

## Nile Basin Initiative

### Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project

#### Micro-grants Capacity Building Workshop

02-04 May 2006

Cairo, Egypt



NILE BASIN INITIATIVE

Initiative du Bassin du Nil

### **Introduction and Objectives:**

1. This workshop has been organized and funded by the Community Level Land and Water Conservation Component of NTEAP. The overall objective of the workshop was to enhance the knowledge and deepen the understanding of the participants on the importance of addressing the environmental threats that face the Nile Basin countries. The workshop also reviewed the different strategies employed by the NTEAP to achieve this including the use of the Micro-grant Funds.

2. Specifically the workshop focused on mitigation efforts of immediate nature which can be used to assist communities in the basin to enhance their conservation activities without losing their livelihoods derived out of the basin. One of the ways of supporting communities' conservation efforts is the use of micro-grants. Hence, the workshop was used to introduce the micro-grants component to participants, its procedures and management and steps which beneficiaries should follow to access the grants. The workshop also sought from participants new ideas that could be incorporated in the implementation of micro-grants to ensure that it achieves the maximum contribution to the overall objective of the NTEA project and ultimately to the NBI's goal.

### **Opening Remarks**

3. There were two introductory remarks made at the Workshop. The first remark was made by Mr. Amir Baker, the Micro-grants Lead Specialist who welcomed the participants to Cairo and emphasized the importance of the Workshop as a means to improve the knowledge and awareness of the participants on the Environment of the Nile Basin as well as on the aspects relating to the operations of the Micro-grants Program.

4. The second introductory remark was made by Mr. Mohamed Hindawy, Director of the NGO Unit in the EEAA (the Government entity in charge of environmental issues in Egypt). Mr. Hindawy addressed the Workshop on behalf of Dr. Mohamed Khalil, the NTEAP PSC member. Mr. Hindawy welcomed participants to Cairo and wished them all a pleasant stay. He emphasized on the importance of joint collaboration of all the Nile Basin countries to preserve and conserve the environment of the Nile Basin. He also mentioned the role of his institution in this regard.

5. The Workshop Facilitator requested participants to introduce themselves and then proceeded to conduct an overview of the Workshop's Program and the objectives that the Workshop intends to achieve. Key messages from the Facilitator included active participation, sharing, learning, contribution, dialogue and exchange of views.

6. The Workshop dwelt on the institutional structure that the Micro-grants employs to achieve its objectives. A presentation was also made on the various environmental threats that face the Nile Basin, as well as the opportunities that exist to address those threats and turn them around into useful benefits.

### **Participants' Expectations**

7. The participants' expectations of the workshop included the following:

- To understand mechanisms and operational guidelines in the micro grant projects
- Understand threats and probable solutions to unforeseen challenges.
- Acquire skills that will improve the performance of micro grants' projects implementation.
- Share and exchange past experiences in micro grants' initiatives and explore new capacity building methodologies.
- Gain experience of government vs NGO's collaboration in combating environmental threats.
- Get a better understanding of the transboundary concept and successful transboundary projects.

### **Methodology**

8. A participatory approach was adopted during the workshop, where the facilitator worked with the workshop presenters. The presentations included: the Introduction to NBI, NTEAP and its components, a presentation on the Micro-grants Program, the threats and opportunities of the Environment of the Nile Basin. Presentations also focused on the community development concepts and theories as well as some practical best practices on community level environmental conservation and management taking into account the GEF Small Grants Program experience of Egypt. A full day was devoted by the Workshop for a field visit, where the participants visited some of the SGP Projects near Cairo.

9. The last day of the Workshop was devoted to the use of Micro-grants to mitigate environmental threats, M&E of Micro-grants and Group discussions.

**Introduction and Update on Nile Basin Initiative with a specific Focus on the Nile Transboundary Environment Project (NTEAP)**

10. Ms. Ithar Khalil the National Project Coordinator of Egypt made a presentation on the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) and the Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP). She pointed out that the NBI is a mechanism that includes nine riparian countries (Burundi, DRC, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda) as equal members in a regional partnership to promote economic development and fight poverty. She pointed out that the NBI is composed of two main programs:

- The Shared Vision Program: the objective is to build the basis for cooperation in the Nile Basin, to build the capacity and to create enabling environment.
- The Subsidiary Action Program: the objective is to implement investment and development projects on the ground.

11. The NBI Shared Vision Program is composed of 7 Projects (the NTEAP is one of them). The NBI Secretariat is located in Entebbe-Uganda. The NBI is funded by a consortium of international of donors lead by the World Bank.

12. With regards to the Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP), Ms. Khalil mentioned that the objectives of the project were: (1) to provide a forum to discuss development paths for the Nile with national/local stakeholders, (2) to improve understanding of the relationship between water resources development and the environment and, (3) enhance basin-wide cooperation. The NTEAP has five components, namely, Institutional Strengthening to facilitate regional cooperation; Community-Level Land, Forest and Water Conservation; Environmental Education & Awareness; Wetland and Biodiversity Conservation and Water Quality Monitoring. The NTEAP total budget is US\$ 43.6 million out which the riparian countries contribute \$4.3million.

## **Overview of the Micro-grants Component and the Environment of the Nile Basin: Threats and Opportunities**

13. This presentation explained what micro-grants were, why they were important, how to access them and provided some lessons and best practices. This component has three sub components which include enhancement of basin wide capabilities and cooperation at regional and national level(capacity building); priority actions for addressing soil erosion which could be funded through micro-grants; transboundary micro-grants programme policy and operational procedures which includes the strategy, operational and planning instruments and the MG manual.

14. The Micro-grants procedures were developed based on the GEF small grants programming model which provides seed capital to NGOs and CBOs. The modus operandi of the MGs requires that genuine community participation be employed in the project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership. Experience from the existing MGs and SGPs mentioned above shows that communities have always been more interested in projects that address their immediate needs which provide them with viable alternative livelihoods to focus them away from destroying the environment. The challenge here is that community needs do not always equal to transboundary environmental initiatives and may easily be things that are un related to the NTEAP agenda. In this regard, it requires extensive and intensive participatory skills and knowledge to be able to help refocus them towards environmental management. Experience by project implementers in participatory planning is therefore important to help in identification of appropriate projects.

15. Tools and techniques like stakeholders analysis that help to identify the beneficiaries, problem tree analysis that help identify the core problems, root causes and effects in the context of the NTEA project, objective tree analysis that help to identify the most important interventions, logical framework analysis that helps in project design and community action planning that helps to translate qualitative data into quantitative data to help in interpretation and design of projects at community level are critical in MGs projects' design. All proposals must demonstrate that this due process was followed otherwise they risk being rejected by the NSC. The overall grant envelope available for MGs is US \$5.1 million and the size of each grant per project is \$25,000.

16. There are three types of micro-grants projects. These include:

- Type I, these include projects that take place within a country. These projects' typology resemble the existing GEF SGP projects however must address transboundary issues. They are single country focused projects; however, their purposes must address issues affecting the Nile basin countries sharing the same transboundary issues.
- Type II, these are projects that are implemented in more than one country at cross border location and financed by separate MGs of each of the countries. These are examples of a multi-country projects which neighboring countries can implement together or in close collaboration. Due to their nature of traversing across borders they are likely to be challenging. Design of such projects must show the transboundary issues at stake which are being addressed.
- Type III- are single or joint projects and can be implemented in two or more countries but not at the cross border locations, and are financed separately or through joint MGs in each of the participating countries. These projects are implemented in different locations although addressing similar issues. The participants may have different culture and languages although they share a common problem.

17. As a rule of thumb, it is envisaged that 50% of MGs projects should be either type II or III thus projects supporting transboundary initiatives. Single country projects must demonstrate their contribution and relationship with achieving transboundary objectives otherwise they may not be approved.

### **The Nile Basin Fact Sheet**

18. In order to place the workshop in the context of the NBI the MGLS painted an overall picture of the important facts and features of the Nile Basin as stated below: (based on data from the World Resources Institute, Watersheds of Africa, 2001):

i. Socio-economic facts are:

- NBI involves 10 countries as stated earlier;
- Covers Area 3.2million sq.km which is 35% of the total area occupied by the 10 riparian states and 46% of the population of these countries live in the basin,

- Population density by 1990 was 41.6 people per sq km and is estimated to reach 91 people per sq km by 2025;
- River Nile traverses over a distance of 6,800km from the farthest source in Uganda to the delta in Egypt-Alexandria;

ii. Drainage:

- Of all the countries Egypt has the highest dependency ration of 97% followed by Sudan 77% and Eritrea 68%;
- 91% of irrigated land in the basin is in Egypt and Sudan while only 9 % is spread out in the rest of the countries;
- The potential of hydro electric energy along the Nile is about 134,000 MW and yet only 5% is being utilized.

iii. Biodiversity:

- The NBI is very rich in biodiversity with about 129 species of fish;
- 129 fish endemics;
- 137 species of amphibians;
- 3 ramsar sites;
- 69 wetland dependent IBAs
- 5 endemic bird areas;
- Only 4.5% of protected area.

Rainfall:

- 3000 bcm water falls over the basin and only 2-4% reaches Aswan in Egypt. Lots of water is lost through evaporation, siltation and poor water resource management;
- In 1994, four countries in the basin experienced water scarcity and stress and this number is estimated to increase to 9 by 2025.

19. Environmental threats facing the Nile Basin include deforestation which is affecting the wetlands and exposing the water sources that feed the Nile river, soil erosion causing serious levels of siltation which negatively affects the river flow and may, if it persists, negatively impact on the quantity of water available especially in the down stream countries such as Egypt and Sudan. Other threats include invasive water weeds infestation which impact on the river ecosystem causing loss of some fish species such as tilapia. Floods, droughts, wetlands degradation and pollution are also among the key threats that face the Basin.

20. Most of these threats except for droughts and floods are human related and can be controlled through proper management of the environmental protection initiatives.

## **Community Development concepts and theories**

21. The presentation which was delivered by the Workshop Facilitator, Dr. Hassan Abu-Bakr focused on the development concepts that are being embraced by the NGOS and other civil society organizations to facilitate development work at the national and regional levels.

22. The Nile Basin Trans-boundary Project was designed to enhance the understanding of communities and countries within the Nile Basin on a range of aspects covering environmental conservation and management. Supporting a large population of over 300 million people in ten countries, the Nile Basin is one of the largest ecosystems in the world. This makes it important to ensure that the interests of all stakeholders are taken care of.

23. The presentation touched on the different development concept and theories that exist specially in relation to the participatory planning approach is one of the most important strategies that need to be applied on regular basis to ensure the views of those who are directly affected and those who are involved are taken care of. Participatory planning entails six key stages, namely, Stakeholder analysis, Problems analysis, Objective analysis, Design, Implementation and Monitoring and evaluation. There are many participatory planning methods which have gained recognition in the last decades. They include:

- Stakeholder Analysis
- Rapid Rural Appraisal/Participatory rural appraisal(RRA/PRA)
- Logical framework Analysis(LFA) and,
- Poverty Reduction Strategies(PRS)
- Community Action Planning(CAP)

24. The Micro grants form an important input to accelerate the generation and dissemination of knowledge on the technologies and also to complement the efforts of national governments and communities. It will be useful in providing funds for training and also to purchase equipment to enhance the environmental protection and management of water sources in the Nile Basin.



**Best practices on community level environmental conservation and management.  
The SGP Experience in Egypt.**

25. Since its inception, the GEF/SGP has been operational in 73 countries covering countries in Africa, Asia Pacific, Arab States, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean. To-date GEF/SGP has supported 5000 projects. Unlike MGs whose maximum grant per project is \$25,000, GEF/SGP provides \$ 50,000 per project. GEF/SGP funding programme is now in its 3<sup>rd</sup> phase. The current budget is \$172 million having risen from pilot phase \$18million, first phase \$24 million and second phase \$133million.

26. Like MGs the target of SGP are the marginalized communities and assistance goes through the NGOs and CBOs. Other beneficiary organizations include training and research institutions, village councils, national level NGOs and CSOs. GEF/SGP management flows from New York where a Central Program Management Team which is responsible for overall direction of the Program. At the country level, UNDP provides administrative support and in most cases office space in the case of SGP At the national level program management for both programmes are managed by National Steering Committees. Both programmes have a country strategy and country monitoring and evaluation framework.

27. Dr. Emad Adly, the National Coordinator for the GEF SGP and NTEP MG gave a presentation on the best practices on community level environmental conservation and management. The presentation focused on some of the projects implemented under the SGP in parts of Egypt. His presentation mentioned some of the lessons learned from these projects and the role that the communities have in managing these natural resources related projects. He emphasized the importance of adopting new approaches and community driven and tested practices that help in conserving the environment. One of these was the use of the Compost as an agricultural fertilizer. The approach has been quite successful in increasing the harvest of fruits such as oranges and has generated wide interest among the communities who adopted the approach and began using it effectively.

28. Another project that was presented was the use of solar energy in heating and power generation in some villages in one of the provinces in the country.

29. The SGP experience has been over the period of 14 years quite successful in bringing about new challenging techniques that were replicated and adopted by small business, CBOs and the Government.

**Field Visit:**

30. The Workshop Group undertook a one day field visit to the Zagazig Governorate of Egypt to see some of the SGP projects in the area. The SGP Program Assistant who accompanied the group explained that the visit would be to two projects in the area. The visit was built around reviewing the two projects presented by Dr. Emad Adly, the SGP National Coordinator on the previous day. The first visit was to a community center and school where the use of Solar panels to heat water and generate power was demonstrated to the workshop group. The demonstration revealed that the use of solar technology was quite useful in those areas as it was much cheaper than the traditional hydro-power electricity. The demonstration also made the communities more aligned to cleaner power generation. A number of income generation activities related to the project were also observed, especially income generation activities related to the manufacture of clothing.

31. Another project visited by the group was the COMPOST Project where community groups through support from GEF are recycling agricultural waste and using it as a fertilizer, especially for crops such as oranges. The farmers using these natural fertilizers indicated that the quality of the crops were a lot better than those produced using the chemical fertilizers. Moreover, the crop yield per acre increased when the COMPOST was used as a replacement to the chemical fertilizers.

32. The field visit also allowed the participants to see a social and economic structure that is well organized, where every member of the household has a unique role to play in the economic activities of the household. Moreover, the fact that Agriculture is basically irrigated in Egypt, gave participants the opportunity to see closely the dominance of the sector on all aspects of life. In addition, it also reflected the importance of the Nile River as the lifeline to its people. Nile water pollution is one of the main challenges that face the communities. A lot of effort needs to be exerted to address pollution and to ensure that it is curtailed. Dr. Diaa El-Qussy, the NSC member of Egypt was quite instrumental and helpful in proving the workshop participants with information on the activities, the history of the areas visited the socio-economic aspects and the successes of similar initiatives in Egypt.

### **Mitigation efforts through project implementation and using the Micro-grants to address transboundary challenges.**

33. The NTEAP's objective is to provide a strategic environmental framework for the management of trans-boundary waters and environmental challenges existing in the Nile Basin. This is aimed to contribute significantly to the overarching objective of the Nile Basin Initiative which is to achieve sustainable socio-economic development through equitable utilization of, and benefit from the common Nile Basin water resources. The riparian countries through a cooperative arrangement have agreed to ensure that the wellbeing of communities in the basin is not compromised through unsustainable exploitation that may lead to adverse environmental degradation and conflicts.

34. Micro-grants aim to enhance capacity and increase knowledge through sharing of lessons and experience across the basin. Through transboundary projects that work across countries, MGs aim to foster linkages and strong partnerships. MGs focus on working with vulnerable groups at community level especially women, to help them implement conservation activities such as forestation, agro forestry, soil and water conservation, terracing, building of gabions, development of woodlots at family and household level and promoting dialogue on contentious environmental issues such sharing of water resource, grazing, wood fuel etc.

35. Micro-Grants can also provide the glue that keeps communities together for a common purpose for example activities in environment, education and awareness component such as supporting schools, universities, media in their network activities. Such activities could range from tree planting which in turn may stimulate the culture of tree planting amongst young people and in the whole community. MGs can also be used to support initiatives like protection of shallow wells and springs for clean drinking water, provision of simple tools like sand filtration units for villagers and providing villagers with kits to monitor water quality.

36. The overall aim of MGs is to provide a facility for NGOs and CBOs to pilot and experiment on new ideas that support conservation efforts. They can also be used to promote ownership hence are supposed to play a key part in ensuring sustainability. They are like fuel provided to kick-start the running of social environmental laboratories through generation of information to foster learning of the intricacies involved in conserving the Nile basin environment and create level grounds for communities to engage in more broader issues for their own benefit. Through regular interactions, MGs will provide a platform for positive ventilation therapy thereby preempting any tensions and or conflicts that may be simmering or underlying between countries or communities.

37. The overall guidance and strategic direction of MGs programming is provided by the project management unit in Khartoum while at national level, the National Micro-grants Coordinators are charged with the management of the MGS including ensuring that all beneficiary NGOs/CBOs are properly supported when preparing proposals. Approval of proposals is the sole responsibility of the National Steering Committee (NSC), however at the local level there may be a local steering committee whose role is advisory and supportive to the host institution and the applying NGOs and CBOs to ensure that their projects are of high quality to meet the standards established and stipulated in the procedures in order to be approved by NSC. Details of MGs are encapsulated in the NTEAP Micro-grants Strategy of January 2005.

### **Micro-grants Proposal Development**

38. The Facilitator, Dr. Hassan Abu-bakr delivered a presentation on project proposal development. His presentation touched on the main elements and characteristics required in a good project proposal. He started with an overview and distinction between a project concept and project proposal, emphasizing the need to simplify both. The purpose of the project concept is to provide the minimal necessary information to the NC/NMC and NSC so that they can assess whether the NGO/CBO organization is eligible to receive funding and whether the project idea, once developed, could meet Nile Micro-grants criteria. Once the project concept is accepted, the proponent organization is requested to transform it into a project proposal.

39. Each project proposal should briefly but clearly state how it complies with the Nile Micro-grants criteria in the National Micro-grants Program Action Plan. This statement may be jointly elaborated by the NC and the NGO. This statement must explain the expected transboundary environmental benefits of the proposed project.

40. The Facilitator listed and explained the different elements that should be contained in a typical project proposal presented for NTEAP Micro-grants funding. These elements are:

- **Statement of compliance with Nile Micro-grants criteria.**

Each project proposal should briefly but clearly state how it complies with the Nile Micro-grants criteria in the National Micro-grants Program Action Plan. This statement may be jointly elaborated by the NC and the NGO. This statement must explain the expected transboundary environmental benefits of the proposed project.

- **Complete information on proponent organization and project participants and stakeholders, including previous experience.**

It is important to provide the information to ensure that the proponent organization has the required experience and has developed the proposal taking into account the needs of the communities.

- **Evidence of a participatory planning process and agreement by participants with project objectives and activities.**

The proponent organization must present to the satisfaction of the MGC and the NSC evident that a participatory planning process has taken place in the formulation stage of the project and that the community agrees to the proposed objectives and activities.

- **Baseline assessment of relevant environmental and, if possible, socio-economic conditions.**

This baseline assessment should be undertaken as part of a participatory proposal planning and development process. The baseline assessment is essential so that changes and impact brought about by the project intervention can be evaluated. It is also important to include an overview of other interventions in the area, both ongoing and planned, by local, national, and international organizations.

- **Clear statement of project objectives, activities, and expected results.**

Describe what the project aims to do: What does the project want to change? How will things be different after this project has ended? What will people do differently after participating in the project from what they do now? Describe the activities project participants will undertake in order to achieve these results.

- **Technical Assistance**

Indicate what external technical assistance is required and how it will be provided.

## **Workplan**

Each proposal should contain a work plan that demonstrates basic congruence among project objectives, activities, results, and budget requested. This work plan, like the rest of the proposal, should be developed in a participatory manner so that project participants understand and agree with the different project components and timeline.

- **Budget**

The budget should correspond to the objectives and activities proposed. The Micro-grants Program in general does not fund purchases of property or vehicles. The Micro-grants Program does not normally fund basic NGO operating or personnel expenses. The budget should include the amount that is requested from the Micro-grants Program, amount to be co funded by NGO/CBO contributions, and amount that will be financed by other donors. In-kind contributions should be described and quantified.

- **Monitoring and Evaluation plan**

M&E costs should be included in the project budget.

- **Sustainability Plan**

How will project benefits be maintained after the Micro-grants Program grant is completed? Provide a concise analysis of the projects economic, financial, and technical viability: Have the technical solutions been successfully applied elsewhere in similar socio-economic and bio-physical circumstances? How likely is it that the proposal will show outcomes that warrant the investment and why? How will the recurring costs be covered by the community in future? What are the major risks?

- **Communications**

Be sure to include visual and written documentation of the project experience as well as any exchange and informational visits to other projects in the work plan and budget.

**41. Other elements/criteria that the MGC or the NSC members should be looking for in a project proposal I include:**

**Partnership**

- Is there shared responsibility and accountability for project results?

**Innovation and creativity**

- Does the project explore new ideas and approaches to achieve its results?

**Appropriate Human Resource Allocation**

- Are suitable human resources involved and used well?

**Prudence and Probity**

- Is financial information complete, and accurate, and reliable? Are financial resources being used *economically*?

**Informed and Timely Action**

- Do we anticipate and respond to change based on adequate information?

**Relevance**

- Does the project make sense in terms of conditions, needs, or problems to which it is intended to respond?

**Appropriateness**

- Are the project resources, capacities and selected strategies sensible and sufficient to achieve expected results?

**Cost- Effectiveness**

- Is the relationship between costs and results reasonable?

**Sustainability**

- Will project benefits continue after completion of project activities?

## A TYPOLOGY OF PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

1. Passive participation	People participate by being told what is going to happen, or has already happened. It is a unilateral announcement by an administration or project management, without listening to people's responses. The information being shared belongs only to external professionals.
2. Participation in information-giving	People participate by answering questions posed by extractive researchers using questionnaire surveys or similar approaches. People do not have the opportunity to influence proceedings, as the findings of the research are neither shared nor checked for accuracy.
3. Participation by consultation	People participate by being consultants, and external agents listen to views. These external agents define both problems and solutions, and may modify these in the light of people's responses. Such a consultative process does not concede any share in decision-making, and professionals are under no obligation to take on board people's views.
4. Participation for material incentives	People participate by providing resources, for example labour, in return for food, cash or other material incentives. Much on-farm research falls into this category, as farmers provide the fields but are not involved in the experimentation or the process of learning. It is very common to see this called participation, yet people have no stake in prolonging activities when the incentives end.
5. Functional participation	People participate by forming groups to meet predetermined objectives related to the project, which can involve the development or promotion of externally initiated social organization. Such involvement usually occurs not at early stages of project cycles or planning but after major decisions have been made. These institutions tend to be dependent on external initiators and facilitators, but may become self-dependent.
6. Interactive participation	People participate in joint analysis, which leads to action plans and the formation of new local institutions or the strengthening of existing ones. It tends to involve interdisciplinary methodologies that seek multiple perspectives and make use of systematic and structured



	learning processes. These groups take control over local decisions, and so people have a stake in maintaining structures or practices.
7. Self-mobilization	People participate by taking initiatives independent of external institutions to change systems. They develop contacts with external institutions for resources and technical advice they need, but retain control over how resources are used. Such self-initiated mobilizations and collective action may or may not challenge existing inequitable distributions of wealth and power.

### **Monitoring and Evaluation of Micro-grants**

42. This session was delivered by the Micro-grants Lead Specialist Mr. Amir Baker. As part of the micro-grants component, the presenter stressed the importance of M&E in forming an integral part of any project design. A good M&E system must be based on sound baseline data for all project components. Monitoring is a process of measuring progress of performance in a project on a continuous basis. Monitoring is usually undertaken by project staff or management and is mostly activity based. Monitoring helps to measure 'effort'.

43. Monitoring helps to show whether the milestones in the project are being reached i.e. on expenditure, procurements, implementation etc. it is through monitoring that project management and stakeholders can tell whether the project is on course, or whether strategies must be changed to ensure progress.

44. Evaluation on the other hand is used to measure results usually at output, purpose and goal level. Evaluation measures effectiveness thus the quality of the services being delivered including coverage and targets. Evaluation is about determining improvements in peoples well being as far as it can be attributed to the project inputs. Evaluation helps to generate replicable lessons and also helps identify capacity gaps which can then be improved through training interventions.

45. The MG Monitoring Framework is based on the GEF/Small Grants Programme which has been adopted by NTEAP. The MG, M&E has three levels M&E levels. The first is the grassroots level and managers of this level are the implementers which in the case of NTEAP are NGOs, CBOs and project beneficiaries. The second level is national and this is implemented by the national micro-grants coordinators, lead monitoring coordinator and steering committee members. This also involves technical departments and environmental authorities. At regional level, this is undertaken by NTEAP, Nile Secretariat, UNOPS and relevant funding donors.

46. The MG M&E framework is based on logical framework matrix where indicators are based on the SMART principle thus: S-specific, M-measurable, A-achievable, R-realistic and T-time bound.

47. All indicators should be derived out of solid baseline data and the MG component of the NTEAP. These could be grants disbursement tables, reports and qualitative information from grantees. Other data could be derived from semi annual and annual reviews. Baselines are important in M&E framework as they help to explain the situation, help identify and set indicator bench marks and are therefore necessary for setting targets to be achieved at every level.

48. The MG component uses both qualitative and quantitative methods for their monitoring and evaluation. The qualitative method ensures that the views of stakeholders are captured at all levels of the programme. This involves consultations with stakeholders from design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. Participatory M&E employs tools and techniques such as direct observation, focus group discussions, social analysis and mapping, while quantitative methods use, surveys, document reviews, cost benefit analysis etc.

## **Group Discussion on designing mitigation related project proposals and incorporating M&E Framework.**

49. The Workshop participants were divided into four groups. Each group attempted to develop the main elements and features required in a project proposal taking into account a major environmental threat facing a Nile Basin Country. The groups came back with some interesting results which reflected their understanding of the concepts presented to them by the Facilitator. They also tried to merge between these concepts and a practical example on the ground.

50. The main elements participants thought of were clearly identical to those in a typical Micro-grant project which reflects their understanding of the concept. The discussion that followed the presentation of each group revealed some interesting concerns by the participants relating to:

- The need to increase the size of the grants to match the growing needs of NGOs in the basin;
- Capacity building activities for NGOs/CBOs are required from the inception phase until the implementation phase;
- More resources need to be availed for M&E of Micro-grants.

## **Conclusion**

51. This report has captured the critical tenets of the proceedings of the Regional Micro-Grants workshop providing a broader understanding of the MGs. Each session has represented the various aspects discussed at the Workshop.

52. Although NTEAP has been running for a little over two years, the project is showing considerable accomplishments towards strengthening the regional or basin wide responses to the management and conservation of the environment of the Nile River for the benefit of all stakeholders. Particular achievements include; creation of awareness on the importance of conserving the Nile River environment, creation of networks between and among stakeholders of different categories, development of the Micro grants institutional set ups and actual implementation in most of the Nile Basin countries. The Workshop has been instrumental in filling the information gaps of some participants and in allowing them to fully comprehend the essence of the Program. Similar future interactions are recommended by participants.

**Annex A:**

**List of Participants – Regional Capacity Building Workshop – 02- 04 May 2006  
Cairo – Egypt**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Name of Participant</b>	<b>Workshop</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Burundi</b>	Mr. DieuDonné Ndagijimana	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>2</b>	<b>Burundi</b>	Ms. Godeleive Karikurubu	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>3</b>	<b>D.R.C.</b>	Dr Malik Wisha	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>4</b>	<b>D.R.C.</b>	Ms Annie Mwana Kakungu	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>5</b>	<b>D.R.C.</b>	Mr. Hakiza Maheshe Bwabwa	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>6</b>	<b>Egypt</b>	Dr. Diaa EL Qusy	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>7</b>	<b>Ethiopia</b>	Ms. Letifa Abajobir	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>8</b>	<b>Ethiopia</b>	Mr. Tamiru Sebsibe	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>9</b>	<b>Kenya</b>	Ms. Beatrice Atieno Okero	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>10</b>	<b>Kenya</b>	Mr. Omondi Benedict Aloo	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>11</b>	<b>Kenya</b>	Dr Gideon Nyamasio	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>12</b>	<b>Rwanda</b>	Ms. Aimee Mpambara	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>13</b>	<b>Rwanda</b>	Ms. Julie Uwamwiza	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>14</b>	<b>Rwanda</b>	Ms. Sehene Chrysostome	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>15</b>	<b>Rwanda</b>	Mr. Joseph Anania	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>16</b>	<b>Sudan</b>	Ms. Khitma El Malik	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>17</b>	<b>Sudan</b>	Mr. Victor W LoTombe	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>18</b>	<b>Sudan</b>	Ms. Rehab A.Osman	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>19</b>	<b>Sudan</b>	Ms. Reem Osman	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>20</b>	<b>Sudan</b>	Mr. Alex Jubek Santo	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>21</b>	<b>Tanzania</b>	Ms. Editrudith Lukanga	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>22</b>	<b>Tanzania</b>	Mr. George R. Kafumu	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>23</b>	<b>Tanzania</b>	Mr. Paul Nyiti	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>24</b>	<b>Uganda</b>	Ms Helen Gakwaya	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>25</b>	<b>Uganda</b>	Ms Angella Rwabutomize	Micro-Grants CB Workshop
<b>26</b>	<b>Uganda</b>	Ms Goretti Kitutu	Micro-Grants CB Workshop

Annex B

**Workshop Program**

**02 May 2006: DAY 1 Introduction to NBI, NTEAP and its components; environment threats and opportunities**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Opening Session : Chaired by Eng. Mohamed Hindawy</b>			
<b>09:00 – 10:00</b>	Welcoming remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Amir Baker, MGLS</li> <li>• Eng. Mohamed Hindawy – Director of the NGO unit in EEAA</li> <li>• Facilitator: Introduction of Workshop participants and Overview of Workshop Program and objectives</li> </ul>	Welcoming of participants	<i>Rapporteur: Facilitator</i>
<b>10:00- 10:30</b>	<b>Coffee Break</b>		
<b>Session 1: Introduction to the NBI, NTEAP its components: Chair: Workshop Facilitator</b>			
<b>10:30-11:30</b>	-Introduction to the NBI and NTEAP and its components : Presentation by Ms. Ithar Khalil NPC Egypt - Presentation on the Micro-Grants Component by Mr. Amir Baker (MG LS) - Discussion	Introduction to the objectives of the Workshop and expectations of the discussions  Improve awareness, develop understanding of the NTEAP and its components	<i>Rapporteur: Facilitator</i>  Presentations (20 minutes each)  Discussions (20 minutes)
<b>Session 2: The Environment of the Nile Basin: Threats and Opportunities: Chair: Mr. Dessalegne Mesfin</b>			
<b>11:30 – 13:00</b>	The Environment of the Nile Basin: Threats and Opportunities by MGLS	Build understanding and knowledge on the different environmental threats affecting the Basin (causes and effects) and the opportunities that exist to address those threats and	<i>Rapporteur: Facilitator</i>  Presentation (45 minutes)  Discussions, Q&As (45 minutes)

		transform them into valuable assets. Linkages with other SVP & SAP Projects.	
<b>13:00 – 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch Break</b>		
<b>Session 3: Participatory Planning Methodologies, Chair: Workshop Facilitator/MG LS</b>			
<b>14:00 - 15:00</b>	Community Development concepts and theories – Presentation by the Workshop Facilitator	Understanding concepts behind community development actions	<i>Rapporteur : Facilitator</i> Overview presentation (20 minutes)  Discussions (40 minutes)
<b>15:00 – 16:00</b>	Best practices on community level environmental conservation and management. The SGP Experience in Egypt – by Dr. Emad Adly NMGC/SGP NC, Egypt	Understanding the best practices of SGP Egypt  Identifying opportunities for the NB countries	<i>Rapporteur : Facilitator</i>  Overview presentation (20 minutes)  Discussions (40 minutes)
<b>16:00 16:30 – Coffee Break and end of day one</b>			

**03 May 2006**

**DAY 2 Field Visit**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Process</b>
<b>09:00 - 16:00</b>	<b>Field visit to see an activity or more of the SGP Project and meet NGO representatives</b>		<b>Transport by vehicle(s) provided by Project</b>
<b>19:00 - 21:00</b>	<b>Workshop Reception at the Hotel</b>		<b>All workshop participants invited</b>

**04 May 2006 DAY 3 Participatory Planning Methodologies and Project Proposal Development**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Process</b>
<b>Session 4: Participatory Planning Methodologies, Chair: Workshop Facilitator/MG LS</b>			
<b>09:00 -09:30</b>	Recap of day one (Facilitator)	Review issues discussed and identify common challenges  Share experiences	<i>Rapporteur: Facilitator</i>
<b>09:30-10:30</b>	Mitigation efforts through project implementation: - using the micro-grants to address transboundary challenges By Amir Baker, MGLS	Understanding the uses of the Micro-grants in the riparian countries	<i>Rapporteur: Facilitator</i>  Présentation (20 minutes)  Discussion : (40 minutes)
<b>10:30 11:00</b>	<b>Coffee Break</b>		
<b>11:00-12:00</b>	Presentation on Micro-Projects Proposal Development: Presentation by the Workshop Facilitator	Understand the main elements of a good project proposal	<i>Rapporteur: Facilitator</i>  Présentation : (30 minutes) Discussion : (30 minutes)
<b>12:00 13:00</b>	Introduction to the M&E, Monitoring and Evaluation of the Micro-Grants Projects -developing indicators -monitoring tools - evaluating the activities  Presentation by Mr. Amir Baker, MG LS  Discussion	Understanding the key M&E concepts  Applying the concepts to project activities	<i>Rapporteur: Facilitator</i>  Présentation : (20 minutes) Discussion : (40 minutes)
<b>13:00 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch Break</b>		



<b>14:00-15:30</b>	Group Discussion on designing mitigation related project proposals and incorporating M&E framework Groups A, B, C and D will be given a transboundary problem and asked to develop project proposal responding to the issue.	Applying concepts  Understanding and fostering transboundary linkages	<b><i>Participants will be divided into four groups. Each group will select a facilitator, timekeeper and rapporteur</i></b>  <i>Time: 90 minutes</i>
<b>15:30 17:00</b>	Reporting back to the Plenary (presentation of group findings by <i>rapportuers</i> ) followed by Discussion	Exchange of knowledge and sharing of experiences	Presentations made by each Group
<b>Closing Session : Chaired by Dr. Mohamed Khalil, PSC Member, Egypt</b>			
<b>17:00 – 17:30</b>	Facilitator: Evaluation of Workshop by participants Closing remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Amir Baker, MGLS</li> <li>• Representative of participants</li> <li>• Eng. Mohamed Hindawy ,Egypt</li> </ul>		