt, Spain, Greece, Jordan, Morocco, Turkey | The project aims at investigating optimum concept for fresh water supply in rural areas derived from salty water (sea water and brackish water). Units powered by autonomous, renewable energy supply systems with fresh water output in the range of 100 l/day to 10 m3/day are in the focus of this project. The project also aims at evaluating the potential and the optimum solution for the countries involved taking into account the technical, economical, environmental, and organisational as well as the socio-technical and the socio-economic aspects. |
| 2 | 59641 | Efficient management of wastewater, its treatment and use in the Mediterranean countries InWent | 3.185.502,70 | <i>InWent - Internationale Weiterbildung & Entwicklung (Germany)</i> | Germany, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine, Turkey | The project objectives and purposes are to develop and implement technical guidelines for efficient waste water management, its treatment and reuse in the MED region; to strengthen the exchange of experience and co-operation in the European and Mediterranean partner countries; to enhance public awareness of the insufficient wrong wastewater treatment; to provide decision-makers with up-to-date, relevant information in order to help them choosing the most suitable technology. |
| 3 | 59627 | EMPOWERS | 3.842.520,80 | <i>CARE International (United Kingdom)</i> | United Kingdom, Egypt, Jordan, The Netherlands, Palestine | The aim is to improve long-term access and rights to water by vulnerable populations, through participatory water planning & management process with key stakeholders including government agencies, NGOs, end-users and the private sector. Stakeholder dialogue and concerted action will help to enhance vertical and horizontal linkages, information flows, empowerment and decision making at all levels, including local communities. |
| 4 | 75262 | Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm-Level | 4.395.060,00 | <i>HWA - Hilfswerk Austria (Austria)</i> | Austria, Spain, Jordan, Palestine | With the combination of technical "hardware" and socio-economic "software", the project will provide access to complementary competencies across international borders in the field of water local management. (Technical and non-technical training, demonstration and pilot activities, and equipment (irrigation networks, collective wastewater treatment, construction of common and individual reservoirs and cisterns). Software component of associations, cooperatives, and forums). |
| 5 | 59763 | Institutional and social innovations in irrigation Mediterranean Management ISIIMM | 4.186.410,00 | <i>Agropolis (France)</i> | France, Egypt, Spain, Italy, Lebanon, Morocco | The overall objective is to understand current contradictions associated with local water management in Mediterranean watersheds and finding institutional innovations according to the area of social compromise in each locality. To achieve this objective, partners from six Euro-Med countries will undertake 11 case studies and will exchange experience and knowledge about institutions, organisations and the rules for water use that are applied at three levels: national frameworks, regional basin situations, and specific river basins. |
| 6 | 59341 | MEDAWARE | 1.876.455,00 | <i>National Technical University of Athens (NTUA) (Greece)</i> | Greece, Cyprus, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine, Spain, Turkey | The project aims at addressing the issue of sustainable urban wastewater treatment and reuse in the agricultural production through promotion of effective technologies and safe practices. It will mainly focus on the development of technical specifications for urban wastewater treatment technologies and systems (including innovative ones) and for urban wastewater utilization. The project aims at increasing the safe reuse of wastewater in agriculture and the protection of environment and public health, as well as at supporting the competent authorities by providing them tools and methods in respect to wastewater treatment and reuse. |
| 7 | 59770 | Mediterranean Drought, preparedness and mitigation planning MEDROPLAN | 2.445.815,00 | <i>Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Saragossa (Spain)</i> | Spain, Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Morocco, Tunisia | The objectives are to develop Guidelines for drought preparedness plans and to set up a Network for drought preparedness in Mediterranean countries. The Guidelines will provide with an integrated approach to minimize the impacts of drought in their people and resources, and to change the way of facing droughts from the present crisis management to a proactive risk management. The project will also focus on understanding of drought, its causes, its impacts on the economy, the environment, and society; transfer of know-how, technology, and expertise; strengthening institutional and public capabilities and raising awareness. |
| 8 | 59768 | Sustainable Concepts towards a zero outflow municipality ZerO-M | 4.413.255,00 | <i>Energy Institute for sustainable technologies (Austria)</i> | Austria, Egypt, Germany, Greece, Italy, Morocco, Tunisia, Turkey | ZerO-M aims at concepts and technologies to achieve optimised close-loop usage of all water flows in small municipalities or settlements (e.g. tourism facilities) not connected to a central wastewater treatment - the Zero Outflow Municipality. (The project will focus on sanitation systems with low water consumption, separation of grey and black water, biological treatment of grey water and re-use for non-drinking purposes (e.g. irrigation), bio-membrane reactors for intense treatment, constructed wetlands for extensive treatment, sludge cleaning for reuse as fertiliser). |
| 9 | 59776 | IRWA Improvement of Irrigation Water Management in Lebanon and Jordan | 4.861.944,00 | <i>Instituto per la Cooperazione Universitaria (Italy)</i> | Italy, Spain, Jordan, Lebanon | The project aims at rehabilitating part of the Litani River; increasing the availability of cultivable lands through protection from inundations and their control; increasing irrigation efficiency in the central and southern parts of the Jordan River Valley; increasing water stocking facilities at farm level; increasing awareness on water management; improving farmers' technical know-how; strengthening regional cooperation on water issues in agriculture. |

3. WORKPLAN

3.1. Incorporation of the EUROMED WATER Programme in the Workplan

The definition of the M-Portfolio started with the reception of the list of projects to be monitored in 2005, prepared by AIDCO/A2 in coordination with the EC Delegations in MED Countries and with AIDCO/A3 for (non de-concentrated) regional programmes. The portfolio was checked by the MED M-Team so as to ensure the monitorability of the projects versus the three main monitorability criteria. Based on this, the M-Team prepared a proposed Workplan for 2005, which was adjusted and consolidated through continuous coordination and consultation with the concerned AIDCO Units (A2 and A3) and with the EC Delegations.

In the frame of this process, the M-Portfolio regarding Euromed Water projects has remained within its initial scope, with however some minor modifications of the plan of Project-Visits. All these modifications that occurred to date in the frame of the M-Team's cooperation with AIDCO and the EC Delegations have been approved by AIDCO/A2, on the basis of the following main inputs:

Table 2: Modifications of the M-Portfolio regarding Euromed Water projects

| Need or reason for adjustments | Initiator | Result |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Modification of the timing of Monitoring Visit | AIDCO/A3 | Bring forward, in the Mission to Jordan, the monitoring of the project: - IRWA Improvement of Irrigation Water Management in Lebanon and Jordan, so that all Water projects are monitored once up to July 2005. |
| Second visits required | AIDCO/A3, EC Delegation in Jordan | The need has occurred through the consultation of the M-Team with the AIDCO/A3 and the Jordan Delegation, for second visits to the following Water Projects in MED countries: - ADIRA - Efficient management of wastewater, its treatment and use in the Mediterranean countries - EMPOWERS - Hilfswerk Austria sustainable water management at farm level - Institutional and social innovations in irrigation Mediterranean Management ISIIMM - MEDAWARE - MEDROPLAN - Sustainable Concepts towards zero outflow municipality ZerO-M |

This process resulted in the following 9 projects to be monitored in 2005:

- ADIRA, CRIS No 59610
- Efficient management of wastewater, its treatment & use in the Med countries, CRIS No 59641
- EMPOWERS, CRIS No 59627
- Hilfswerk Austria sustainable water management at farm level, CRIS No 75262
- Institutional and social innovations in irrigation Mediterranean Management ISIIMM, CRIS No 59763
- IRWA Improvement of Irrigation Water Management in Lebanon and Jordan, CRIS No 59776
- MEDAWARE, CRIS No 59341
- Mediterranean Drought, preparedness and mitigation planning MEDROPLAN, CRIS No 59770
- Sustainable Concepts towards a zero outflow municipality ZerO-M, CRIS No 59768;

The above process resulted in the following plan for the monitoring of Euromed Water projects in 2005.

In December 2005, all the above monitoring missions including visits to Euromed Water projects have been successfully implemented according to the schedule.

The main data of the Monitoring Missions in the frame of which Euromed Water projects have been monitored in 2005 are presented in the following Table:

Table 4: Monitored projects in 2005

| N° | Mission | Period | Projects monitored | Reports produced |
|----|------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| 1 | Regional 2 | 27 June – 14 July | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADIRA, Germany - Efficient management of wastewater, its treatment & use in Mediterranean countries, Germany - EMPOWERS, UK - Hilfswerk Austria sustainable water management at farm level, Austria - Institutional and social innovations in irrigation Mediterranean Management ISIIMM, France - MEDAWARE, Greece - MEDROPLAN, Spain - Sustainable Concepts towards a zero outflow municipality ZerO-M, Austria | 8 |
| 2 | Jordan | 10 – 22 July | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IRWA Improvement of Irrigation Water Management in Lebanon and Jordan - ADIRA (2nd visit) - Hilfswerk Austria sustainable water management at farm level (2nd visit) | 3 (including 1 Monitoring Note) |
| 3 | Lebanon | 09 – 21 October | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Efficient management of wastewater, its treatment and use in the Mediterranean countries (2nd visit) | 1 |
| 4 | Egypt | 07 - 17 November | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutional and social innovations in irrigation Mediterranean Management ISIIMM (2nd visit) - Zer0-M (2nd visit) - EMPOWERS (2nd visit) | 3 |
| 5 | Morocco 2 | 27 November – 10 December | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MEDAWARE (2nd visit) - MEDROPLAN (2nd visit) | 2 |

An overview of the Monitoring activity in 2005 is presented in the Table below:

Table 5: Overview of the monitoring activity in 2005

| Statistics of the Monitoring Activity in 2005 | | | |
|--|----|--|-------|
| N° of projects monitored | 9 | N° of monitoring operations | 17 |
| N° of specified sectors covered (at the level of CRS code) | 2 | N° of monitoring reports (including 1 Monitoring Note) | 17 |
| N° of missions undertaken | 5 | Million € covered (All projects monitored) | 31.94 |
| N° of Countries visited | 10 | Average size of Project monitored (mio €) | 3.55 |

4. INSIGHTS OF THE PROGRAMME

4.1. Programme Performance by Monitoring Criteria

The following table presents the average performance of the Euromed Water projects, which have been monitored to date. The performance of the projects is calculated as average of the five monitoring criteria (Quality of project design, Efficiency of implementation to date, Effectiveness to date, Impact prospects, and Potential sustainability). For the calculation of the average, the grades a, b, c, d have been replaced by scores 4, 3, 2, 1 respectively.

Table 6: Average ratings per each main criterion (Euromed Water)

| Criterion | Average rating | Sample (number of Projects) | Sample (number of M-Reports) |
|---------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Quality of project design | 2.71 | 9 | 16 |
| Efficiency | 2.93 | 9 | 16 |
| Effectiveness | 2.74 | 9 | 16 |
| Impact | 3.03 | 9 | 16 |
| Sustainability | 3.10 | 9 | 16 |
| AVERAGE | 2.90 | 9 | 16 |

NOTE: The Average of all reports produced for each project was calculated first and then the Average at Programme level (i.e. of all 9 projects) was calculated).

As presented in the above table, the Euromed Water is performing well (average equal to 2.93 – highly above the limit of 2.55). However, and although the projects present deficiencies that could jeopardise their implementation, it would be useful to focus on some issues, which need further attention.

From the 5 monitoring criteria, “Quality of project design” is the weaker criterion. Out of 9 projects, only 3, “ZERO-M”, “Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level” and “MEDAWARE”, have an overall concise, structured and well presented conceptual design together with an adequately developed Logical Framework Matrix (LFM). Most of the projects revealed design weaknesses during the fourth phase of the Project Cycle Management (Implementation). This is an issue that could be taken into account in future similar calls for tender, by setting the proper project design as a prerequisite.

One other major issue revealed through the assessment of the quality of design is that rather frequently the contractors / project co-ordinators (PC) underestimate the necessity of the existence of a strong management team for handling all administrative needs, such as reporting, preparation of tender documents, application of EC guidelines, as well as partners’ guidance. This lack of strong management by the Project Coordinators has a significant impact quite early in the implementation phase of the projects. This sometimes leads to financial problems as they tend to over-spend resources in project management (in comparison with what was foreseen in the original design). It should be made clear that if a contract is awarded to a PC, all management needs should be clearly understood and accepted by the contractor, so as to avoid such issues during the course of the project’s implementation.

At the level of Efficiency and Effectiveness, specific projects such as ISIIMM and Zer0-M face some delays with respect to the implementation of their Pilot Plants. Other interventions (“IRWA”, “Efficient Management of Wastewater, its Treatment and Use in the MED Countries”), are still experiencing problems related to administrative procedures, non-compliance of reports and tender documents with the EC regulations, despite the fact that most of them are now entering in the third year of their implementation. This phenomenon results almost always in the need for redrafting some items related with the administrative work done. This need is correctly pointed by the EC Task Managers wherever it applies. Again this is a result of the above-mentioned Coordinators’ underestimation of project management work. However, these exceptions taken aside, Efficiency and Effectiveness seem to be rather good in all cases.

In general, Impact prospects are good at present, with some cases such as "ADIRA" having a low visible impact due to delays of their pilot sites' development. Beneficiaries and involved stakeholders are in most of the cases well aware of the projects' Overall Objectives (OO), Project Purpose (PP) and expected results, and are keen on participating and contributing; however, administrative delays may undermine the effective impact of some projects.

Sustainability is the strongest area of performance for the Euromed Water projects. Nevertheless, a common issue is the unequal willingness of the state actors to actively support project results. Indeed, project results could be promoted by allocating funds and further adapting relevant policies and legislation, resulting in fostering the application and use of project benefits in a more sustainable framework.

At this stage, the following projects (monitored in 2005) are considered as successes (projects with average ratings corresponding to "a" and/or "b" for all 5 criteria):

- Euromed Water: Institutional and social innovations in irrigation Mediterranean Management ISIIMM.
- Euromed Water: MEDAWARE, Development Tools and Guidelines for the Promotion of the Sustainable Urban Wastewater Treatment and Re-use in the Agricultural Production in the Mediterranean Countries.
- Euromed Water: Hilfswerk Austria Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level.
- Euromed Water: Sustainable Concepts towards a zero outflow municipality ZerO-M.
- Euromed Water: Efficient Management of Wastewater, its Treatment and Use in the Mediterranean Countries.

As mentioned before, the other projects are not facing any serious problems, although some of them are in a stage where solutions to problems are necessary in order to further promote their progress.

4.2. Projects performance by monitoring criteria and prime issues

Table 7: Average ratings for main criteria

| Code | Criterion | Projects | | | | | | | | | Average |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|--|-------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|-------------|-------------|
| | | ADIRA | Efficient Management of Wastewater, its Treatment and Use in the Mediterranean Countries | EMPOWERS | Improvement of Irrigation Water Management in Lebanon and Jordan | ISIMM | MEDAIWARE | MEDROPLAN | Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level | Zer0-M | |
| M1 | Quality of project design | 2,08 | 3,00 | 2,23 | 3,00 | 2,75 | 3,00 | 2,30 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,71 |
| M11 | Actual Relevance | 1,80 | 3,00 | 2,75 | 3,00 | 2,75 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,81 |
| M12 | Feasibility & flexibility | 2,20 | 3,00 | 2,00 | 3,00 | 2,75 | 3,00 | 2,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,66 |
| M2 | Efficiency to date | 2,68 | 2,84 | 2,95 | 2,40 | 3,05 | 3,66 | 2,90 | 3,00 | 2,90 | 2,93 |
| M21 | Input availability | 1,40 | 2,20 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,86 | 3,50 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,88 |
| M22 | Activity timeliness | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,75 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,86 | 3,75 | 3,00 | 2,83 | 3,13 |
| M23 | Results achievement | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,00 | 3,00 | 3,86 | 2,25 | 3,00 | 2,83 | 2,88 |
| M24 | Partner contribution & involvement | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,00 | 3,25 | 2,86 | 2,75 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,87 |
| M3 | Effectiveness to date | 2,68 | 2,32 | 2,80 | 2,30 | 3,00 | 2,86 | 2,83 | 3,00 | 2,88 | 2,74 |
| M31 | Accessibility of results | 2,20 | 3,20 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,25 | 3,00 | 2,83 | 2,83 |
| M32 | Use of results | 2,20 | 2,20 | 3,00 | 2,00 | 3,00 | 2,86 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,83 | 2,68 |
| M33 | Project Purpose achievement | 3,00 | 2,00 | 2,75 | 2,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,75 |
| M34 | Status of previous key observations | 3,80 | 2,20 | 2,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,00 | 2,75 | 3,00 | 2,67 | 2,71 |
| M4 | Impact Prospects | 2,60 | 3,40 | 2,86 | 3,00 | 3,08 | 2,91 | 3,06 | 3,00 | 3,38 | 3,03 |
| M41 | Ensuring of impact achievement | 2,20 | 3,60 | 2,75 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,75 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,92 |
| M42 | Wider planned effects | 3,00 | 3,20 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,57 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,83 | 3,07 |
| M43 | Status of previous key observations | 0,00 | 0,00 | | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,14 | 2,25 | 3,00 | 2,50 | 1,77 |
| M5 | Sustainability | 3,04 | 3,18 | 3,17 | 3,11 | 3,15 | 3,10 | 3,15 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,10 |
| M51 | Economic viability | 3,00 | 3,20 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,25 | 2,57 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 |
| M52 | Local ownership | 3,00 | | 3,00 | 4,00 | 3,25 | 3,00 | 3,50 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,86 |
| M53 | Policy support | 2,20 | 2,20 | 2,50 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,77 |
| M54 | Institution building | 4,00 | 3,20 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,75 | 3,00 | 2,83 | 3,20 |
| M55 | Socio-cultural adequacy | 3,00 | 3,20 | 4,00 | 3,00 | 3,25 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,16 |
| M56 | Gender equality | 0,00 | | | 0,00 | 3,00 | 0,00 | 2,25 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 1,25 |
| M57 | Technology appropriateness | 3,20 | 3,20 | 2,25 | 3,00 | | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,63 |
| M58 | Consideration for environ. protection | 3,00 | 4,00 | 4,00 | 3,00 | 3,25 | 3,86 | 3,25 | 3,00 | 3,17 | 3,39 |
| TOTAL AVERAGE | | 2,62 | 2,95 | 2,80 | 2,76 | 3,01 | 3,10 | 2,85 | 3,00 | 3,03 | 2,90 |

The overall performance of the projects is considered as good. Most of the projects have already implemented a fair share of foreseen activities but still have some difficulties in demonstrating tangible results, e.g. works for implementing pilot plants; hence, although the prospects for impact are good, any significant impact is still to come. As regards sustainability prospects, perspectives for all projects are quite optimistic, but the extent of the actual embrace of the local communities as well as of the relevant stakeholders will be visible in most cases only after pilot plants are operating or, in other cases, near project completion. A brief analysis of the situation for each project follows hereafter:

ADIRA

The project has experienced some delays due to the original underestimation by the Project Coordinator of the required project management effort. Although the initial project design can be characterised as over-ambitious and a bit vague, project implementation so far is considered as adequate. Pilot plants are a priority in order to reinforce the impact and set the basis for sustainability of project results.

Efficient Management of Wastewater, its Treatment & Use in Mediterranean Countries

This is also a quite ambitious project, not so with regards to the practical results planned, as to the policy formulation targets. A re-definition of the project purpose may serve in focusing on really achievable objectives and a careful consideration of the design and implementation of the pilot plants is necessary. Stakeholders, and specifically those with decision-making power at the policy level, are only involved in an informative way, whereas their enhanced and active participation in the project could be fostered by the Coordinator.

EMPOWERS

Designed and co-ordinated by CARE International UK in a rather unconventional way compared to the familiar project management practices, the project lacks the usual logic of clear indications of the required activities, milestones and key deliverables. This situation is reflected in the LFM, where one can observe an absence of explicitly defined activities. Result-oriented practices are highly welcome as a successful approach during implementation, but not for preparing the work breakdown structure of projects. The action plans presented so far do not really correspond to what an action plan should be. They merely indicate periods of time during which project results are supposed to be delivered and / or achieved without any clear commitment. To be fair with the project, this apparent design problem is not really reflected in the actual implementation. The consortium, led by a very experienced Coordinator, may very well prove to be one of the most successful partnerships in the Euro-Med Water Programme, ensuring a strong project impact, while in the same time promoting sustainability of the project results with fresh ideas such as creating "host organisations".

Institutional and Social Innovations in Irrigation Mediterranean Management ISIIMM (ISIIMM)

The project is mainly focusing on soft activities such as training, information dissemination and knowledge exchange through target groups meetings, case studies and a pilot plant. The project design was amended in the course of project implementation, in order to combine the different needs of the participating countries and integrate them according to the Project Purpose (PP) and Overall Objective (OO). Progress so far seems according to plan, with minor delays in some project outputs. Some more focus could be given to the pilot plant, as it will surely demonstrate the practices and methods used for water management.

IRWA - Improvement of Irrigation Water Management in Lebanon and Jordan

The project has been monitored once, in its Jordanian segment. Although the original project design may be considered as adequate, current workplans and time schedule seem rather inconsistent with the initial LFM. There is an overall delay of one year, but the Coordinator is optimistic, as all obstacles (e.g. co-operation with the Jordan Valley Authority and the Jordan Army) seem now to have been overcome. Furthermore, procurement issues are being resolved and the project, with the support of the EC Delegation in Jordan, is progressing now in the correct direction. Some more interaction should be foreseen between the partner countries, in order to foster exchange of knowledge and experiences as well as visits to selected project sites.

MEDAWARE

The project has concise targets and its design can be considered as adequate, though some fine-tuning in the LFM may be necessary. There is some concentration of work and responsibility on the Coordinator; however, all partners are committed and perform rather well, given certain specificities due to internal (national) issues.

Further involvement of the beneficiaries may be useful, if not important, for the project's impact. Project progress so far is rather good and expectations for sustainability are high, provided that the relevant stakeholders and authorities, already involved in the project, will integrate solutions and guidelines delivered by the project. Monitoring in Morocco (December 2005) allowed confirming its good performance in this country, and the consequent need of a wider and stronger dissemination effort, and better visibility.

MEDROPLAN

Despite some design issues, connected with a problematic PCM/LFM approach, the project progress so far seems adequate. The project's Workplan is being followed. There are some minor issues related to the extent of the involvement of all related parties, stakeholders, beneficiaries as well as partners, but also a number of promising results delivered so far. Sustainability is a problem, as there is no guarantee that Guidelines proposed by the project will eventually be integrated in a respective policy by the relevant authorities. It is however the project's aim to produce high quality reports and guidelines that will correspond to the needs of the relevant actors. Monitoring in Morocco (December 2005) notes an efficient participatory approach, and an adequate political impulsion, with nevertheless the need of intensifying lobbying in favour of effective adoption and application of the Guidelines.

Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level

The performance of the project is rather satisfactory so far, with some delays in the implementation plan due to the works' tendering procedures as well as to a request for amendment by the Coordinator for budget fine-tuning reasons. The Coordinator seems very competent and together with the partners they form a strong team with good perspective for project success. However, the drafting of a phase-out strategy is still of key importance, as sustainability is not necessarily guaranteed by the current enthusiasm and/or commitment of the stakeholders and beneficiaries. Moreover, the numerous foreseen pilot plants on both sides of the Jordan river, currently delayed for about 3-4 months, will eventually be the main criteria for assessing project impact and achievement.

Sustainable Concepts Towards a Zero Outflow Municipality - ZerO-M

The project seems to be on the correct track, with good performance so far. Some budgetary issues and non-compliance of expenses with EC procedures caused minor delays, but now they are being resolved and procurement as well as tendering for the foreseen pilot plants is expected to commence. The Co-ordinator and partners seem committed to the project and, although some further Information Dissemination activities might be necessary in collaboration with the rest of the or Euromed Water projects (e.g. through the long expected RMSU), the project has generated adequate impact already. Sustainability may be an issue, as all the existing enthusiasm between beneficiaries and stakeholders should be utilised and formulated into active support by the end of the project.

4.3. Performance of projects Over Time

As mentioned already, 9 projects of Euromed Water Programme have been monitored in 2005. The average performance at Programme level, as it results from the findings of the Monitoring Visits, is presented in the Table below, compared with the respective average performance identified in 2004 by the Monitoring Team.

Table 8: Performance of projects over time

| Criterion | 2004 | 2005 | All Years |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Number of Reports | 11 | 16* | 27 |
| Quality of project design | 2.91 | 2.71 | 2.81 |
| Efficiency to date | 2,70 | 2.93 | 2.81 |
| Effectiveness to date | 2.75 | 2.74 | 2.75 |
| Impact Prospects | 2.87 | 3.03 | 2.95 |
| Sustainability | 3.05 | 3.10 | 3.08 |
| AVERAGE | 2.86 | 2.90 | 2.88 |

* The total number of reports in 2005 is 17 including the monitoring note for the project "Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level", after the visit of the project partner in Jordan.

4.4. Strong and Weak Points by Criterion

The strengths and the relative weaknesses of the monitored projects are presented in the Table below:

Table 9: Strong and weak points per main criterion and sub-criterion

| Strong & Weak | | P1: ADIRA | P2: Efficient Management of WW | P3: EMPOWERS | P4: IRWA | P5: ISIMM | P6: MEDAWARE | P7: MEDROPLAN | P8: Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level8 | P9: ZerO-M | TOTAL |
|----------------|----------------|------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---|------------|---------------------------------|
| Project-visits | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 16 |
| Strongest | Main Criterion | M5 | M4 | M5 | M5 | M5 | M2 | M5 | ALL | M4 | M5 |
| | Sub-criterion | M54 | M41 M58 | M55 M58 | M52 | M24 M51 M52 M55 M58 | M21 M22 M23 M58 | M21 M22 M52 M54 | ALL | M42 | M22 M42 M54 M55 M58 |
| Weakest | Main Criterion | M1 | M3 | M1 | M3 | M1 | M3 | M1 | - | M3 | M1 |
| | Sub-criterion | M11 M21 | M21 M33 M53 | M12 M34 M57 | M23 M24 M32 M33 | M11 M12 | M34 M43 | M12 M23 M31 M43 M56 | - | M34 M43 | M12 M43 M56 M57 |

4.5. Analysis by Country

The Euromed Water Programme has been included quite recently (2004) in the portfolio of the projects of the MED Monitoring Team. This did not allow for a detailed assessment of all the country components of the Programme's projects. Some comments and general remarks, based on the country visits to Egypt, Jordan and Morocco Projects' Coordinators, are given below.

Egypt

The situation in Egypt –with regards to the availability of water resources– renders the Euromed Water programme a major intervention, both in terms of importance and usefulness alike. As the Nile river constitutes the one and only source of water for the whole wider region, all aspects of life are flourishing around the river which provides the privileged populations with its substantial elements. Health, agriculture, economic growth, life itself depend heavily on the river. The optimisation of the use of these water resources has been playing a pivotal role in Egypt for centuries. All Water projects have been highly welcome in Egypt and receive sincere and unconditional support from National authorities at all levels. There are various players participating in the implementation of projects but the key stakeholder remains the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation (MWRI), which participates actively in the follow-up and facilitation of the Water Programme interventions. The Ministry is characterised by considerable capacity and possesses a sound network of regional offices in all Governorates, through which it can facilitate the implementation of projects as well as monitor their proper execution. In general beneficiaries are experienced organisations in the Water Sector, putting adequate efforts to carry out all foreseen project tasks properly. At some point their limited acquaintance to the EC procedures causes some delays in the execution of specific tasks, mainly with regards to the implementation of Pilot Plants and other relevant activities, requiring the enactment of tendering procedures. Egypt constitutes a special project partner for the Water projects; the country is dotted by numerous highly interesting examples of Water Management implementations, from simple countryside settings to high-tech urban applications. The Pilot Plants and case studies deriving from these paradigms are extremely interesting; their replication though to other countries is questionable, mostly because of Egypt's great Nile singularity.

Jordan

Jordan appears as a very well organised partner in the Euromed Water Programme as regards the availability of experts and knowledge of the local scene. However, Jordanian partners seem quite dependent on the relevant EU Project Co-ordinators in planning and designing issues, even if they manage successfully their own part of the project work. It would be for example very interesting to see more initiatives from their side in the direction of other (similar) regional projects, involving the other Mediterranean neighbouring countries. Having said that, it is worth mentioning some special relations with the Palestinian side, with whom co-operation in any field is always sought. The participation of quite active Jordanian NGOs as well as Universities is very promising, and so is their commitment to contribute to the projects with highly qualified experts. What is still necessary though, is some flexibility from the State entities in order to promote and facilitate implementation of such projects, especially in cases where relevant Public Sector institutions are also involved.

Morocco

The two monitored projects – MEDAWARE and MEDROPLAN – perform very well, receive adequate political support and have managed to build up and maintain a solid partnership platform on the level of the country. Both projects are expected to provide precious decision making tools in order to reinforce the national water policies – Guidelines for preparedness and mitigation planning related to drought and Guidelines & Tools for sustainable reuse of wastewater, and bring them closer to EU policies and practice, representing also a substantial contribution to the strategic country approach in the Association Agreement.

4.6. Analysis per Type of Partner

Euromed Water projects have already attracted a large number of multi-disciplinary partners, spanning a wide spectrum of technical, administrative, financial and scientific capacities. Partners are mainly falling under the following generic categories: National Authorities, Universities, Public Sector Institutions, NGOs and Private Sector entities.

Depending on the scientific, technical and business project context, the involvement, motivation and effectiveness of each partner type may vary significantly, also depending on the capacity of each individual partner institution.

With regards to the performance and attitude of each partner type group, the discussions of the Monitors with the Project Coordinators of the Euromed Water projects and the monitoring of the projects' components in Jordan and Egypt revealed that the findings and conclusions presented in the Synthesis Report on the Cultural Heritage II and III Programme seem valid also in the case of the Euromed Water Programme. The findings of the Synthesis Report on the Cultural Heritage II and III Programme are presented below, customised where applicable to the reality of the Euromed Water Programme.

National Authorities

Ministries and Municipal Services are main National representatives involved in the Euromed Water Programme. In almost all cases the Ministry of Water/Irrigation is the higher-level related actor in each partner country. Their presence and support in a project is always essential, especially for facilitating procedures that could otherwise consume a large amount of time and effort to implement. In most of the cases National Authorities are not directly involved in the execution of technical tasks but rather are expected to act by adapting knowledge and experience through guidelines and information provided by the project. The main theme of participation is to carefully represent the country by assigning the right people to the right place and securing that all resources are made available to the project and, in some cases like Egypt, to ensure that the projects' purpose and results are in line with the National Strategies. In general they have considerable capacity (advanced IT infrastructure, skilful personnel and administrative efficiency), especially compared to other Public Sector Institutions, as well as a prestigious institutional "weight", but are not always characterised by motivation and enthusiasm. In the specific cases of Jordan and Egypt, there are cases where the involvement of a high level authority is beneficial to the respective project. In general however, the involved actors, following a long-lasting corporate culture, are not always interested in being efficient or effective in what concerns the project-related tasks. Exceptions include staff members driven by personal interest or motivation, with a view to obtaining a higher status or rank as a result of their participation in the project. In extreme cases, the paternalistic attitude of this type of Partners towards the rest of national partners may distract project focus by promoting political priorities, in lieu of, and where they are different from, technical/scientific needs. The Monitoring Team will further assess this type of partners in 2006, should the Euromed Water projects be included in the Monitoring Portfolio for the coming year.

Universities

Maybe the most valuable partner for a project of technical nature, universities are centres of excellence from many points of view. Their capacity is normally quite high and staff skills very advanced. In most cases they possess a significant volume of knowledge critical to the project. University members are rich in resources, efficient, effective, knowledgeable and motivated. In general they are aware of EC procedures and have the administrative capacity to carry out project tasks, but this does not necessarily apply to all the MED countries. As they usually constitute a most-wanted partner for the majority of projects, the involvement of universities also bears a number of drawbacks. Due to their strong academic focus, universities are not really able to provide the projects with adequate practical expertise and tackle real life problems. In several cases the approaches followed by university partners are somehow too theoretical, without the attitude of an experienced market partner. Universities are easy to approach, motivate and co-operate with, but their participation should be moderated by the equal presence of experienced business partners, when applicable.

Public Sector Institutions

Public sector institutions include state controlled Water, Environmental and other Authorities as well as other bodies directly or indirectly involved in the water sector. In most cases the personnel of these institutions is experienced, conscientious and open to acquiring new knowledge, with a strong will to learn and benefit from their participation to the project. Their work and the professional skills of their staff allow them to be in general efficient, effective and good team players. One of the issues worth mentioning in relation to their participation in the Programme is a frequent turnover of staff, something common in the MEDA region, which sometimes undermines the capacity building efforts of the projects and dilutes the knowledge and experience gained throughout its implementation.

NGOs

NGOs seem to be the core of the moving force of the Euromed Water projects. They tend to be more flexible in taking initiatives and are motivated by sheer interest to help the people in the field. In general however, the involvement of NGOs in projects sometimes has controversial effects. In a

variety of occasions NGOs, based on their experience and strong networking in the region, are able to provide and secure the necessary level of co-operation and visibility of project efforts in the beneficiary area and to get through to the end-users. NGOs are ideal for motivating local stakeholders, promoting the project and effectively dealing with local populations. A potential risk in NGOs participation is the limited administrative capacity and means, the lack of experience in project management and the emotional / theoretical approach to existing needs. This may result in a poorly organised project, with sometimes ill-defined scope and objectives. It is therefore essential that NGOs are reinforced by project management experts and their efforts be combined with the knowledge and managerial experience of other types of partners (either private or public).

Private Sector entities

The private sector entities involved in the Euromed Water Projects can be divided to two main levels, the independent firms and the individuals, e.g. farmers.

Independent firms and consulting companies are usually able to conceive, design and execute projects of original concept and good quality. Private sector entities have the required resources and experience to carry out all steps included in the typical PCM approach. In almost all cases they have the required administrative capacity and experience to smoothly run EC projects without major deficiencies. Unlike all other partners, though, private entities are mostly driven by a purely business instinct, usually putting the overall usefulness and sustainability of efforts at lower priority.

One of the key issues frequently met in projects run by private entities, is their limited sustainability prospects and the rapid devaluation of their benefits. Private firms normally focus on short-term benefits, usually involving the capitalisation of project momentum mainly within its life cycle. This calls for a broad participation of public institutions and stakeholders during the project design phase, so that the project vision remains high and long-term effects to the targeted populations are secured.

Individuals are contributing, from their side, a lot to the project design and implementation, as they tend to be the target for demonstration of successful project results. Their participation is essential and the attracting of their interest and co-operation has proven to be significant for most of the projects. It is obvious that the end-users of the technology / knowledge / methodologies / policies provided and/or initiated by the Euromed Water projects in most cases will be individuals. Their benefit will actually be the real success of the projects, leading to a better overall management of the scarce water resources in the region.

5. SPECIAL ISSUES

5.1. Deconcentration

Deconcentration was a long awaited situation, which above all aimed at allowing a more direct contact between the EC and its funded projects in the Region. The general conclusion so far is that although deconcentration took rather long to be implemented, the results in the case of the Euromed Water Programme are immediately obvious, with the relevant Task Manager not only a sectoral expert based "in the field", but also very keen to promote the implementation of the projects focusing on their content and results expected and assisting any administrative issue arising.

However, the monitoring activity in 2005 revealed that there a number of issues which still need appropriate solutions. There seems to be no concrete procedure for the cooperation of the EC Delegations with the EC Delegation that is responsible for each of the big Regional Programmes, in the direction of (a) coordination and follow-up of the projects in the country of their responsibility and (b) provision of assistance to the responsible Task Manager on issues related to the country of their responsibility. Furthermore, the Monitors are not aware of the existing provisions with regards to potential visits of the responsible Task Manager to the other MED countries, for the purpose of visiting the local components of the Programme's projects and of consulting with the EC Delegations on the involved "horizontal" (country-specific) issues.

5.2. Follow up on Recommendations

In general, the essence of recommendations formulated in ROM Monitoring Reports of the MED Monitoring Team is conveyed to the relevant Project Coordinators (PC) and project partners through their cooperation with the EC Task Managers. As the Monitoring Reports constitute an objective, professional judgement on the projects' developments, the PCs could highly benefit from taking into consideration the proposed recommendations. The Monitors always abide by PCM principles and the relevant monitoring templates and produce –without prejudice– a refined output, based on the assessment criteria set by the EC. The majority of recommendations aimed at the co-ordinators falls into the following broad categories:

- Overall Project Design (Project Structure / Quality of the LFM / Clarity);
- General implementation Issues, (Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact);
- Sustainability prospects;
- Other issues (ad-hoc problems / difficulties, unforeseen risks, partners' requests).

The Monitoring Team has already produced a long list of recommendations for the monitored programmes. In some cases the recommendations are being adopted (directly or indirectly), as a result of a relevant notice of the EC Task Manager. In other cases, though, PCs meet problems in conforming to the modifications proposed by the Monitors.

The majority of comments have been aimed towards the poor quality of the project design, especially the lack of specific action plans and Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) for the proposed interventions. A summary of the key comments / recommendations made by the Monitors on Euromed Water projects is provided below:

ADIRA, Autonomous Desalination System Concepts for Sea Water and Brackish Water in Rural Areas with Renewable Energies - Potentials, Technologies, Field Experience, Socio-technical and Socio-economic Impacts

The Project Coordinator should make sure that all issues concerning the Pilot Plants, including tendering documents and contracts to be signed, have been examined with regards to their consistency with EC rules. The Project Coordinator should prepare complete Action Plans under a uniform format, for the Plants to be implemented, including technical details, costs, potential benefits and sustainability prospects. The organisation of a campaign for convincing governments and pressure groups to support the replication of the successful Pilot Plants in their broader regions, is now required. The work done in the Pilot Projects could be capitalised if all lessons learnt from their operation are included in Deliverable 3 ("Sustainable Concepts") of WP2.

Efficient Management of Wastewater, its Treatment and Use in the Mediterranean Countries

The Project actors confirmed that the deconcentration of the project to the EC Delegation in Jordan has given a new dynamic to the project. The two Lebanese partners have an academic profile, which results in high commitment from their side. The need for project extension without change in the budget should be considered as soon as possible. The Project Purpose should be re-oriented, focusing on increasing awareness in Wastewater Treatment. The development of synergies with relevant EC projects (IRWA, ISIIMM and MEDAWARE) could be beneficial for the project

EMPOWERS, Euro-Med Participatory Water Resources Scenarios

Urgent action is required with respect to the improvement of the project design: The Coordinators should provide detailed action plans for each beneficiary country, together with a process-based description of their role in each country, coupled to a complete Gantt chart or any other network diagram. A comprehensive list of the contracted outputs, deliverables and milestones is urgently needed so as to define what the project should deliver after all.

Improvement of Irrigation Water Management in Lebanon and Jordan

The project is well conceived, set to offer practical help over a very serious problem. The cost recovery of the project services is a key factor of its design. In the forthcoming annual report the Project Coordinator should refine the LFM and introduce consistency. Furthermore, they should enrich the regional dimension of the project and seek to co-ordinate activities with the SMAP programme / EBDA (in Egypt). Finally, they should try to attract and commit nearby farmers, co-operatives and local authorities right away.

Institutional and Social Innovations in Irrigation Mediterranean Management (ISIIMM)

The project has strong contextual resemblances to other interventions (e.g. EMPOWERS", or Irrigation Improvement Programme (IIP) and "Water Boards" funded by other Donors, in the case of Egypt). So far, the possible synergies and overlapping activities of all these projects have not been properly identified; the risk of duplicating efforts and spending precious time –and money– is present. In this respect a close control over ISIIMM achievements is required, in order to secure a fair assessment of the effectiveness of the various interventions. The national authorities could assist in exercising this type of control. The Project Coordinators should provide final action plans for the remaining project period at country level.

MEDAWARE, Development Tools and Guidelines for the Promotion of the Sustainable Urban Wastewater Treatment and Re-use in the Agricultural Production in the Mediterranean Countries

The Project Coordinators should prepare a LFM in order to improve clarity of the intervention logic, keeping specific objectives clear and in perspective, thus allowing flexibility of implementation and maximum impact. They should widen and deepen as much as possible the relationship with stakeholders, including farmers, involving them in the preparation of deliverables and having them participating in the workshops. Improving coordination and facilitating interaction among MEDAWATER partners could extend the impact of the project, allow them to profit from synergies and disseminate knowledge more effectively. In this respect, the organisation of a MEDAWATER international conference at the highest level could be beneficial to all other interventions.

Mediterranean Drought Preparedness and Mitigation Planning (MEDROPLAN)

The Project Coordinator should update the LFM in order to better visualize the project's direction and goals; enhance the relationship with stakeholders; and increase the communication between the project coordination and the MEDAWATER office.

Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level

The Project Coordinators should focus on training as well as on the implementation schedule for the next period. They should continue to consult beneficiaries and stakeholders on the design of activities and submit tendering documents as soon as possible. The EC could possibly consider the formulation of a Task Force, with the participation of various Projects of the MEDA Water Programme, in order to foster coordination.

Sustainable Concepts towards a Zero Outflow Municipality (ZerO-M)

The project faces some implementation problems. The Project Coordinator and Partners should speed up procedures related to implementation of TDC and Pilot Plant. The preparation of tender documents and proper funding arrangements should be put forward as soon as possible.

A complete action plan for the awareness activities should be elaborated, carefully considering all possible ways of promoting project benefits and securing optimal function of awareness tools.

Given that the Euromed Water Programme has been included in the MED Monitoring Portfolio only in 2004, it is indeed too early to assess the degree of adoption of the Monitors' recommendations. Nevertheless, the MED Monitoring Team takes the opportunity to point out in the present Report a number of risks involved, as revealed by the overall experience gained from the implementation of the ROM in the Mediterranean Region to date:

- In several cases recommendations not concerned with critical project issues are not given adequate attention or -although adopted- are never applied. This is usually the case with comments related to the quality and design of the project, the structure of intervention logic, the elaboration of OVIs, assumptions, etc. Co-ordinators sometimes appear reluctant –or unable- to elaborate a new structure or at least prepare a correct LFM. In general, recommendations concerning modifications to the original project description (new LFM, updated list of deliverables, new Gantt chart, etc) are usually neglected. This is mostly because partners do not feel the urgency of such a demand, thus perceiving post-design issues as of secondary importance, since apparently they do not link these issues to the successful implementation of the projects.
- Project Coordinators frequently claim not having received any notification on the Monitor's recommendations. It seems that it would be beneficial for them to officially receive at least an abstract of the final section of the Monitoring Report (Section V – Key Observations) to the extent they are concerned, or equally to receive detailed instructions for action to be taken, based on the monitors recommendations that are adopted by the EC. This would provide them with a chance to respond to the monitor's comments and present their own view on emerging project issues, while at the same time rendering them accountable for any pending/unresolved issues potentially identified during the following monitoring visits. Furthermore, it would secure that all parties (EC, Co-ordinators, and Monitoring Team) share the same amount of knowledge and concerns about demanding project issues.

5.3. Logical Framework Approach

The Euromed Water Programme has attracted the interest of a large number of players acting in the Water Sector. The priorities addressed by the projects are genuine and interesting, covering a large thematic area connected with water resources management, reuse and conservation. Setting up a project of such a size, scope and objectives could be a hard and demanding work, especially for those organisations with no prior experience in the PCM principles.

The main problems and deficiencies related to the Logical Framework Approach are presented in detail in the Synthesis Report on the Cultural Heritage II and III Programmes, produced by the MED Monitoring Team in December 2005.

With regards to the Euromed Water projects, out of 9 projects, only 2 or 3 have adequately developed Logical Framework Matrices and therefore concise, structured and well presented design. Although Project Purposes (PPs) and Overall Objectives (OOs) are in most cases well defined and depict the actual needs, usual problems are: unclear activities' breakdown; vague and not easily measurable Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs), due to thinking that a mere transfer of Work packages (WPs) as activities satisfies the analysis needs.

A project with a very good LFM is the "Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level", where a concise analysis is made and a rather accurate tool is provided to the project management for organising the relevant work and monitoring its implementation. Zer0-M is another project demonstrating clear structure and a straightforward intervention logic.

In general the LFM has not yet acquired the instrumental role for planning and managing projects, as it is supposed to. There are cases where there is an LFM, which is more or less appropriate but is not used as a project management tool. In these projects, partners should improve the existing LFM and rely more on its use for the efficient management of project activities. Most of the projects face design problems at various degrees. In general, project co-ordinators have had considerable problems in organising their thoughts in a structured & clear fashion so as to elaborate a correct LFM for their project. Ill-defined project structures are directly reflected to the projects' LFMs, which are either absent or poorly elaborated. It would be worth considering to urge the partners to further familiarise themselves with the PCM principles and to get well acquainted with the LFA methodology. Proper training, when possible, could clarify all unclear issues, especially with respect to the elaboration of the Objectives Tree and the selection of OVIs. The Euromed Water RMSU could be facilitating in this direction, organising some training workshops among project partners.

6. SUCCESS STORIES IN 2005

As reported in section 4.1, a number of Euromed Water projects have received only “a” and “b” scores in 2005, and can thus be considered as successes. However, no overall success story in the real sense has been identified this year, such as would constitute a real example of best practice.

Some projects have strong points in issues such as design, while others in efficiency and impact or potential sustainability, as briefly commented below.

The project: “Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level” has a rather concrete design and a very analytical LFM. However from there until reaching a very good level of implementation there is still time necessary as: there are delays in tendering; there was an underestimation of the administrative effort and time required; no visible impact will be possible to be monitored unless the construction of pilot sites begins.

Another interesting case seems to be the project EMPOWERS, co-ordinated in a rather unconventional manner by CARE International UK, who may not be applying concise management tools or having a structured LFM and activity plan. However, being results oriented the project is at the moment achieving much more than could be expected, with relevant impact, while at the same time promoting sustainability of the project results with fresh ideas such as creating “host organisations”.

Other projects, like MEDAWARE, are on average in a good situation; however their centralised management does not promote much capacity building of the partners.

Mentioning these projects should not undermine the remaining 6 which at this stage are in an average level, not necessarily because of lack in performance, but rather as a consequence of a multitude of internal and external reasons ranging from delays due to the need of meeting properly the provisions of the EC procedures, underestimation of administrative effort required, minor deficiencies in project design and lack of actual support from national and state actors.

A general comment is that the majority of the projects, though near or just after the first half of their overall duration, are actually at an average level of 30% to 40% of accomplishments and are all more or less in the threshold of producing visible results such as construction works. This means that due to delays, performance is not yet as it optimally should, but at the same time in the near future, e.g. in six months, most of the projects are expected to have achieved more tangible results, more mobilisation of local partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries will most probably be visible, the impact will be better recognisable and/or measurable and sustainability issues will be much clearer. A better assessment on success stories will then be possible.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1. Overall Conclusions on the Euromed Water Programme, as Implemented

The Euromed Water Programme is a multidisciplinary endeavour, bringing together various actors, holding key roles in the water sector of the MEDA Region. Most of its interventions are focusing on real-life problems concerning water resources, water management, reuse and conservation. All projects are involving stakeholders of the water sector: NGOs, State, Public or Private entities, as well as end-users, i.e. individuals trying to secure water resources.

The projects seem to be so far implemented in line with the general orientation of the Programme, as mentioned in the Programme Areas of Action and Horizontal Themes. Results so far are promising, and based on the fact that water is a prime necessity, the active involvement of the relevant actors is quite high. It is however the Monitors' impression that all positive mobilisation so far has been initiated mainly through the EC funding and not so much in view of concise national and/or regional policies on water, although most of the countries have some –unstructured- plans for the matter. Obviously policy guidelines and pilot and demonstration plants will offer the basis for the development and application of such a water management centred policy in the region. However, it seems that the relevant National Authorities should be further mobilised either through the current projects or through further similar initiatives. NGOs and universities, with the assistance of local water authorities and individuals, can of course demonstrate, through the projects' implementation, that solutions exist and are feasible; but from that point until the combined (national and regional, between neighbouring countries) integration of these solutions to their overall water plans, there is still road ahead.

The overall picture of the Programme at the level of the analysis allowed by the monitoring work seems adequate, although most of the projects that include construction or works for the implementation of pilot plants have not yet initiated these activities. Tangible results are more or less expected to be visible in the beginning of 2006 for the majority of the projects, and it is by then that a better assessment on the real value of the projects will be possible.

Results delivered so far, although limited to training sessions and workshops, data surveying and other related to "soft" activities, are of promising quality and seem right on course for achieving a satisfactory level of success. However, it is up to the projects' Coordinators and partners to ensure that the -mainly administrative- delays will be overcome, implementation will continue according to plan and on-time and the development of the pilot plants, wherever foreseen, will be managed in a timely and disciplined way.

Moreover, the necessity of phase-out strategies and plans for maintaining project benefits long after project completion should be a priority for ensuring sustainability. Only then will the projects be able to guarantee that the funds allocated for their implementation were well invested; at present stage, this remains to be seen.

7.2. Lessons Learnt

The experience gained through the monitoring of the Programme has shown the following:

- Appropriate design. Partners should abide by the principles of LFA with no exception. A careful consideration of requirements, risks and costs should be made before going on with the project. Project description should be short and clear and supported by project management tools.
- Efficient management. The consortia led by experienced Coordinators are more likely to succeed: experienced not only in the water sector (which seems mandatory anyway), but also in project management principles. This is the case in the Water Programme, where in most of the successful projects, leadership has been assumed by partners with both technical and managerial skills.
- Flexible structures. The number of partners should be decided on a structured basis, always securing the participation of entities with complementary skills and capacities. Pre-existing synergies may also prove effective for future endeavours. Such schemes could use inputs of specialised local experts or entities as and when appropriate.
- Phase-out strategies. Sustainability is one of the first issues to be considered, even from project design stage already. Partners should elaborate a concrete phase-out strategy and a plan for making operations viable long after the completion of their project.

- Administrative Issues. Many projects have suffered problems related to unforeseen administrative difficulties stemming from the need to apply EC rules & regulations. Clear instructions should be given by the Coordinators to all involved partners at an early stage, before it is too late for the project. The RMSU (the establishment of which is delayed) would obviously have helped a lot in this direction.

7.3. Recommendations

Following the above analysis, the following recommendations are presented for the consideration of the relevant EC Services:

1. The assessment of real project impact should become a high priority for the concerned players (EC, RMSU, Monitoring / Evaluation Teams). Several interventions with similar technical context are being implemented in overlapping areas (e.g. EMPOWERS & ISIIMM in Egypt, EMPOWERS and Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm-Level, in Jordan and Palestine, IRWA, EMPOWERS and Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm-Level in Jordan, IRWA and ISIIMM in Lebanon, etc). The scope and objectives of each intervention might be different but this is totally transparent to the final beneficiaries. Apparently end-users seek to resolve their problems without really focusing on which of the projects really promotes their goals. Projects, themselves, include overlapping components, which may eventually require the redundant replication (and financing) of the same set of activities. Moreover this may pose difficulties in assessing the real value of each of the interventions. At some point it may become impossible to distinguish between achievements (who did what and how). All involved stakeholders, including the concerned National Authorities, should require a specific plan of interventions, explaining what will be achieved and by whom. This will at least secure a fair assessment of project impact and effectiveness. Central co-ordination is required in order to bring together the concerned Water Programme Project Coordinators and undertake some clustering efforts. This may prove very efficient in organising future work, avoiding overlapping and securing adequate efficiency and effectiveness of the implemented projects.
2. Any vagueness in the work plans should be eliminated. It leaves room for misinterpretations of the scope and usefulness of activities and allows for severe reductions in the quality and / or quantity of the projects results. This way partners may scale-down the project outcome (expected or contracted) without facing any serious consequences (e.g. contractual, visibility-wise et al). Projects with poor LFMs should be asked to submit a precise Project Description and Action Plan, especially focusing on the implementation of their Pilot Installations. The text should be simple, short and clear, avoiding verbose expressions and should be complemented by a proper LFM, a complete and detailed work breakdown structure, a complete list of deliverables and a network diagram, illustrating the relations between tasks and respective deadlines.
3. Further guidance should be provided to Partners in order to improve the quality of reporting. In their technical reports, progress should be clearly specified and self-assessed against the detailed plan of activities of the project. Where applicable, individual Partners should also be advised to fully respect their contractual obligations concerning Management Reporting. Furthermore, proper guidelines should be prepared, covering key project issues, especially the ones with hidden administrative difficulties, as indicated above. The RMSU is expected to contribute a lot in these matters. The Partners should be given templates, in order to secure homogeneous and proper preparation of the documents.
4. In the frame of a Phase-Out Strategy, the projects should be asked to prepare a number of important Plans including a "Business Plan" for explaining their strategy for securing project sustainability and a "Dissemination plan", explaining how and when they plan to promote the project in the concerned areas. It is worth considering providing the Partners with respective templates, in order to secure homogeneous and proper preparation of these documents.
5. Projects should be asked to provide full reporting on their "soft" activities (e.g. training activities), as these sometimes constitute a significant part of the project intervention logic. Specifically, partners should be asked to provide a detailed schedule of foreseen activities as well as analytical reporting on the implemented ones. This includes lists of participants in (or addressees of) such activities and evaluation sheets completed by them. Moreover, partners should be prompted to perform at least one more evaluation round, six to twelve months after the event /

activity, thus allowing the assessment of the effectiveness of the projects' efforts as well as the tracing of their impact.

6. Project Coordinators, as well as project partners should always receive an abstract of any monitoring / evaluation mission's comments and recommendations addressed to them. This way they will be given the opportunity to respond to these comments and recommendations as well as to take appropriate corrective actions whenever necessary.

ANNEX I

Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

ANNEX II

Statistics of Projects Monitored in 2005

Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

| C/N | Project Data | | | | | | Monitoring Data | | | Conclusions | | | | | Action Points |
|-----|--------------|---|---------|--------------------|----------|---|-----------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|------------|---------------|--------|----------------|--|
| | Ref. No | Title | Country | Primary Commitment | End Date | Project Authority | Mission No. | Report Ref. | Monitor | Design | Efficiency | Effectiveness | Impact | Sustainability | |
| 1 | 59610 | ADIRA: Autonomous Desalination System Concepts for Sea Water and Brackish Water in Rural Areas with Renewable Energies - Potentials, Technologies, Field Experience, Socio-technical and Socio-economic Impacts | GERMANY | 2729259 | 01/08/07 | Fraunhofer Institute | 5 | 10241.02 | George Kostaras | c | b | b | c | b | The Co-ordinator should: 1) Make sure that all issues concerning the Pilot Plants, including tendering documents and contracts to be signed, have been examined for consistency with EC rules; 2) Prepare complete Action Plans for the Plants; include technical details, costs, potential benefits and sustainability prospects, under a uniform format; 3) Organise a campaign for convincing governments and pressure groups to support the replication of the successful Pilot Plants in their broader regions; 4) Consider including lessons learnt from the operation of the Pilot Plants, in Deliverable 3 ("Sustainable Concepts") of WP2. EC Services: A decision, either negative or positive, has to be made on the subject of subcontracting, as soon as possible. |
| 2 | 59641 | Efficient Management of Wastewater, its Treatment and Use in the Mediterranean Countries | GERMANY | 3185503 | 01/05/07 | INWENT | 5 | 10239.02 | George Kostaras | b | b | c | b | b | The Co-ordinators should: 1) Finalize the 3rd technical report; 2) Finalise the visibility plans as soon as possible; make sure that the EU support is referred to in all project related publications; 3) Carefully consider all risks related to the construction of the Pilot Plants. 4) Re-define Project Purpose; 5) Enhance efforts to attract trainees of technical / engineering background in addition to (or instead of) students; 6) Consider the possibility of organising a number of info-workshops aiming at attracting decision makers. |
| 3 | 59627 | EMPOWERS: Euro-Med Participatory Water Resources Scenarios | UK | 3842521 | 01/05/07 | CARE International UK | 5 | 10240.02 | George Kostaras | c | b | b | b | b | Coordinators: 1) Urgent action should be undertaken before the project grows totally uncontrolled: A comprehensive Action Plan, for the next two years, including: activities, milestones, list of deliverables, dead-lines should be prepared; also, the LFM should be updated accordingly; 2) Attention should be given to reporting. Accuracy, comprehensiveness and simplicity are key characteristics of actual technical reporting; the Co-ordinators should stick to this principle. |
| 4 | 75262 | Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level | AUSTRIA | 4395060 | 18/03/07 | Hilfswerk Austria (HWA) | 5 | 10236.02 | Panagiotis Leventis | b | b | b | b | b | PC: 1) Continue good work. 2) Follow time schedule. 3) Plan a phase-out strategy. EC: 1) Keep up support to the project. 2) Provide assistance, if possible, for VAT issue and travel to WBG. |
| 5 | 59763 | Institutional and Social Innovations in Irrigation Mediterranean Management (SIIMM) | FRANCE | 4186410 | 30/04/07 | AGROPOLIS | 5 | 10238.02 | Kyriakos Argyroudis | b | b | b | b | b | 1. Preparation of 8 films: The real use of these films should be identified and the target groups should be defined. Country partners together with the Contractor should try to involve key persons and institutions (i.e national broadcasting TV stations). 2. Case studies and the micro project in Egypt could be good examples for dissemination. Contractor should initiate such dissemination activities. 3. Contractor should try to invite key persons from the Palestinian Authority to participate in future training seminars. |
| 6 | 59341 | MEDAWARE: Development Tools and Guidelines for the Promotion of the Sustainable Urban Wastewater Treatment and Re-use in the Agricultural Production in the Mediterranean Countries | GREECE | 1876455 | 01/11/06 | National Technical University of Athens-School of Chemical Engineering-Unit of Environmental Sciences | 5 | 10243.02 | Jordi Riera Sancho | b | a | b | b | b | I. Coordinator :1) Prepare a logframe matrix for more clarity of the intervention logic, keeping specific objectives clear and in perspective, to allow flexibility of implementation, and maximum impact; 2) Widen and deepen as much as possible the relationship with stakeholders, including farmers, involving them in the deliverables preparation and workshop participation; 3) Translate the documentation and the software produced to Arabic, using, if possible, remaining unspent funds; 4) Address if not directly, as it is out of the scope of the project, the treatment of sludge, in order to have the authorities act on this issue after the end of the project. II. EC-MEDAWATER : 1) Improve coordination, facilitating interaction among MEDAWATER partners to extend the impact of the projects, profit from synergies and disseminate knowledge more effectively; 2) Organize a MEDAWATER international conference at the highest level, at the end of the project; 3) Update the reporting system giving a different focus to each kind of reports to avoid repetitiveness. |
| 7 | 59770 | Mediterranean Drought Preparedness and Mitigation Planning (MEDROPLAN) | SPAIN | 2445815 | 15/06/07 | Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Zaragoza (IAMZ) | 5 | 10237.02 | Jordi Riera Sancho | c | b | b | b | b | I. Coordinator: 1) Update the logframe matrix to help visualize the project's direction and goals; 2) Involve other IAMZ partners deeper in the project (testing of the guidelines, input providing, etc.); 3) Propose to use the funds not spent: more travelling to increase contacts between partners and stakeholders, or for a most effective dissemination of the results at the end of the project; 4) Involve the FED putting them on the leadership of the Dissemination and Visibility strategy and actions, the website, and the strategy for the Drought Preparedness Network; 5) Widen and deepen as much as possible the relationship with stakeholders, requesting input from them for use by the project. II. EC-MEDAWATER :1) Facilitate the interaction between MEDAWATER partners to extend the impact of the projects, profit from synergies and disseminate knowledge to other relevant parties. 2) Increase the communication between the project coordination and the MEDAWATER office; 3) Study a way to compensate for low Morocco salary rates, so as to provide a fair retribution that stimulates commitment by the project's personnel. |

Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

| C/N | Project Data | | | | | | Monitoring Data | | | Conclusions | | | | | Action Points |
|-----|--------------|--|---------|--------------------|----------|--|-----------------|-------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------|---------------|--------|----------------|--|
| | Ref. No | Title | Country | Primary Commitment | End Date | Project Authority | Mission No. | Report Ref. | Monitor | Design | Efficiency | Effectiveness | Impact | Sustainability | |
| 8 | 59768 | Sustainable Concepts towards a Zero Outflow Municipality (ZerO-M) | AUSTRIA | 4413255 | 01/09/07 | Institute for Sustainable Technologies (AEE-INTEC) | 5 | 10235.02 | Panagiotis Leventis | b | b | b | b | b | Project Coordinator: 1) Follow closely the workplan; 2) Try to comply fully with EC procedures in order to avoid delays; 3) Enhance information campaign for anticipating possible environmental worries. EC: 1) Keep up support to the Project; 2) Further promote networking of the MEDA Water projects through the timely intervention of the respective RMSU. |
| 9 | 75262 | Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level | JORDAN | 4395060 | 18/03/07 | Hilfswerk Austria (HWA) | 6 | 10236.03 | Panagiotis Leventis | Monitoring Note | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The communications between JOHUD, the Palestinian Partner and the PC are considered as very good. • Increased visibility of MEDA and socio-economic benefits of regional co-operation. • Stakeholder meetings, in addition to the steering committee meetings, have already been conducted. • Know-How and technology transfer on sustainable irrigation water management is transferred between Europe and MEDA countries. • An international "Conference on Irrigation Water Resource Management" has been organised. • A first exchange meeting between the project personnel and other projects active in the region in comparable activities has been organised. • Increased public awareness and education on the problems and opportunities in the water sector through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Training courses: Goal of the training courses is to build problem awareness and technical, economic and social competence on the local levels. 2 out of 6 courses have been implemented so far. They will be repeated among the 5 selected regions. o Target groups: Water users/Farmers, women, community based organizations, Government Employees and Youth. o Duration and training: 5 days of training – 4 hours/ daily. o Training curricula have been prepared. Training materials are partly available. • From a series of 6 additional training courses targeted at stakeholders for the formation of water associations, the first is planned for October 2005. A baseline survey at the project location is envisaged in order to measure the impact of the project and it will be used as a data base in designing these courses. The survey has been delayed for around a year and is expected to be contracted late August 2005. • Pilot projects range from collective and household wastewater treatment plants, renovation of water cisterns, palm tree planting for utilising brackish water resources, as well as implementing other small-scale water and waste-water management techniques, all distributed among 5 selected west-Jordan regions. Selection of regions was done according to yearly rainfall, which in Jordan valley is much lower than in the highlands. • 2 main phases have been foreseen for the implementation of the pilot projects in the 5 regions. No discrete difference between phases, just the second phase would be based on the knowledge and experience acquired during the first phase. • Overall delay is around 4-5 months, with certain activities being implemented earlier to win time. Construction of pilot projects delayed for around 1 year. A possible time extension is under consideration, but decision on applying will be taken early 2006. • Tender Process for the cooperative pilot and demonstration projects for increasing the quantity and quality of water for irrigation purposes is ongoing. Estimated award early September 2005. • Inability to attend the steering and executive committee meeting in the west bank. • The length of time needed for the preparation of detailed technical designs and specifications and the procurement procedures, as required by the EU, was not foreseen. • Due to the inability of the project team to visit the West Bank, it is recommended by the partner to change the location of the visit to other MEDWA countries. • Assistance is requested by the partner from the EU to acquire entry visas for the project team to visit the West Bank. |

Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

| C/N | Project Data | | | | | | Monitoring Data | | | Conclusions | | | | | Action Points |
|-----|--------------|---|---------|--------------------|----------|---|-----------------|-------------|---|-------------|------------|---------------|--------|----------------|---|
| | Ref. No | Title | Country | Primary Commitment | End Date | Project Authority | Mission No. | Report Ref. | Monitor | Design | Efficiency | Effectiveness | Impact | Sustainability | |
| 10 | 59610 | ADIRA: Autonomous Desalination System Concepts for Sea Water and Brackish Water in Rural Areas with Renewable Energies - Potentials, Technologies, Field Experience, Socio-technical and Socio-economic Impacts | JORDAN | 2729259 | 01/08/07 | Fraunhofer Institute | 6 | 10241.03 | Panagiotis Leventis | c | b | b | b | b | JUST: 1) Continue good work. 2) Promote project sustainability. 3) Control any environmental impact. PC: Provide some support to JUST for financial issues. EC: Decide soon on the amendment request, one way or the other. |
| 11 | 59776 | Improvement of Irrigation Water Management in Lebanon and Jordan | JORDAN | 4861944 | 01/06/07 | National Center for Agricultural Research and Technology Transfer (NCARTT). | 6 | 10196.02 | Sakis Galigalis | b | c | c | b | b | General: A well-designed project, experiencing delays in the first half of its implementation. Project Coordinator: 1) Consider strengthening the regional character of the Project; 2) Recheck the workplan feasibility for the remaining period; 3) Improve workplans and introduce consistency in reporting progress; 4) Enrich farm level work along the ideas exchanged during the monitoring mission; 5) Consider the economics of increasing the size of the second filtering installation; 6) Revisit the farm level filter specifications, in relation with the two upstream filtering installations; 7) Coordinate with other EC funded projects. |
| 12 | 59641 | Efficient Management of Wastewater, its Treatment and Use in the Mediterranean Countries | LEBANON | 3185503 | 01/05/07 | University of Balamand (UoB), Lebanese American University (LAU) | 10 | 10239.03 | Konstantinos Missirilis/Nabil Zoghbi | b | b | b | b | a | The project director and partners confirmed that the deconcentration of the project to the EC Delegation in Jordan has given a new dynamic to the project. Both partners in Lebanon have an academic profile presenting high commitment from their side. TM and PC: 1) The submission of the mgmt reports should not depend on the submission of the financial reporting. Incidental delays in financial reporting are hampering the proper monitoring of project activities. 2) There is a need for project extension without change in the budget (the request should be formulated no later than Sep-06). 3) Re-orient the Project Purpose focusing on increasing awareness in WWT. 4) Update the website of the project (some info not updated since Nov/03, e.g. 4 instead of 5 WWT plants). BoU & LAU 1) Strengthen the relationships with the MEW, not only with the MoE. 2) The country study has to be updated. The Water Sector in Lebanon has been restructured and the new RWEs are fully functional (p.11 of the country study). 3) The UoB could incidentally encounter heavy preparation works before building the plant (steep and rocky ground). 4) There is a need for stronger alignment with the visibility guidelines inside the campuses. Progress is observed in the websites of UoB and LAU which have recently added links to the project's main website. The project is planning to further increase its visibility through a service contract for the production of a video for public awareness, brochures and a website. 5) Appoint operator for the plants, who should be involved in the plant installation. 6) The project should monitor the disposal of the sludge, once the plants are operational in order to ensure that it is managing its environmental responsibilities. 7) Cooperate and develop synergies with the Lebanese partners of the EC projects IRWA, ISIIM, MEDAWARE (a very good opportunity is the SEMIDE seminar in Nov-05. 8) The construction of a WWT plant requires an Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA). Its elaboration and approval by the MoE in Lebanon could take 2 months. This should be taken into account early enough before the construction works for the plants in order not to further delay them. |
| 13 | 59763 | Institutional and Social Innovations in Irrigation Mediterranean Management (ISIIMM) | EGYPT | 4186410 | 01/05/07 | Association AGROPOLIS | 12 | 10238.03 | George Kostaras / Athanasios Papakonstantinou | c | b | b | b | a | EC: With regards to overlapping among projects: A close control over ISIIMM achievements in Egypt is required, in order to secure a fair assessment of effectiveness. The MWRI regional services could assist in exercising this type of control. Coordinators: 1) Provide a final action plan for the remaining project period at country level. 2) The role and functionalities of the OSIRIS system do not seem to be very clear for local partners; provide the required clarifications to them. 3) EU visibility: The absence of standard EU awareness material (brochures, CDs, flags, etc) in the project regional offices became apparent during the monitoring visit; only some draft banners revealed the project's title and the role of the EU. As other donors are also contributing in the sector through projects, an enhancement of the EU visibility is required. |

Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

| C/N | Project Data | | | | | | Monitoring Data | | | Conclusions | | | | | Action Points |
|-----|--------------|---|---------|--------------------|----------|--|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|---------------|--------|----------------|--|
| | Ref. No | Title | Country | Primary Commitment | End Date | Project Authority | Mission No. | Report Ref. | Monitor | Design | Efficiency | Effectiveness | Impact | Sustainability | |
| 14 | 59768 | Sustainable Concepts towards a Zero Outflow Municipality (ZerO-M) | EGYPT | 4413255 | 01/09/07 | Institute for Sustainable Technologies (AEE-INTEC) | 12 | 10235.03 | George Kostaras | b | c | c | b | b | Co-ordinator and partners: 1) Speed up procedures related to implementation of TDC and Pilot Plant; preparation of tender documents and proper funding arrangements should be put forward as soon as possible. 2) Elaborate a complete action plan for the awareness activities; consider carefully all possible ways of promoting project benefits and securing optimal function of awareness tools. 3) Clarify activities related to the development of the GIS tool. 4) The Egyptian partners claim having received only a small share of the advance payment and that funds are required for the upcoming tendering phase. Identify reasons and resolve this cash-flow problem. |
| 15 | 59627 | EMPOWERS: Euro-Med Participatory Water Resources Scenarios | EGYPT | 3842521 | 01/05/07 | CARE International UK | 12 | 10240.03 | George Kostaras | c | b | c | c | b | Because the project applies a soft approach it does not mean it should be ill-designed. Urgent action is required: The coordinators should now provide: 1) Detailed action plans for each beneficiary country. 2) A process-based description of their role in each country, coupled to a complete Gantt chart or any other network diagram. A comprehensive list of the contracted outputs, deliverables and milestones is urgently needed so as to define what the project should deliver after all. |
| 16 | 59341 | MEDAWARE, Development Tools and Guidelines for the Promotion of the Sustainable Urban Wastewater Treatment and Re-use in the Agricultural Production in the Mediterranean Countries | MOROCCO | 1876455 | 01/11/06 | Chouaib Doukkali University (CDU), Laboratory of Water and Environment | 15 | 10243.03 | Jordi Riera Sancho | b | b | b | b | b | CDU (Partner's management): 1) Reinforce stakeholders involvement, extending it to farmer and consumer groups, 2) Translate, print and distribute the project outputs to stakeholders, 3) Engage in awareness building on environmental issues and water reuse among farmers and plant workers, 4) Provide for adequate visibility (office, correspondence). MEDAWARE Coordinator: 1) Reallocate unused funds for the translation of the work packages into Arabic (Greek, Spanish, French) and for more dissemination activities, 2) Prepare a phase-out strategy, 3) Monitor partner's dissemination activities. MEDAWATER: 1) Maintain direct contact with projects' partners in order to have a wider view of the projects, 2) Provide training regarding EC rules and procedures to project coordinators and partners, 3) Organize a final conference of Medawater stakeholders. |
| 17 | 59770 | Mediterranean Drought Preparedness and Mitigation Planning (MEDROPLAN) | MOROCCO | 2445815 | 15/06/07 | Institut Agronomique et Vétérinaire Hassan II (IAV) (Coordinator IAMZ) | 15 | 10237.03 | Jordi Riera Sancho | c | b | b | b | b | IAV Hasssan II: 1) Draw a lobbying plan to maximise the impact of the Guidelines on national policy, 2) Widen as much as possible dissemination activities to include farmers and consumers; Coordinator: 1) Redraw the intervention logic to give the project a more strategic scope, 2) Propose an amendment to the budget, but do not link it to a request for payment, 3) Provide guidance to the partners on EC rules and regulations, 4) Address in the Guidelines the cost-benefit aspects of National Plans, 5) Involve other IAMZ partners in the projects activities and workshops. MEDAWATER: 1) Provide the project's partners with training on EC procedures, 2) Promote interaction between partners, coordinators and MEDAWATER, for best coordination and cross learning. Delegation: 1) Give support to the project by promoting the guidelines at the highest instances. |

Average score per criterion per project and year

| Project | Year | Number of Visits | Criterion | | | | | AVERAGE |
|--|---------|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | | Quality of project design | Efficiency to date | Effectiveness to date | Impact Prospects | Sustainability | |
| ADIRA | 2004 | 1 | 3,66 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,66 | 3,00 | 3,06 |
| | 2005 | 2 | 2,08 | 2,68 | 2,68 | 2,60 | 3,04 | 2,62 |
| | Average | - | 2,87 | 2,84 | 2,84 | 2,63 | 3,02 | 2,84 |
| Efficient Management of Wastewater, its Treatment and Use in the Mediterranean | 2004 | 1 | 3,00 | 2,66 | 2,33 | 3,00 | 2,80 | 2,76 |
| | 2005 | 2 | 3,00 | 2,84 | 2,32 | 3,40 | 3,18 | 2,95 |
| | Average | - | 3,00 | 2,75 | 2,33 | 3,20 | 2,99 | 2,85 |
| EMPOWERS | 2004 | 1 | 3,33 | 3,25 | 3,33 | 3,33 | 3,60 | 3,37 |
| | 2005 | 2 | 2,23 | 2,95 | 2,80 | 2,86 | 3,17 | 2,80 |
| | Average | - | 2,78 | 3,10 | 3,07 | 3,10 | 3,38 | 3,08 |
| Improvement of Irrigation Water Management in Lebanon and Jordan | 2004 | 1 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 |
| | 2005 | 1 | 3,00 | 2,40 | 2,30 | 3,00 | 3,11 | 2,76 |
| | Average | - | 3,00 | 2,70 | 2,65 | 3,00 | 3,06 | 2,88 |
| ISIIMM | 2004 | 1 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,33 | 3,33 | 3,50 | 3,23 |
| | 2005 | 2 | 2,75 | 3,05 | 3,00 | 3,08 | 3,15 | 3,01 |
| | Average | - | 2,88 | 3,03 | 3,17 | 3,20 | 3,33 | 3,12 |
| MEDAWARE | 2004 | 1 | 2,66 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,66 | 3,00 | 2,86 |
| | 2005 | 2 | 3,00 | 3,66 | 2,86 | 2,91 | 3,10 | 3,10 |
| | Average | - | 2,83 | 3,33 | 2,93 | 2,79 | 3,05 | 2,98 |
| MEDROPLAN | 2004 | 1 | 4,00 | 3,50 | 3,66 | 3,66 | 3,66 | 3,70 |
| | 2005 | 2 | 2,30 | 2,90 | 2,83 | 3,06 | 3,15 | 2,85 |
| | Average | - | 3,15 | 3,20 | 3,24 | 3,36 | 3,41 | 3,27 |
| Stakeholder Participatory Sustainable Water Management at Farm Level | 2004 | 1 | 2,66 | 2,25 | 2,66 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,71 |
| | 2005 | 1 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 3,00 |
| | Average | - | 2,83 | 2,63 | 2,83 | 3,00 | 3,00 | 2,86 |
| Zero-M | 2004 | 1 | 1,66 | 1,75 | 2,00 | 2,66 | 2,50 | 2,11 |
| | 2005 | 2 | 2,50 | 2,50 | 2,50 | 2,88 | 2,50 | 2,58 |
| | Average | - | 2,08 | 2,13 | 2,25 | 2,77 | 2,50 | 2,34 |
| ALL | 2004 | 9 | 3,00 | 2,82 | 2,92 | 3,03 | 3,12 | 2,98 |
| | 2005 | 16 | 2,65 | 2,89 | 2,70 | 2,98 | 3,04 | 2,85 |
| | Average | - | 2,82 | 2,85 | 2,81 | 3,00 | 3,08 | 2,91 |

Score per project size in 2005

| Criterion | < 4 MEUR | > 4 MEUR |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Projects | 5 | 4 |
| Quality of project design | 2,52 | 2,94 |
| Efficiency to date | 3,01 | 2,84 |
| Effectiveness to date | 2,70 | 2,80 |
| Impact Prospects | 2,97 | 3,12 |
| Sustainability | 3,13 | 3,07 |
| AVERAGE | 2,86 | 2,95 |

