MID-TERM REVIEW

Project ID:	10117
Project Name:	Green Sharm El Sheikh
Countr(ies):	Egypt
Implementing Agency:	UNDP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name Green Sharm El Sheikh	
Country Egypt	
GEF ID 10117	Implementing Agency UNDP
Executing Entity Ministry of Environment	
Trust Fund GET	Project Type FSP
Objective To turn Sharm El Sheikh into a model integrated and ecologically sustainable tourism city of national and international importance through the adoption of further low-carbon technologies, proactive waste prevention and management practices and a further-enhanced protection of its natural capital basis	

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval 1/4/2022	Agency Approval 6/6/2022
Implementation Start 6/6/2022	First Disbursement 3/13/2023
Expected MTR 6/6/2025	MTR Submission 3/2/2026
Actual MTR 9/11/2025	Expected Completion 6/6/2028

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main MTR Findings

Between 2022 and 2025, by the midterm of this six-year project (June 2022 – June 2028), the Government of Egypt together with the private sector, and partially supported with international donors, have invested already 78.6 million USD in sustainable development in Sharm El Sheikh (which is 139% of the planned co-financing of 56.1 million USD). Of this, the Government of Egypt invested 40.5 million USD, the private sector 33.5 million USD, international donors co-financed 4.6 million USD (including UNDP managed co-financing).

The actual UNDP/GEF project expenditures reached 0.6 million USD at the midterm (June 2025), which is 10% of the total GEF budget, or 15% of the cumulative project budget planned for the first three years of the project implementation period.

Main Green Sharm El Sheikh co-financed achievements include:

• 40 MWp utility-scale photovoltaic plants

• 10.364 MWp roof-top PV installations in public and private facilities (of which 5.473 MWp in hotels, 3.187 MWp in other private facilities, 1.704 MWp in public buildings)

• 891 PV-powered LED street lighting posts

• Improved municipal solid waste collection (99% collection rate)

• Solid waste separation facility (one)

• Sanitary landfill (one)

• 5 electric buses

• Waste water treatment plant improvements, increased efficiency of oxidation ponds

• Cycling tracks (60 km) • Strategic water conveyance pipeline (17 km)

• Botanical Garden, Central Park - newly established in the city

• Autoclave waste sterilizer in Sharm El Sheikh Hospital

• Awareness rising campaign to support South Sinai Governor's decision to ban single-use plastic (SUP) bags

• Mooring buoys for tourist boats in Protected Areas near coral reefs

All of these co-financed projects were implemented within the Green Sharm Initiative and are fully in line with the key pillars of the SESSDS. Some of the co-financed activities were implemented with a direct project support and received technical assistance; however, others were implemented without direct project support. All co-financed activities are fully in line with the Green Sharm Initiative and with the objectives of the Green Sharm Project. They were developed with UNDP support after a longterm partnership of UNDP with the Government of Egypt, and after a series of UNDP-supported projects implemented in Egypt and Sharm El Sheikh focusing on individual aspects of the Green Sharm Initiative. They are also fully in line with the objectives of the SESSDS under development. Co-financed activities were implemented in the early phase of project implementation, and the investment was mobilized because of Egypt hosted the COP 27 conference in Sharm El Sheikh in November 2022.

Although achievements of co-financed activities are typically not included in the UNDP/GEF project LogFrame targets, few of them are directly included (such as Indicator 7: Public investment in SESSDS implementation), and some others have direct impact on LogFrame target achievements (project objective indicators 1 – 3, and Indicator 13: Improved waste collection and separation). Thus, the MTR LogFrame achievements report both direct UNDP/GEF project achievements and separately relevant co-financed achievements as well. However, the co-financed achievements, if not addressed directly by the LogFrame target (see Indicator 7), are not included in the summary table with the overall project towards results rating.

Main achievements directly supported by the UNDP/GEF Green Sharm El Sheikh Project by midterm (end of June 2025) include:

• Sharm El Sheikh Sustainable Development Strategy partially developed (mission, vision, strategic objectives approved and adopted, detailed pillars-based strategies mostly drafted, water strategy under development).

• 1.157 MWp in roof-top PV installed in 3 hotels, an additional 2.687 MWp of roof-top PV under development in 9 hotels (suppliers contracted). This represents in total 3.844 MWp of newly installed roof-top PV capacity.

• 30 feasibility studies for PV in hotels, 50 walk-through energy, water, and biodiversity improvements audits, and 3 detailed energy and water audits in hotels were developed.

• 3 hotels implemented low-cost/no-cost energy efficiency and water-saving measures

• The GEF project supported with technical assistance installation of PV in Gharqana village, ground mounted PV installations and batteries for street lighting, and installation of a 400-liter autoclave waste sterilization unit in Sharm El Sheikh hospital (co-financed technologies).

• Workshop in Gharqana village for local women was equipped with sewing machines and material.

• ESIA, ESMP, Baseline Study, Fostering Ecotourism Expansion in Nabq Protectorate via Investment Packages/Inception Report, Sharm El-Sheikh Local Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) of Tourism Impacts to Biodiversity in Protected Areas, Enhancing Solid Waste Management in Sharm El-Sheikh (Waste Enhancement Strategy (SWES), Implementation of Pilot Projects, Guidance note for the implementation of no-cost and low-cost interventions), Monitoring and benchmarking indicators, Gender Mainstreaming in Project Activities - Guidelines for Green Sharm's Technical Consultants, Integrated Local Community Development Plan, and other documents and reports, including project planning and monitoring, were developed.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement can serve as an example of a good practice. It is built on a long-term experience and partnerships UNDP developed in Egypt, and it combines both the support and active involvement of key high-level decision-makers in Egypt, and effective involvement of all relevant stakeholders in project activities planning, decisions, and implementation on a local level.

The Green Sharm Committee was established on a local level at the kick-off of the project in 2023, and it serves as a platform where all relevant local stakeholders are represented.

The Steering Committee consists of key representatives of mainly central government and authorities: the Ministry of Environment, Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA), Ministry of Tourism and

Antiques, Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Electricity and Renewable Energy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, South Sinai Governorate, Egyptian Tourism Federation, Tourism Development Authority, and UNDP.

The Green Sharm Committee consists of representatives of mainly local representatives: South Sinai offices of Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Tourism, South Sinai Governorate, Egyptian Hotel Association, Egyptian Tourism Federation, Sinai Protected Areas Administration, Sharm El Sheikh Municipality, Chamber of Diving and Water Sports (CDWS), relevant project partners: hotel owners and managers, Zahret Ganoub Sinai waste management company, Banque du Cairo – project partner for SUP plastic ban information and awareness rising campaign, project consultants and contractors, and the PMU Project Team.

Rating: Highly Satisfactory

C. Gender Equality

During the project development phase, a detailed Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan have been developed and integrated into the project design and Project Document, and it has been partially integrated into the implementation of project activities.

The project LogFrame specified two of 22 indicators as gender sensitive. The Indicator 1 – Number of direct individual and institutional participants (including both women and men) benefiting from project-led initiatives, includes equal targets for men and women – individual beneficiaries should include 50% men and 50% women, and Indicator 9 target: At least 50 (100 EOP target) municipal/govt staff (thereof min. 50% women) trained in the development and management of integrated sustainable urban development planning.

Gender equality and women's empowerment in Egypt vary across different social groups. In urban areas, women often have access to qualified and even top managerial and decision-making professional positions. In rural areas, the communities are more traditional, which is also reflected in more genderspecific roles and opportunities.

For example, the Minister of Environment (Implementing Agency), Deputy Governor of South Sinai, and several interviewed municipal experts and staff are women. On the other hand, the staff of hotels in Sharm El Sheikh, at least in a sample of hotels visited, is exclusively male-dominated (at least those who are exposed to a contact with tourists). There are no "cleaning ladies" neither, but "cleaning boys" only. The most traditional, also in terms of gender roles, are local communities of Bedouins, where women often wear niqabs in public.

The PMU project team is composed equally of men and women. Women in the project team hold fully qualified positions and are fully emancipated and assertive as well.

While some project activities have gender neutral impact by its nature, such as the installation of PV in hotels, some other activities are very sensitive in this regard. A very specific case is the impact of biodiversity protection in PAs on minorities – local communities of Bedouins, including gender specific impacts. The project works both with one of the Bedouin communities as a whole, and specifically with Bedouin women as well (empowering local communities, and specifically empowering Bedouin women by the development of income-generating opportunities for women, such as handicraft workshop). However, this activity does not have a gender-disaggregated specific target in the LogFrame. The developed Integrated Local Community Development Plan includes budget for each specific activity, of which several of them include specific components on women empowerment. The budget is defined per content/activities, and it is not explicitly gender-specific, since it targets both, women and men.

The project results are rated as per the Gender Results Effectiveness Scale as Gender Responsive. Outcome 1.1 – gender targeted, Outcome 1.2 – gender neutral, Outcome 2.1 – gender targeted, Outcome 2.2 – gender neutral, Outcome 2.3 – gender neutral, Outcome 3.1 – 3.3 – gender neutral, Outcome 3.4 – gender responsive, Outcome 3.5 – gender neutral, Outcome 4.1 – gender targeted. The overall score is not a simple weighted average, because the project implements key activities addressing improvement of local communities and especially women empowerment, which are not fully reflected in the LogFrame.

Gender (and children) disaggregated participation in conducted trainings was monitored and disaggregated into women, men, (and children when applicable - stringing beads). While in some trainings the participants were mainly women and children, in most trainings the participants were predominantly men, depending on the subject of the training.

The project initiated and assisted establishment and official registration of an NGO representing the local community of Bedouins and their interests in the Gharqana village in the Nabq protected area.

The project Gender Officer developed the Guidelines for Green Sharm's Technical Consultants – Gender Mainstreaming in Project Activities, and suggested several revisions/updates to the Gender Action Plan. MTR endorses these revisions. The Gender Action Plan includes a set of Gender Specific Indicators (GSI) and Gender Specific Actions (GSA) for each project output.

Specific MTR recommendations regarding the Gender Action Plan:

• Allocation of gender-specific budget for each relevant project activity

Since the relevant project activities are not sex-disaggregated, but in multiple cases they do include women empowerment components, a particular gender-specific budget is not considered necessary for gender-sensitive execution of the project.

• GSA/GSI 9: How many women should be targeted? Is it worth including an indicator that ensures sustainability beyond the project's lifecycle? For example, Training of trainers? Or local community women training their fellow members or is it best to keep it general?

The project area covers Sharm El Sheikh and 3 PAs. Activities should cover women in this region, and namely women from the local communities.

I don't think it is necessary to include an indicator that ensures sustainability beyond the project's lifecycle. The targets should not limit the PMU in additional activities, should they be found useful.

Training in use of digital platforms depends on accessibility of the internet/mobile signal. It would be good if at least some of participants could use the internet and be trained in basic skills using digital platforms, such as information (google) search etc.

• GSI 11 (b): Include the number of women and men employed annually in x number of entities.

This may be included, if data collection is feasible.

• GSI 18 (a): Gender polices or gender-sensitive HR polices within the eligible private sector companies. Q: What is the eligibility criteria for the selection of eligible private sector companies?

The term "eligible" means existence of gender polices or gender-sensitive HR polices. However, an unintended impact when the lack of gender/local community policies would prevent the financing should be avoided. At least a brief model gender sensitive policy should be developed that could be adopted by applicants for financing.

• GSI 18 (b): “Community level action/CSR initiatives engaging local communities” is proposed to be replaced with “Number of local community members in Nabq PA engaged through CSR initiatives/community level action”.

Number of community members better reflects the achievement/impact than number of initiatives. MTR supports the revision. Alternatively both indicators may be used if deemed feasible.

• GSA 16: (Align with the NCW anticipated Gender and Sustainable Development Manual), however, this manual has not been developed, yet.

The training does not need to rely on this manual, if it is not available. It can benefit from this or other manuals, if they are available. It is not necessary to remove it, just in case the manual would be developed.

• GSI 19: Women and/or GEWE CSO’s are included in the piloting process. Suggested revision to: “Number of women and/or GEWE CSO’s included in the piloting process”.

Yes, the suggested revision is more specific and thus recommended. Include number of women and share in %. Likewise in GSI 20.

• GSA 29: Conduct regular awareness raising sessions with the community on biodiversity related harmful practices.

Include biodiversity into the GSA definition.

• GSA 43: Can we include educational institutions.

Yes, this is a good example of adaptive management. Consider reporting separately in green purchasing and in education (immediate vs. longer-term impact).

• GSA 33: (Align with the NCW anticipated Gender and Sustainable Development Manual)

Since the manual is not available yet, it is not relevant.

• GSI 33: Training package produced and delivered. Q: Target audience: women in Nabq PA? And Bedouins working in the waste sector?

Yes, target women in Nabq PA. Bedouins working in waste sector if need and interest identified.

• GSI 40: Strategy and Gender Action Plan delivered and institutionalized

Include brief Strategy and Gender Action Plan into SESDS, focus on most relevant activities, so that women would not be excluded/disqualified.

• GSI 42: “Three knowledge products…”

Develop before EOP, not annually, focus on brief summary of lessons learned and best practices, rather than “long” reports, so that it would be easier to attract attention of readers. Publish it accordingly within the community in Sharm El Sheikh, and on internet (project website).

The UNDP gender marker assigned to the project is GEN 2 – gender equality is a significant objective, i.e. the project focus is on gender equality and women’s empowerment. The project document specified in its Chapter 3.8 Gender Equality and Empowering Women, seven strategies to mainstream gender issues in the project. As of project midterm, these strategies have been partially implemented. The actual midterm GEN coding for various implemented project activities would vary within the range between GEN 1 and GEN 3.

The project does not specifically address human rights and people with disabilities.

D. Knowledge Management

The Green Sharm initiative and individual project activities, namely those with participation of highlevel governmental stakeholders, have been communicated via various media outlets, such as private and governmental/public traditional and web-based media, as well via social media channels (such as Facebook page of the Government of Egypt (with 6.5 mil followers), web portals: Seventh day - youm7.com, https://earthsguards.com/, Al Khaleej Newspaper – https://www.alkhaleej.ae, Akhbar Elyom – https://akhbarelyom.com, Extra News, and others. The project has also operationalized its dedicated Green Sharm web page at https://greensharm.org in English and Arabic, with information on the project as well as information for tourists.

An effective sharing of project experience is channeled by project beneficiaries through their professional associations within the South Sinai region and Egypt (Egyptian Hotel Association, Egyptian Tourism Federation, Chamber of Diving and Water Sports, and others).

The Project's Environmental Awareness Campaign was officially launched at the official inauguration and opening of Gharqana's new residential houses on June 24, 2025.

The project established very effective communication with all relevant project stakeholders through the initiation of the Green Sharm Committee, which was officially formed through a decision issued by the South Sinai Governor in July 2023. The Green Sharm Committee is a platform where all relevant project stakeholders actively participate in discussing and planning project activities and sharing project experience and results.

Rating: Satisfactory

III. Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
1170000	117000	117000	

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
1170000	117000	117000	

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Abu Galum Managed Resource PA (estimated 70% of 500,000 ha)	40978	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources	350,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00		27.00	40.00	
Nabq Managed Resource PA (estimated 80% of 600,000 ha)	40977	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources	480,000.00	48,000.00	48,000.00		30.00	44.00	
Ras Mohamed NP (estimated 40% of 850,000 ha)	9782	National Park	340,000.00	34,000.00	34,000.00		44.00	54.00	

Indicator 2 Marine protected areas created or under improved management

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
780000	78000	78000	

Indicator 2.1 Marine Protected Areas Newly created

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 2.2 Marine Protected Areas Under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
780000	78000	78000	

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Abu Galum Managed Resource PA (estimated 30% of 500,000 ha)	40978	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources	150,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00		27.00	40.00	
Nabq Managed Resource PA (estimated 20% of 600,000 ha)	40977	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources	120,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00		30.00	44.00	
Ras Mohamed NP (estimated 60% of 850,000 ha)	9782	National Park	510,000.00	51,000.00	51,000.00		44.00	54.00	

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (direct)	1100000	105837	73368	
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (indirect)		1174166	914880	

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (direct)				

Expected metric tons of CO_2e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (direct)	1100000	105,837	73,368	
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (indirect)		1,174,166	914,880	
Anticipated start year of accounting		2021	2025	
Duration of accounting		20	20	

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)	3.80	2.2	25,445,700	

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
Solar Photovoltaic	1.50	2.50	4.00	

Indicator 9 Chemicals of global concern and their waste reduced

Metric Tons (Expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 9.1 Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type)

POPs type	Metric Tons (Expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 9.2 Quantity of mercury reduced (metric tons)

Metric Tons (Expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 9.3 Hydrochloroflurocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out (metric tons)

Metric Tons (Expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 9.4 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste (Use this sub-indicator in addition to one of the sub-indicators 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 if applicable)

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 9.5 Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented, particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities (Use this sub-indicator in addition to one of the sub-indicators 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 if applicable)

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 9.6 POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided

Metric Tons (Expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 9.7 Highly Hazardous Pesticides eliminated

Metric Tons (Expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 9.8 Avoided residual plastic waste

Metric Tons (Expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 10 Persistent organic pollutants to air reduced

Grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ (Expected at PIF)	Grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ (Achieved at MTR)	Grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ (Achieved at TE)
10.80	28.90	7.04	

Indicator 10.1 Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air (Use this sub-indicator in addition to Core Indicator 10 if applicable)

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
1	1	0	

Indicator 10.2 Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented (Use this sub-indicator in addition to Core Indicator 10 if applicable)

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
1	1	0	

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	3,750	3,750	7,800	
Male	3,750	3,750	7,800	
Total	**7,500**	**7,500**	15,600	**0**

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO($)	Materialized at MTR($)
GEF Agency	UNDP (own resources)	Grant	Investment mobilized	90,000.00	17,273.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment	Grant	Investment mobilized	53,100,000.00	9,610,200.00
Private Sector	Egyptian Hotel Association/member hotels	Grant	Investment mobilized	3,000,000.00	4,030,000.00
Donor Agency	UNDP (from Government of Italy).	Grant	Investment mobilized	500,000.00	500,000.00
Private Sector	Taqa Arabia Group	Equity	Investment mobilized		13,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	South Sinai Governorate	Public Investment	Investment mobilized		18,819,565.00
Recipient Country Government	Water and Sanitation Company in South Sinai	Public Investment	Investment mobilized		12,100,000.00

Donor Agency	EU and Japanese Grants for Egypt PV Project	Grant	Investment mobilized		1,768,000.00
Private Sector	Private Sector Investment in PVs	Equity	Investment mobilized		2,296,066.00
Private Sector	Banque du Caire	Grant	Investment mobilized		140,000.00
Other	Public Private Partnerships (PV plant)	Other	Investment mobilized		14,000,000.00
Donor Agency	EU	Grant	Investment mobilized		350,000.00
Donor Agency	China	Grant	Investment mobilized		2,000,000.00
Total Co-financing				**56,690,000.00**	**78,631,104.00**

Comments

The planned co-financing of the Government of Egypt of 53.1 million USD included also a utility-scale 35 MWp PV power plant with expected costs of 30 million USD. This PV plant has been constructed and financed by private investors (including a Public Private Partnership (PPP) scheme, i.e. a governmental contract with private investors). Planned governmental co-financing without the utility scale PV plant was 23.1 million USD. Actual disbursed co-financing of the Government of Egypt reached 40.5 million USD, i.e. 175% of the 23.1 million USD plan (excluding the private/PPP investment into the PV plant). Actual disbursed co-financing of the Government of Egypt and private investors into the utility-scale PV plants (27 million USD) reached 67.5 million USD, i.e. 127% of the original expected governmental co-financing of 53.1 million USD (including the utility-scale PV plant). Private sector investment in small-scale roof-top PV reached 4 million USD, i.e. 134% of the planned amount. The total actual co-financing already invested and disbursed of 78.6 million USD includes: co-financing provided by the Government of Egypt of 40.5 million USD, utility-scale PV plant private/PPP investment of 27 million USD, private co-financing of 6.5 million USD (roof-top PV in hotels and public and commercial facilities, info campaign), EU, Japan and China grants of 4.1 million USD (of which 1.768 million USD EU and Japanese grant for Egypt PV project – roof-top PV in public buildings, 0.35 million USD EU grant for an sterilization autoclave in a hospital, and 2 million USD Chinese grant for PV powered LED street lighting), and UNDP managed co-financing of 0.517 million USD. The actual and already materialized and invested/disbursed co-financing of 78.6 million USD is 39% higher than the planned co-financing of 56.69 million USD as of Project Document. The high already disbursed cash co-financing, which includes primarily co-financing provided by the Government of Egypt and the PPP project, illustrates high commitment of the Government of Egypt to the Green Sharm Initiative. It illustrates also a strong ownership of the Government of Egypt of both, the Green Sharm Initiative, and the Green Sharm Project itself. This strong commitment and ownership is not a result of a one-time effort or a single UNDP-supported project, but it was developed over years of strong UNDP partnership with the Government of Egypt, and a series of multiple UNDP-supported projects financed by GEF and other donors focusing on sustainable development in Egypt and specifically in Sharm El Sheikh.

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
	High or Substantial	High or Substantial	

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

GEF's safeguards requirements have been met by applying UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards.

During the project development phase, the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) have been drafted. The SESP identified a total of 12 social and environmental risks, of which two in waste management and biodiversity workstreams were rated "high", and the other ten risks were rated "moderate". Thus, the overall Social and Environmental Risk categorization for the project was "high" as well. The ESMF outlined the safeguard risk assessment and management measures the project must undertake at project launch to ensure the environmental and social risks and potential impacts are fully assessed and management measures are fully defined and incorporated.

The Project Document specified that within the first 3-6 months after the project launch, at least two ESIAs/ESMPs for two high/risk workstreams must be elaborated, and the management plans and measures in place before the relevant project activities can be initiated.

ESIAs and ESMPs for waste management and biodiversity workstreams have been developed at the initial phase of the project implementation period and after their submission implementation of actual project activities was launched in August 2023.

SESP procedures have been fully implemented, ESIAs and ESMPs were developed, and risk mitigation measures have been specified and are gradually implemented.

Rating: Highly Satisfactory

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Prefix	Title
M and E Document	Mid-term Review (MTR)	MTR (Egypt / GEF 10117 / UNDP 6249)
Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	PRODOC Annex 12 SESP