

THE EUROPEAN UNION'S ENPI PROGRAMME FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION

MID-TERM EVALUATION OF ENPI H2020 CAPACITY  
BUILDING / MEP

Letter of Contract N° 2013/313823

DRAFT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Prepared by Eva RÖBEN

August 2013



The project is financed  
by the European Union



The project is implemented by IBF International Consulting

“The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the author and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.”

# ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CB	Capacity Building
BREF's	Best Available Techniques Reference Documents
EC	European Commission
ECRAN	Environment and Climate Regional Accession Network
EEA	European Environment Agency
EEAA	Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIB	European Investment Bank
ENP	European Neighbourhood Policy
ENPI	European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument
EUWI	European Water Initiative
GEF LME	Global Environmental Facility – Mediterranean Large Marine Ecosystem
GIS	Geographic Information System
H2020	Horizon 2020
HCWW	Holding Company for Water and Waste Water
ICZM	Integrated Coastal Zone Management
IPPC	Integrated Pollution Prevention Control
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
LBS	Land Based Pollutant Sources
LIFE TCY	LIFE: EU funding instrument for environmental projects, TCY: Third countries (non-EU neighbourhood))
LRTAP	Long-Range Transboundary Atmospheric Pollution (UN Convention)
MAP	Mediterranean Action Programme (UNEP)
MARPOL	Maritime Pollution (UN Convention)
MEHSIP-PPIF	Mediterranean Hot Spots Investment Programme Project Preparation and Implementation Facility
MEP	Mediterranean Environment Programme
MIO-ECSDE	Mediterranean Information Office for Environment, Culture and Sustainable Development
NAP	National Action Plan (under Barcelona Convention Land Based Sources Protocol)
NEAP	National Environmental Action Plan
NKUA	National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

PRTR	Pollution Release and Transfer Register
RENA	Regional Environmental Network for Accession
RIP	Regional Implementation Plan
RMR	Review, Monitoring and Research group (of H2020)
ROM	Result Oriented Monitoring
RSP	The Regional Strategy Paper
SEA	Strategic Impact Assessment
SEIS	Shared Environment Information System
SMAP	Short and Medium Term Priority Environmental Action Programme
SWIM	Sustainable Water Integrated Water Management
UfM	Union for the Mediterranean
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WEEE	Waste Electric and Electronic Equipment
WFD	Water Framework Directive
WWTP	Waste Water Treatment Plan

The “Horizon 2020 initiative” aims at de-polluting the Mediterranean by the year 2020 by tackling the sources of pollution that account for around 80% of the overall pollution of the Mediterranean Sea: municipal waste, urban wastewater and industrial pollution. H2020 is made up of the following components:

- (i) Investment),
- (ii) Capacity building
- (iii) Review, monitoring and research (RMR).

Under each component, An EU-funded sub-programme is currently being run.

The Mid-Term Evaluation of the ENPI H2020 Capacity Building/ Mediterranean Environment Programme (ENPI/2009/220-191) has been awarded to IBF International Consulting in order to assess the results, impact and outcomes of the service contract led by the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, aiming at conducting a comprehensive training programme for beneficiaries from the ENPI South countries (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya since 2012, Morocco, Palestine, Syria until 2011, and Tunisia), Western Balkan countries (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro) and Turkey. The programme covers the Southern Mediterranean countries between 2010 – 2014 and the Western Balkans and Turkey from 2010 – 2012.

The assignment started on 01 April 2013 and will continue until September 2013. The methodology is based on a set of evaluation questions which are systematically covering the OECD DAC evaluation criteria based on:

- *relevance*
- *effectiveness*
- *efficiency*
- *impact*
- *sustainability*

Both literature review, internet research and interviews were used for obtaining the necessary data, opinions and information in the context of the mid-term review. 102 people from 7 beneficiary countries, consisting of training participants, representatives of the implementing consortium, the programming institutions and stakeholders were interviewed.

The project was found to have delivered good results according to all evaluation criteria. Relevance is excellent, all other aspects good. The overall evaluation results according to the evaluation criteria are summarised below:

	Maximum	Achieved	
		Points	%
Relevance	20	17,65	88,24
Effectiveness	20	15,76	78,80
Efficiency	20	14,10	70,48
Impact	20	14,10	70,48
Sustainability	20	14,56	72,80
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>76,16</b>	<b>76,16</b>

0 – 50	Insufficient
50 – 70	Average
70 – 85	Good
85 – 100	Excellent

The key findings of the evaluation are summarised in the following sub-chapters.

## 1.1 Relevance

Both literature review, assessment of programme documents, interviews with representatives from the programming institutions, the implementing consortium and the beneficiaries (focal points, training participants from line ministries and other stakeholders) showed that the **H2020 CB/MEP programme was considered to be very relevant** for environmental management in the Mediterranean region.

The programme has been established according to the objectives of the Environment Strategy for the Mediterranean, the Barcelona Convention, the Cairo Declaration and Cairo Roadmap. It is in line with the objectives of the ENP programme and ENPI bilateral agreements.

The main EU legislation relevant to the H2020 CB/MEP programme is the EU Marine Strategy Directive. However, **the programme also covers the essential principles of many other EU policies**, such as waste hierarchy, sustainable production and consumption, horizontal integration of environmental issues, polluter pays and producer responsibility etc. Both the technical and cross-cutting issues trainings were based on these approaches.

The H2020 CB/MEP is coherent with the two other projects (ENPI SEIS and MeHSIP-PPIF) contributing to the three components of the H2020: Capacity Building, Review, Monitoring and Research, and Investment, However, synergies and cooperation are limited, partly because the overlap between

the three components is restricted to some specific subjects of generic character concerning the overall project preparation in case of MeHSIP-PPIF, partly because the training programme was already determined before the ENPI SEIS pillar could begin to integrate its needs. Although the overall coordination is found to be satisfactory, **more consideration of ENPI SEIS and MeHSIP-PPIF capacity building needs** is recommended for the next programming phase.

Decisions on training needs and priorities were taken in a participatory way during the Steering Group meetings. They reflect beneficiaries' needs within the context of Mediterranean depollution. Especially national trainings were strongly influenced by local context and priorities. H2020 CB/MEP trainings provide knowledge, tools and competence for the implementation of environmental policy and strategies in all beneficiary countries, including countries in the process of EU approximation or accession. The programme is generally viewed as not only **completely in line with strategies and policies of the beneficiary countries**, but beyond sheer coherence, also as making valuable contributions to awareness building on and conception of new policies (several beneficiaries used the term "eye opener" during the interviews).

The Arab spring had little influence on the relevance of the H2020 CB/MEP programme so far; environmental policy did not change in the Maghreb countries or Egypt. Civil society claims and participation have increased and focus mainly on visible environmental issues such as solid waste collection or pollution of specific areas. Environmental administrations do take these concerns into consideration but do not change their policies ad hoc. Presently **the H2020 CB/MEP programme maintains its relevance for all beneficiary countries** although there remains a question mark regarding the future political development in the region (impending war in Syria, military coup in Egypt, unrest in Tunisia and Turkey).

## 1.2. Effectiveness

Effectiveness has been assessed according to the coherence of outputs with the initial terms of reference and the Steering Committee decisions, beneficiaries' satisfaction with quality and performance of trainings, visibility of H2020 CB/MEP and efficient coordination of the Steering Group and the H2020 pillars.

Not all activities foreseen in the ToR could be carried out; for example, the contract required coordination of Euro-Med ministers' meetings, but no such meeting had been organised throughout the first phase of the programme, so no coordination was required. The Steering Group and CB sub-group meetings were also carried out with less frequency foreseen (2 instead of 3 in the reference period). However, the coordination of the Steering Group was considered to be efficient both by the programming institutions (EU, UNEP and UfM) and by beneficiaries.

On the other hand, **training activities surpassed the requirements in the ToR**. The implementing consortium organised a much higher amount of regional and sub-regional trainings than initially foreseen, involving all beneficiary countries equally. Differences in participation are due to varying commitment from the side of beneficiaries or to organisational difficulties. National trainings and

study visits are slightly behind schedule, (66,7 % done after 70 % of programme duration passed). Despite the temporary postponement of some trainings, **no training was cancelled due to the Arab spring**, and all projects continued.

Except some single trainings, beneficiaries were very satisfied with the quality and performance of trainings. Satisfaction with trainings was also related to the respective participant's involvement and knowledge in the sector; **the more a participant was proficient in a subject and carried out concrete work, the more he/she appreciated the training**. However, there was some criticism concerning the set-up of trainings; several beneficiaries would have wished the training to be more interactive, practice oriented and including local context and problems.

The programme set-up was also much appreciated by beneficiaries, both the combination of regional, sub-regional and national trainings, and the duration of these. Site visits were found to be very useful.

**Inadequate selection of training participants influences the performance of the trainings negatively**. Despite the selection criteria and control of applications by the trainers, focal points often send inadequate or unsuitable participants to trainings. An estimated 40 – 50 % of training participants are either not related to the subject or do not have the competence or mandate to implement knowledge and tools acquired during the trainings. Communication between focal points and other institutions is insufficient in some countries, and in consequence, institutions hosting the focal point often send their staff in place of more adequate participants from other organisations.

**The visibility of the H2020 CB/MEP programme is quite low**, both in comparison with other programmes working on environmental capacity building in the Mediterranean, and in comparison with the FP7 programme of DG Research.

### 1.3. Efficiency

Within H2020, the Steering Group is the main instrument for coordination. **The internal coordination is smooth and efficient**, although more consideration of ENPI SEIS and MeHSIP-PIF needs in the set-up of the training programme would be desirable.

The organisation of trainings was excellent, concerning training materials, venues and travel arrangements. Consortium members had a good dialogue with training participants and ensured a smooth implementation of trainings, also dealing professionally with specific restrictions (like Palestinians needing more time for exit and visa procedures). A high percentage of local consortium members and local trainers ensured integration of local knowledge and comprehension of local context, albeit to lesser extent in Western Balkans and Turkey.

A deficiency was observed in the lack of post-training and internal monitoring. Feedback from participants and beneficiary organisations was not requested except the standard multiple choice evaluation carried out directly after trainings.

No quantitative cost-benefit calculation could be carried out, since the benefits of the programme cannot be assessed yet. Possibilities for comparison with similar programmes are limited, since no ex-post evaluations for most of these programmes are available. However, the probable **impact of the programme is reduced due to the relatively high proportion of inadequate training participants (no commitment => no impact), and therefore this influences the cost-benefit ratio negatively.** This is probably also the case in other programmes, albeit not explicitly mentioned in reports and evaluations.

The EU added value of the H2020 CB/MEP programme lies in the overall acceptance of the EU as a neutral and supranational institution (“without hidden agenda”) with proven competence in the area of environmental policy and management. For Western Balkans and Turkey, EU projects are also more attractive due to their integration in the approximation and accession process. The EU added value could probably be enhanced by better visibility of both the programme and its embedding in EU institutions and policies.

## 1.4. Impact

**The H2020 CB/MEP programme had until now a very positive impact on environmental mainstreaming.** This covers both awareness building – some very new concepts for some beneficiaries – and the development of concrete initiatives towards the integration of environment in sector policies. A very positive example is Tunisia, where three different initiatives were undertaken with the help of the CB/MEP programme and led to concrete decisions. Moreover, due to the close cooperation with the Barcelona Convention, the H2020 CB/MEP programme also provides important contributions for its implementation.

**Approximately a third of trainings led to a practical outcome,** either a new initiative started by participants or a tangible improvement in their daily work<sup>1</sup>, and approximately 40 % of trainees either found the trainings useless or irrelevant or did not have any possibility to apply the competences acquired<sup>2</sup>. It is in the nature of a training programme that the outcomes are diverse; the training provides participants with tools, but the participant decides if and how to apply them. The table below provides an overview of the usefulness of individual trainings as perceived by the interviewees:

---

<sup>1</sup> Green and bright green cells in table 1

<sup>2</sup> Red and orange cells in table 1

**Table 1: Usefulness of H2020 CB/MEP trainings**

Usefulness	Application			
	Never	some time in the future	in preparation	in application
No use at all	15,73%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%
Enhancement of personal knowledge	14,61%	5,62%	0,00%	0,00%
Contribution to improve daily work	5,62%	8,99%	5,62%	11,24%
Lead to concrete outcome/ application	0,00%	8,99%	10,11%	13,48%

Factors of success and failure lie mostly in the selection of participants and in the capacity of the trainers to provide interactive and constructive training sessions corresponding to the needs of beneficiaries. The table below provides an overview of factors for success and failure.

**Table 2: Factors for success and failure**

	Within H2020 MEP programme	Within beneficiary institutions
<b>Factors for success</b>	<p>Precise selection criteria for training participants.</p> <p>Training programme adapted to local context and beneficiaries' needs</p> <p>Realistic expectations what can be achieved during a regional/ sub-regional/ national training</p> <p>Trainer motivates the participants and inspires the wish to go further</p> <p>Competence, local knowledge and</p>	<p>Selection of committed participants with both knowledge and decision competence working on subject related to the training</p> <p>Endorsement of initiatives started as an outcome of H2020 CB/MEP training (political/ financial)</p> <p>Appointment of dedicated focal point with good connections to other institutions, agencies, NGOs and private sector</p>

	efficiency iof implementing consortium	
<b>Factors for failure</b>	Too theoretical training programme (participants lose interest)	Selection of inadequate participants Transfer of trainee to other work area Lack of endorsement of training subject Focal points with too large portfolio => no time for working on H2020 CB/MEP Ministries of Environment “monopolising” trainings and sending mostly their own experts

In some cases, training led to unexpected impacts beyond the direct training outcome. These are singular cases, where beneficiaries built on the training results to start a completely new initiative or where local trainers transferred knowledge and tools from trainings to other projects within or even outside the beneficiary countries.

A concrete contribution of the H2020 CB/MEP programme to socio-economic development, poverty reduction, gender equality and similar cross-cutting issues could not be observed. It should also not be expected from a programme of this nature; if such an effect was achieved and could be directly linked to the programme, it would rather have to be considered as an “unexpected impact”. This is the case for conflict management; in two cases the programme could provide tools and knowledge to participants who used them in conflict mitigation in very different circumstances.

**The influence of the Arab spring on the impact of the project is still open.** Until now, the institutions in the Arab spring countries have remained very stable and continued implementation and development of existing policies and projects. However, it is not at all certain if and how the military coup in Egypt, the political developments in Tunisia and Turkey, and the regional effects of a possible war in Syria would affect environmental policy in the whole region. This development may constitute an important threat for the impact of H2020 CB/MEP and other environmental programmes in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean region.

## 1.5. Sustainability

The sustainability of the H2020 CB/MEP programme depends strongly on external factors. Both **approach, contents and results have been strongly endorsed by institutional and non-governmental beneficiaries**, a success that is certainly linked to the participatory decision making in the Steering Group.

Beneficiary countries generally have legal and policy framework supporting the implementation and further development of H2020 CB/MEP results, but the application related to legal texts, monitoring and enforcement systems are generally insufficient except in some more advanced countries. Financing of further trainings or investment is also often limited due to budget constraints, insufficient financing mechanisms and lack of budget autonomy. In consequence, **the sustainability of H2020 CB/MEP achievements depends in many cases on the further availability of donor funding and further institutional strengthening in the area of implementation, monitoring and enforcement.**

Apart from the financial dependency, sustainability of the H2020 CB/MEP outcomes also depends on

the political stability of beneficiary countries. Most indicators for the Western Balkan countries, Israel and Turkey point rather towards stability; the situation is more fragile for the Mashreq and Maghreb countries and changed with the recent political events. Economy in Tunisia, Egypt and Turkey has already been affected by the political developments of spring 2013, and a possible war in Syria will most probably affect Israel, but also the neighbouring countries Lebanon, Palestine, Jordan and Turkey. A backlash on environmental policy and programmes and therefore also on the H2020 CB/MEP acquis is very probable.

## 1.6. Recommendations

Although the programme was evaluated rather positively, some recommendations have been made to improve its impact and sustainability in the second phase. These recommendations also concern relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, since an improvement of these aspects also leads to a better outreach, higher impact and better sustainability.

External factors such as political stability cannot be influenced by the project implementation bodies and stakeholders and are therefore not mentioned here. Contents and focus of the programme are very appropriate and should remain as they are, in order not to dilute the scope and goals of the programme.

### **Relevance:**

- The ENPI SEIS and MeHSIP-PPIF should closer cooperate on preparation of training programmes addressing capacity building needs in the context of these programmes to ensure the integration of the three pillars under H2020.
- Concrete needs for integrating environmental aspects in horizontal areas (finance, tax, media...) in the beneficiary countries should be consulted among main stakeholders
- More coordination is required with other donors, UNEP/MAP and EU delegations to improve cooperation on the local level
- Inclusion of Western Balkans and Turkey either by additional financing or synergies with ECRAN or similar programmes is recommended in order to ensure a coherent approach for the entire Mediterranean basin
- Uninterrupted continuation of the programme is necessary to avoid a gap between the first and the second phase and risk of disruption which may lead to disappointment and negative impressions in beneficiary institutions
- More involvement of EU Member States in order to achieve stronger EU internal endorsement and contribution.

### **Effectiveness and efficiency:**

- Improving the selection of training participants in cooperation with Focal Points to increase the number of trainees and ensure practical use of the skills and knowledge is recommended

- Better design and delivery of training for Focal Points is necessary to improve participant selection and communication with local stakeholders
- Design and delivery of training of trainers is recommended to help willing participants to transfer knowledge acquired to colleagues and stakeholders
- Integrating local context into the design of training is recommended to provide more practical exercises and case studies to ensure that the training fully addresses the working environment of the participants
- Designing and delivery of follow-up training and pilot projects is necessary to establish a clearer link between some trainings, and to ensure practical experience transferred
- Enhancement of visibility is recommended by embedding the H2020 website into the ec.europa.eu site and by resolving the problem of double use of the H2020 name both by FP7 and by DG DEVCO
- Content and design of H2020 website should be improved (better thematic structure, links to background information etc.)
- More control of implementing organisations is needed to avoid internal conflicts (partnership issues, misunderstandings...) that might affect their performance
- The programming institutions should take care to separate clearly the programming from the execution responsibilities in order to avoid conflicts of interests (organisations involved in programming should not participate to tenders according to PRAG Rulebook Chapter 2.3.6.)
- Systematic support for visa procedures is recommended to avoid last minute bookings and participants missing the trainings
- Use of open source software and free training material is suggested to enable beneficiaries to continue applying tools and competences acquired during the trainings.

***Impact and sustainability:***

- Systematic post training monitoring and evaluation of training results by implementing organisation in order to improve design of training is recommended
- Cooperation with other donors on launching follow-up projects to ensure sustainability of initiatives undertaken by beneficiaries is necessary.