Financial and Economic Analysis for Agricultural Projects

(West Delta Irrigation Project Case)

Mahmoud A. Abd El Aziz; Karima Awad Mohamed; Alaa El Deien.M. Safaan and Haitham .B.Aly

National Research Centr and Agricultural Research Centre

Abstract: The project aimed to increase the water productivity and efficiency. Therefore, the main objective of the current study is to evaluate both the financial and economic viability of installing irrigation water connections and facilities through RC pipelines. The results indicated that the project will need to inject capital till year 4, in that it will be financially sustainable beginning from year 5 of operation. In spite of the fact that the project is not financially viable where IRR (8%) < WACC (10%), it is sustainable in that it is capable of covering cost of operation and is also economically viable (17%). However, it is advised to adopt alternative one where ERR (25%) much exceeds ERR of alternative two (17%) and where IRR (16%) would attract capital investment.

[Mahmoud A. Abd El Aziz; Karima Awad Mohamed; Alaa El Deien.M. Safaan and Haitham .B.Aly. Financial and Economic Analysis For Agricultural Projects. Nature and Science 2010;8(11):222-233] (ISSN: 1545-0740).

Keywords: West Delta Project, Financial Analysis, Economic Analysis, Internal Rate of Return, Agricultural Projects.

Introduction:

The West Delta Project is a unique example of the national projects that achieve the economic and institutional reform plans, develop the services provided to the public, raise performance efficiency and promote conservation and rationalization of water as one of the vital natural source that faces huge risks and challenges. One of the key principles upon which the project is founded is that water is a public property of the state. The state grants the right to use it merely for agricultural purposes according to binding contractions that forbid disposing or selling it to a third party. At the same time, the project allows full cost-recovery of the costs of construction, operation and maintenance and grants the private sector an opportunity to contribute to financing as well as operating this kind of projects in return for water delivery charges within an regulatory framework ensuring the implementation of the required criteria of efficiency, adhering to the technical specifications and financial conditions via precise legal frameworks binding all the partnership's parties, i.e. the private sector, stakeholders and the state represented in the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation.

Project Components:

The project comes as a component of the framework of the State's plan for horizontal expansion and irrigation improvement projects relevant to the West Delta region. The project includes three major components that are as follows:

The First Component

The first component aims to improve irrigation in Al-Nobariya area that suffers from a discharge shortage to meet the water requirements of present types of cultivation that became double the rates that had been determined when the canal was constructed. The area of this component covers nearly 500 thousand feddans.

The Second Component

The Project's second component targeted to reclaim and cultivate new 170 thousand feddans distributed along the sides of Wadi Al-Natroun-Al-Alamein (100 thousand feddans) and west of Al-Sadat Town (70 thousand feddans).

The Third Component

The third component is the water conservation and irrigation rehabilitation project in a 255 feddans area situated at the sides of Cairo-Alexandria desert road between kilo 50 and kilo 90. The project will be executed in the form of a public-private partnership (1).

1. Study objective:

The project aimed to increase the water productivity and efficiency. Therefore, the main objective of the current study is to evaluate both the financial and economic viability of installing irrigation water connections and facilities through RC pipelines.

2. Methodology of study:

The current study evaluates the whole project based on the financial and economical indicators. The financial indicators can be conducted through the following items:

- 1- Net Present Value (NPV),
- 2- Internal Rate of Return (IRR).
- 3- Pay Back Period (PBP).

The economic indicators can assessed based on the following indicators:

- 1. Present value of net benefits.
- 2. Economic Rate of Return (ERR).

However, regarding to the prsent project, there are three basic differences between financial analysis and economic analyses:

Prices:

In the financial analysis, the market prices are applied as reflected in the market, while in the economic analysis shadow prices should be applied.

Taxes are considered expenses to the investor,

Cost Source of **Expected Life Investment Costs** (LE '000) Finance (Years) **Cost of reclamation** cost of reclamation (70,000 feddan) 1,400,000 cost of reclamation (100,0000 feddan) 2,000,000 **Total Investment Cost of Reclamation** 3,400,000 **Phase 1 Construction Works LOT 1 Construction Works** Approach channel (AC) P.S. (4) 50 Earth Works Local 6,881 Local 50 Miscellaneous Works 737 Sub Total 7,618 Intake culverts P.S (4) 50 Local Earth Works 2,082 Local 50 2,797 Structural Works Local 50 Miscellaneous Works 325 Sub Total 5,204 **Pumping Station #4** 50 Local Earth Works 4,123 Local 50 Structural Works 5,503

Table 1: Total Investment Cost.

Indirect effects are included in economic analysis while they are not included in the financial analysis. Indirect effects are the benefits of the society from generating such a project, i.e. increase the productivity in other areas of West Delta etc.

3. Financial Analysis: It implies an evaluation of the underlying project from the investor's point of view, i.e. reflecting the commercial profitability.

3.1 Basis of the Financial Evaluation: The financial analysis is based on the following;

3.1.1 Investment cost:

The investment cost includes cost of land reclamation, construction works and institutional cost. The investment cost estimated on the basis of the technical data. Cost of land reclamation implies both reclamation and plantation costs and is estimated on the basis of prevailing norms at LE 20,000 per feddan on the basis of gross area (equivalent to LE 28,000 per feddan for the net area).

The following table illustrates the total investment cost, source of finance and expected life by item which is estimated on the basis of the technical data from the experts.

| Investment Costs | Cost | Source of | Expected Life | | |
|---|---|-----------|---------------|--|--|
| Miscellancous Works | (LE 1000) | Local | (Tears) | | |
| Flastra Machanical Works | 62 520 | Foreign | 15 | | |
| Sub Total | 03,330 | Törengin | 15 | | |
| Sub Iotal Main Channel PS (4) | /4,/// | | 1 | | |
| Farth Works | 17 157 | Local | 50 | | |
| | 3 454 | Local | 50 | | |
| Main Canal structures | 231 | Local | 50 | | |
| Missellaneous Works | 1 602 | Local | 50 | | |
| Sub Total | 1,092 | Local | 50 | | |
| Suphon Under El Deheny, & Deilwey DS (4) | 22,534 | | | | |
| Syphon Under El Denary & Kanway F.S. (4) | 1 722 | Local | 50 | | |
| Earth Works | 1,722 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miggelleneous Weste | 43,979 | Local | 50 | | |
| Sub Total | 022 | Local | 50 | | |
| Sub Iolai Feeding Chennel to El Deveh El Dehew, DS | 40,525 | | | | |
| Feeding Channel to El Kayan El Denary F.S. | (4) | Local | 50 | | |
| | 300 | Local | 50 | | |
| Linnig Miscallanaous Works | 231 | Local | 50 | | |
| Sub Total | 2.31 | Local | 50 | | |
| Now Additional Culvert at KM 38 | 2,090 | | | | |
| Structural Works | 4 502 | Local | 50 | | |
| Total I OT 1 Construction Works | 163 248 | Lotur | | | |
| I OT 2 Construction Works | 105,240 | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/1 | | | | | |
| Farth Works | 10.019 | Local | 50 | | |
| Structural Works | 13 048 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miscellaneous Works | 2.213 | Local | 50 | | |
| Electro-Mechanical Works | 65 110 | Foreign | 15 | | |
| Sub Total | 90.390 | | | | |
| RC Pipelines (KM 0-19) P.S. (3) | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | 1 | | |
| Earth Works | 156,996 | Local | 50 | | |
| Structural Works | 1.300.921 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miscellaneous Works | 43,140 | Local | 50 | | |
| Sub Total | 1.501.057 | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/2 | | | 1 | | |
| Earth Works | 10.019 | Local | 50 | | |
| Structural Works | 12.460 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miscellaneous Works | 2.213 | Local | 50 | | |
| Electro-Mechanical Works | 65,110 | Foreign | 15 | | |
| Sub Total | 89.802 | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/6 (for 70,000 feddans) | | | | | |
| Earth Works | 9,511 | Local | 50 | | |
| Structural Works | 6.345 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miscellaneous Works | 193,934 | Local | 50 | | |
| Electro-Mechanical Works | 51,666 | Foreign | 15 | | |
| Sub Total | 261,456 | - | | | |
| Total LOT 2 Construction Works | 1,942,705 | | | | |

| Investment Costs | Cost | Source of | Expected Life | | |
|---|---------------|-----------|---------------|--|--|
| Crond Total Phase 1 | (LE^{-000}) | Finance | (rears) | | |
| Granu Total Flase 1 Phase 2 Construction Works | 2,105,955 | | | | |
| LOT 3 Construction Works | | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/3 | | | <u>_</u> | | |
| Earth Works | 10.019 | Local | 50 | | |
| Structural Works | 12,259 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miscellaneous Works | 2.093 | Local | 50 | | |
| Electro-Mechanical Works | 55,266 | Foreign | 15 | | |
| Sub Total | 79.637 | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3 / 4 | , | | | | |
| Earth Works | 10.019 | Local | 50 | | |
| Structural Works | 12.259 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miscellaneous Works | 2.093 | Local | 50 | | |
| Electro-Mechanical Works | 55.266 | Foreign | 15 | | |
| Sub Total | 79,637 | | | | |
| RC Pipelines (KM 19-48) P.S. (3) | | | | | |
| Earth Works | 165,320 | Local | 50 | | |
| Structural Works | 1,486,313 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miscellaneous Works | 47,850 | Local | 50 | | |
| Sub Total | 1,699,483 | | | | |
| Total LOT 3 Construction Works | 1,858,757 | | | | |
| LOT 4 Construction Works | | | | | |
| Syphon of El Bustan Drain, Cairo-Alex. Roa | ud P.S. (3) | | - | | |
| Earth Works | 1,858 | Local | 50 | | |
| Structural Works | 34,330 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miscellaneous Works | 424 | Local | 50 | | |
| Sub Total | 36,612 | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/5 | · | | <u> </u> | | |
| Earth Works | 10,019 | Local | 50 | | |
| Structural Works | 12,259 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miscellaneous Works | 2,093 | Local | 50 | | |
| Electro-Mechanical Works | 55,266 | Foreign | 15 | | |
| Sub Total | 79,637 | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/7 (for 100,000 feddans) | | | | | |
| Earth Works | 1,723 | Local | 50 | | |
| Structural Works | 7,002 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miscellaneous Works | 82,041 | Local | 50 | | |
| Electro-Mechanical Works | 65,666 | Foreign | 15 | | |
| Sub Total | 156,432 | | | | |
| RC Pipelines (KM 48-77) P | S. (3) | | | | |
| Earth Works | 165,320 | Local | 50 | | |
| Structural Works | 1,486,313 | Local | 50 | | |
| Miscellaneous Works | 47,850 | Local | 50 | | |
| Sub Total | 1,699,483 | | | | |
| Total LOT 4 Construction Works | 1,972,164 | | | | |
| Grand Total Phase 2 | 3,830,920 | | <u> </u> | | |
| Total Construction Works | 5,936,873 | | | | |

| Investment Costs | Cost (LE '000) | Source of Finance | Expected Life (Years) |
|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Institutional Cost | 2,300 | | |
| Contingency (10%) | 933,916 | | |
| TOTAL COST | 10,273,090 | | |

Source: Technical data from the experts.

Only 33.3% of all related P.S. (4) investment cost items is allocated to the project, as per the technical experts. 10% contingency is allowed to take into account any changes in investment cost.

The project is expected to be implemented in a period of seven years (year -3 to year 4) during two phases. The disbursement done in based of the technical plan related to cost item as phase 1 of the project which covers the period year -3 to the year 1 and includes cost of land reclamation. Phase 1 of the project consists of the construction works, cost of rehabilitation and institutional cost; while phase 2 covers the period year 1 to year 4 and includes phase 2 of construction works. The table below indicates disbursement of investment cost by year:

| Table 2: | Disbursement | of Investment | Cost. |
|----------|--------------|---------------|-------|
|----------|--------------|---------------|-------|

| Year | Cost (LE '000) | Weight (%) |
|---------|----------------|------------|
| Year -3 | 1,004,561 | 10% |
| Year -2 | 1,525,092 | 15% |
| Year -1 | 2,890,913 | 28% |
| Year 1 | 1,003,803 | 10% |
| Year 2 | 1,454,237 | 14% |
| Year 3 | 1,734,915 | 17% |
| Year 4 | 659,568 | 6% |
| Total | 10,273,090 | 100% |

Source: Technical data from the experts.

3.1.2 Net Cash Flow: The annual net cash flow (revenue – operation cost) is based on constant prices over a period of ten years with foreign exchange rate of US\$ 1 = LE 5.4.

* The two major sources of income are identified as follows;

- Net returns to be resulted from cultivating two sets of land areas:

70,000 feddans

100,000 feddans

Total revenue, cost and net revenue are estimated on the basis of the agronomist data as follows:

| | ~ | - | | - | | | | | 0 - 0 | ~ ~ ~ | | / - - | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|---------|------------------|-------|---------|------|------------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|--------------|--------|------|
| Tohlo 39 | · (Lroce | Rovoniio | and Not | Rovonuo ii | 1 tha | typical | Voor | (('ultivation | of 70 | i mmi i | foddone) | | 4° 4 M | MI |
| Table 5 | 01033 | Kevenue | anu ret | Nevenue n | 1 the | typical | Itai | Cultivation | 01 / 0 | ,000. | icuualis) | | 2 00 | JU). |

| Сгор | Gross Revenue | Operation Cost | Net Revenue |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Winter crops | | | |
| Wheat (ardab) | 35,280 | 17,500 | 17,780 |
| Oat (ardab) | 6,250 | 3,800 | 2,450 |
| Bean (ardab) | 6,300 | 2,500 | 3,800 |
| Bersem (ton) | 28,000 | 14,000 | 14,000 |
| Sugar beans (ton) | 7,560 | 4,200 | 3,360 |
| Other crops | 4,900 | 2,500 | 2,400 |
| Total Winter Crops | 88,290 | 44,500 | 43,790 |
| Summer crops | | | |
| Maize (ardab) | 15,400 | 7,000 | 8,400 |
| Beans (ardab) | 35,000 | 16,800 | 18,200 |
| Seism (Kishla) | 2,835 | 2,100 | 735 |
| Sun flours (ton) | 3,150 | 2,100 | 1,050 |
| Maize (ardab) | 12,250 | 7,000 | 5,250 |
| Other crops | 14,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Total Summer Crops | 82,635 | 42,000 | 40,635 |

| Сгор | Gross Revenue | Operation Cost | Net Revenue |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|
| Winter vegetables | | | |
| Tomatoes (ton) | 252,000 | 84,000 | 168,000 |
| Peas (ton) | 8,400 | 3,500 | 4,900 |
| Beans (ton) | 15,750 | 6,300 | 9,450 |
| Squash (ton) | 11,760 | 6,300 | 5,460 |
| Egg plants (ton) | 10,080 | 5,250 | 4,830 |
| Other vegetables | 21,000 | 8,400 | 12,600 |
| Total Winter Vegetables | 318,990 | 113,750 | 205,240 |
| Summer Vegetables | | | |
| Tomatoes (ton) | 58,800 | 35,000 | 23,800 |
| Potatoes (ton) | 73,500 | 29,400 | 44,100 |
| Cucumbers(ton) | 31,500 | 14,700 | 16,800 |
| Water melons (ton) | 11,760 | 6,300 | 5,460 |
| Cantaloupe (ton) | 10,780 | 5,600 | 5,180 |
| Squash (ton) | 5,600 | 2,800 | 2,800 |
| Other vegetables | 21,000 | 11,200 | 9,800 |
| Total Summer Vegetables | 212,940 | 105,000 | 107,940 |
| Fruits | | | |
| Oranges (ton) | 61,600 | 28,000 | 33,600 |
| Grapes (ton) | 77,000 | 38,500 | 38,500 |
| Apples (ton) | 28,000 | 14,000 | 14,000 |
| Peaches (ton) | 54,600 | 14,000 | 40,600 |
| Bananas | 35,000 | 17,500 | 17,500 |
| Other fruits | 31,500 | 14,000 | 17,500 |
| Total Fruits | 287,700 | 126,000 | 161,700 |
| Total | 990555 | 431250 | 559305 |

Source: Results of the disciplinary (agronomist & economist) team.

Table 4: Gross Revenue and Net Revenue in the typical year (Cultivation of 100,000 feddans)(LE '000).

| Сгор | Crop Gross Revenue | | Net Revenue | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|---------|-------------|--|--|
| Winter crops | | | | | |
| Wheat (ardab) | 50,400 | 25,000 | 25,400 | | |
| Oat (ardab) | 9,000 | 5,400 | 3,600 | | |
| Bean (ardab) | 9,000 | 3,600 | 5,400 | | |
| Bersem (ton) | 40,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | | |
| Sugar beans (ton) | 10,800 | 6,000 | 4,800 | | |
| Other crops | 7,000 | 3,500 | 3,500 | | |
| Total Winter Crops | 126,200 | 63,500 | 62,700 | | |
| Summer crops | | | | | |
| Maize (ardab) | 22,000 | 10,000 | 12,000 | | |
| Beans (ardab) | 50,000 | 24,000 | 26,000 | | |
| Seism(Kishla) | 4,050 | 3,000 | 1,050 | | |
| Sun flours (ton) | 4,500 | 3,000 | 1,500 | | |
| Maize (ardab) | 17,500 | 10,000 | 7,500 | | |
| Other crops | 20,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | | |
| Total Summer Crops | 118,050 | 60,000 | 58,050 | | |
| Winter vegetables | | | | | |
| Tomotoes (ton) | 360,000 | 120,000 | 240,000 | | |

| Peas (ton) | 12,000 | 5,000 | 7,000 |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Beans (ton) | 22,500 | 9,000 | 13,500 |
| Squash (ton) | 16,800 | 9,000 | 7,800 |
| Egg plants (ton) | 14,400 | 7,500 | 6,900 |
| Other vegetables | 30,000 | 12,000 | 18,000 |
| Total Winter Vegetables | 455,700 | 162,500 | 293,200 |
| Summer Vegetables | | | |
| Tomatoes (ton) | 84,000 | 50,000 | 34,000 |
| Potatoes (ton) | 105,000 | 42,000 | 63,000 |
| Cucumbers(ton) | 45,000 | 21,000 | 24,000 |
| Water melons (ton) | 16,800 | 9,000 | 7,800 |
| Cantaloup (ton) | 15,400 | 8,000 | 7,400 |
| Squash (ton) | 8,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| Other vegetables | 30,000 | 16,000 | 14,000 |
| Total Summer Vegetables | 304,200 | 150,000 | 154,200 |
| Fruits | | | |
| Oranges (ton) | 88,000 | 40,000 | 48,000 |
| Grapes (ton) | 110,000 | 55,000 | 55,000 |
| Apples (ton) | 40,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Peaches (ton) | 78,000 | 20,000 | 58,000 |
| Bananas | 50,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Other fruits | 45,000 | 20,000 | 25,000 |
| Total Fruits | 411,000 | 180,000 | 231,000 |
| Total | 1415150 | 616000 | 799150 |

Source: Results of the disciplinary (agronomist & economist) team.

However, it is expected that reclaimed land will reach typical yield / productivity in year 4.

- * The operation, costs of the irrigation system installation are estimated on the basis of prevailing norms are including;
 - Maintenance cost;
 - Running expenses;
 - Institutional and administrative expenses;

* Land tax is based on 2% of net revenue of agricultural land.

The following financial cash flow statement summarizes the annual net cash flow of the whole project. A residual value is estimated at year 11 to reflect the value of the project for the upcoming years (i.e. infinite life of the project) and is then discounted at the opportunity cost of capital. It is estimated as follows.

((Net Cash Flow – Depreciation) / WACC) / (1+WACC)

Annual net cash flows are discounted at Private Opportunity Cost of Capital, i.e. WACC. WACC is estimated at 10%.on the following basis;

- Debt Equity Ratio is 1:1.
- Interest rate (ib) at which investor would borrow money is 13% per annum.
- Interest rate on long terms deposit (id) is 10% per annum.
- Business risk (r) 6;
- Risk premium (ß) is 1,5;
- Annual inflation rate (f) is 6%.

WACC at constant prices is therefore estimated as follows:

 $= [ib * D/I + [(id + (r * \beta) * E/I] - f]$

$$= [13\% * 0.5 + [(10\% + (6\% * 1.5) 0.5] - 6\%$$

= 6.5% + 9.5% - 6%

= 10%

3.2 Financial Evaluation:

The key financial indicators are net present value (NPV), internal rate of Return (IRR) and Pay back Period (PBP). These indicators are estimated in order to verify the financial viability of the underlying project as follows:

| Item | Value |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| NPV (LE'000) | - 1,240,013 |
| IRR | 8% |
| Pay Back Period (PBP) | More than 10 years |

Table 5: Financial Indicators

Financial cash flow statements:

It is very important to estimate the cash flow statements based on the results in phase one; i.e. total cash flow statements that reflect phases one and two as could be seen in table 6 bellow.

| | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
|--|---------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| years | Year -3 | Year -2 | Year -1 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 |
| Cash Inflow | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Revenue through cultivation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| reclaimed area (70,000 feddan) | | | | 247,639 | 495,278 | 742,916 | 990,555 | 990,555 | 990,555 | 990,555 | 990,555 | 990,555 | 990,555 |
| reclaimed area (100,000 feddan) | | | | 353,788 | 707,575 | 1,061,363 | 1,415,150 | 1,415,150 | 1,415,150 | 1,415,150 | 1,415,150 | 1,415,150 | 1,415,150 |
| Total Reclamation Revenues | 0 | 0 | 0 | 601,426 | 1,202,853 | 1,804,279 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 |
| Total Cash Inflow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 601,426 | 1,202,853 | 1,804,279 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 | 2,405,705 |
| Cash Outflow | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Investment Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cost of land reclamation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| cost of land reclamation (70,000 feddan) | 350,000 | 420,000 | 630,000 | | | | | | | | | | |
| cost of land reclamation (100,0000 feddan) | 500,000 | 600,000 | 900,000 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Cost of land reclamation | 850,000 | 1,020,000 | 1,530,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PHASE 1 Construction Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LOT 1 Construction Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Channel (AC) P.S. (4) | | 7,250 | 369 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intake Culvert P.S. (4) | | 1,041 | 4,055 | 108 | | | | | | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 4 | | 3,935 | 49,341 | 21,501 | | | | | | | | | |
| Main Channel P.S. (4) | | 7,022 | 10,456 | 5,055 | | | | | | | | | |
| Syphon under El Behary & Railway P.S. (4) | | | 34,706 | 11,817 | | | | | | | | | |
| Feeding Channel to El Rayah El Behary P.S(4) | | | 1,782 | 308 | | | | | | | | | |
| New Additional Culvert at KM 38 | | 237 | 2,971 | 1,294 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total LOT 1 Construction Works | 0 | 19,485 | 103,680 | 40,083 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| LOT 2Construction Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/1 | 2,621 | 18,718 | 69,051 | | | | | | | | | | |
| RC Pipelines (KM 0-19) P.S. (3) | 60,042 | 300,211 | 600,423 | 540,381 | | | | | | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/2 | | 6,990 | 82,812 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/6 (for 70,000 feddans) | | 20,352 | 241,104 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total LOT 2Construction Works | 62,663 | 346,273 | 993,389 | 540,381 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Grand Total Phase 1 | 62,663 | 365,758 | 1,097,068 | 580,464 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Phase 2 Construction Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LOT 3 Construction Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/3 | | | | 5,275 | 73,921 | 441 | | | | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/4 | | | | | 5,275 | 73,921 | 441 | | | | | | |

Table (6): Financial cash flow Statement (LE '000).

| years | Year -3 | Year -2 | Year -1 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| RC Pipelines (KM 19-48) P.S. (3) | | | | 174,285 | 424,934 | 773,015 | 327,249 | | | | | | |
| Total LOT 3 Construction Works | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179,560 | 504,129 | 847,377 | 327,690 | 0 | | | | | |
| LOT 4 Construction Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Syphon of El-Bustan Drain, Cairo-Alex Road | | | | 929 | 20,955 | 14,728 | | | | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/5 | | | | 5,275 | 73,921 | 441 | | | | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3/7 (for 100,000 feddans) | | | | 10,362 | 145,204 | 867 | | | | | | | |
| RC Pipelines (KM 48-77) P.S. (3) | | | | 135,959 | 577,824 | 713,783 | 271,917 | | | | | | |
| Total LOT 4 Construction works | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152,524 | 817,904 | 729,818 | 271,917 | 0 | | | | | |
| Grand Total Phase 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 332,084 | 1,322,034 | 1,577,195 | 599,607 | 0 | | | | | |
| Institutional cost | 575 | 690 | 1,035 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contingency | 91,323 | 138,645 | 262,810 | 91,255 | 132,203 | 157,720 | 59,961 | | | | | | |
| Total Investment Cost | 1,004,561 | 1,525,092 | 2,890,913 | 1,003,803 | 1,454,237 | 1,734,915 | 659,568 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Operation Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) Land Cutivation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| cost of reclamation (70,000 feddan) | | | | 431,250 | 431,250 | 431,250 | 431,250 | 431,250 | 431,250 | 431,250 | 431,250 | 431,250 | 431,250 |
| cost of reclamation (100,000 feddan) | | | | 616,000 | 616,000 | 616,000 | 616,000 | 616,000 | 616,000 | 616,000 | 616,000 | 616,000 | 616,000 |
| Total Operation Cost of Reclamation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 |
| (b) Construction Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LOT 1 Construction Works | | | | 3,265 | 3,265 | 3,265 | 3,265 | 3,265 | 3,265 | 3,265 | 3,265 | 3,265 | 3,265 |
| LOT 2Construction Works | | | | 38,854 | 38,854 | 38,854 | 38,854 | 38,854 | 38,854 | 38,854 | 38,854 | 38,854 | 38,854 |
| LOT 3 Construction Works | | | | 37,175 | 37,175 | 37,175 | 37,175 | 37,175 | 37,175 | 37,175 | 37,175 | 37,175 | 37,175 |
| LOT 4 Construction Works | | | | 39,443 | 39,443 | 39,443 | 39,443 | 39,443 | 39,443 | 39,443 | 39,443 | 39,443 | 39,443 |
| (d) Institutional cost | | | | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 |
| (e) Land Tax | | | | 12,855 | 25,711 | 38,566 | 51,422 | 51,422 | 51,422 | 51,422 | 51,422 | 51,422 | 51,422 |
| Total Operation Cost | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,178,889 | 1,191,744 | 1,204,600 | 1,217,455 | 1,217,455 | 1,217,455 | 1,217,455 | 1,217,455 | 1,217,455 | 1,217,455 |
| Total Cash Outflow | 1,004,561 | 1,525,092 | 2,890,913 | 2,182,692 | 2,645,981 | 2,939,515 | 1,877,024 | 1,217,455 | 1,217,455 | 1,217,455 | 1,217,455 | 1,217,455 | 1,217,455 |
| Net Cash Flow (NCF) | -1,004,561 | -1,525,092 | -2,890,913 | -1,581,266 | -1,443,129 | -1,135,236 | 528,681 | 1,188,250 | 1,188,250 | 1,188,250 | 1,188,250 | 1,188,250 | 1,188,250 |
| Cumulative Net Cash Flow | -1,004,561 | -2,529,654 | -5,420,568 | -7,001,834 | -8,444,963 | -9,580,199 | -9,051,517 | -7,863,268 | -6,675,018 | -5,486,769 | -4,298,519 | -3,110,270 | -1,922,020 |

Source: Results of financial study analysis.

Table(7):Economic cash flow statements(LE '000).

| VEARS | Year -3 | Vear -2 | Vear -1 | Vear 1 | Vear 2 | Vear 3 | Vear 4 | Year 5 | Vear 6 | Vear 7 | Vear 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 |
|--|---------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Cash Inflow | icur o | Teur 2 | Actual 1 | | itti 2 | i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i | Tem T | itur e | Teur o | icui / | itur o | | itur 10 |
| Revenue through cultivation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| reclaimed area (70,000 feddan) | | | | 267,060 | 534,119 | 801,179 | 1,068,239 | 1,068,239 | 1,068,239 | 1,068,239 | 1,068,239 | 1,068,239 | 1,068,239 |
| reclaimed area (100,000 feddan) | | | | 381,533 | 763,067 | 1,144,600 | 1,526,134 | 1,526,134 | 1,526,134 | 1,526,134 | 1,526,134 | 1,526,134 | 1,526,134 |
| Total Reclamation Revenues | 0 | 0 | 0 | 648,593 | 1,297,186 | 1,945,779 | 2,594,372 | 2,594,372 | 2,594,372 | 2,594,372 | 2,594,372 | 2,594,372 | 2,594,372 |
| Additional productivity (institutional) | | | | 427,296 | 427,296 | 427,296 | 427,296 | 427,296 | 427,296 | 427,296 | 427,296 | 427,296 | 427,296 |
| Total Cash Inflow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,075,889 | 1,724,482 | 2,373,075 | 3,021,668 | 3,021,668 | 3,021,668 | 3,021,668 | 3,021,668 | 3,021,668 | 3,021,668 |
| Cash Outflow | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Investment Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cost of land reclamation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| cost of land reclamation (70,000 feddan) | 332,500 | 399,000 | 598,500 | | | | | | | | | | |
| cost of land reclamation (100,0000 feddan) | 475,000 | 570,000 | 855,000 | | | | | | | | | | |

| mm mm< | | Veen 2 | Vacan 2 | Veen 1 | Veer 1 | Veen 2 | Veen 2 | Voor 4 | Veen 5 | Veen 6 | Veen 7 | Voor 9 | Veer 0 | Veer 10 |
|---|--|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| and cond dots | years | 1ear - 3 | 1ear -2 | 1 452 500 | iear i | iear 2 | iear 5 | iear 4 | iear 5 | iear o | iear / | iear o | iear 9 | iear io |
| IDMODING ID < | Investment Cost of land reclamation | 807,500 | 969,000 | 1,455,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | U |
| Monome Mode < | PHASE I Construction works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approximation (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) | LOT I Construction Works | | | | | | | _ | | | | | _ | |
| Indicator (v)< | Approach Channel (AC) P.S. (4) | 0 | 6,887 | 350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Many bannet MainGGG <td>Intake Culvert P.S. (4)</td> <td>0</td> <td>989</td> <td>3,852</td> <td>103</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> | Intake Culvert P.S. (4) | 0 | 989 | 3,852 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Machand Max Sub (S)() | Pumping Station # 4 | 0 | 3,738 | 46,874 | 20,426 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spin spin spin spin spin spin spin spin s | Main Channel P.S. (4) | 0 | 6,671 | 9,934 | 4,803 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Inder ControlInder< | Syphon under El Behary & Railway P.S. (4) | 0 | 0 | 32,971 | 11,226 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nore Allowed Control ALM 200102102102102102000 <td>Feeding Channel to El Rayah El Behary P.S(4)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1,693</td> <td>293</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> | Feeding Channel to El Rayah El Behary P.S(4) | 0 | 0 | 1,693 | 293 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Def D Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thd< td=""><td>New Additional Culvert at KM 38</td><td>0</td><td>225</td><td>2,822</td><td>1,229</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></thd<></thdescription<> | New Additional Culvert at KM 38 | 0 | 225 | 2,822 | 1,229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Image <th< td=""><td>Total LOT 1 Construction Works</td><td>0</td><td>18,511</td><td>98,496</td><td>38,079</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></th<> | Total LOT 1 Construction Works | 0 | 18,511 | 98,496 | 38,079 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Demonspheric stateDescriptionDe | LOT 2Construction Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Interpretace< | Pumping Station # 3/1 | 2,490 | 17,782 | 65,598 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Image <th< td=""><td>RC Pipelines (KM 0-19) P.S. (3)</td><td>57,040</td><td>285,201</td><td>570,402</td><td>513,361</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></th<> | RC Pipelines (KM 0-19) P.S. (3) | 57,040 | 285,201 | 570,402 | 513,361 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Improgram 25607 (2006 body)00 <td>Pumping Station # 3/2</td> <td>0</td> <td>6,641</td> <td>78,671</td> <td>0</td> | Pumping Station # 3/2 | 0 | 6,641 | 78,671 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tanel CY Conversion Reak99.0099.0099.0099.0099.0099.0090.00 <td>Pumping Station # 3/6 (for 70,000 feddans)</td> <td>0</td> <td>19,335</td> <td>229,048</td> <td>0</td> | Pumping Station # 3/6 (for 70,000 feddans) | 0 | 19,335 | 229,048 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Granda for the set of the s | Total LOT 2Construction Works | 59,530 | 328,959 | 943,719 | 513,361 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Para 2 Conception WarkImage of the set o | Grand Total Phase 1 | 59,530 | 347,470 | 1,042,215 | 551,441 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LOT 2 connector WorksImage <t< td=""><td>Phase 2 Construction Works</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<> | Phase 2 Construction Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Perpengenener 3A O | LOT 3 Construction Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Penping Statist 340.00.00.00.010.020.0< | Pumping Station # 3/3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,011 | 70,225 | 419 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RCPpelmer(KM194b)PS, CM00 <t< td=""><td>Pumping Station # 3/4</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>5,011</td><td>70,225</td><td>419</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></t<> | Pumping Station # 3/4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,011 | 70,225 | 419 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Intel LOP 3 Construction Works00 | RC Pipelines (KM 19-48) P.S. (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165,571 | 403,687 | 734,364 | 310,887 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LDT 4 controction WorksIC | Total LOT 3 Construction Works | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170,582 | 478,923 | 805,008 | 311,306 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sybbo of El-Bastan Drain Cairo-Akes Road000 | LOT 4 Construction Works | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pumping Station # 3500000.010.0< | Syphon of El-Bustan Drain, Cairo-Alex Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 883 | 19,907 | 13,992 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pumping Station 4 37 (or 10,000 feddam)000< | Pumping Station # 3/5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,011 | 70,225 | 419 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RC Pipeline (KM 48.77) P.5. (3) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Tidal LOT 4 Construction works 0 0 0 144.88 777.00 603.327 258.327 0 <td>Pumping Station # 3/7 (for 100,000 feddans)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>9,844</td> <td>137,944</td> <td>823</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> | Pumping Station # 3/7 (for 100,000 feddans) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9,844 | 137,944 | 823 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total L07 4 Construction works00 | RC Pipelines (KM 48-77) P.S. (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129,161 | 548,933 | 678,093 | 258,321 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Todal Pase 2000315.40125.59321.498.3650.607000 <th< td=""><td>Total LOT 4 Construction works</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>144,898</td><td>777,009</td><td>693,327</td><td>258,321</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></th<> | Total LOT 4 Construction works | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144,898 | 777,009 | 693,327 | 258,321 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Institutional cost 546 983 I.I. I.I. <thi.i.< th=""> I.I. <thi.i.< th=""> <thi.i.< th=""> I.I.<td>Grand Total Phase 2</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>315,480</td><td>1,255,932</td><td>1,498,336</td><td>569,627</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></thi.i.<></thi.i.<></thi.i.<> | Grand Total Phase 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 315,480 | 1,255,932 | 1,498,336 | 569,627 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Contingency 86,78 131,713 249,670 86,692 125,593 149,834 56,663 I. I. <thi.< th=""> I. <thi.< th=""> <thi.< td="" th<=""><td>Institutional cost</td><td>546</td><td>656</td><td>983</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></thi.<></thi.<></thi.<> | Institutional cost | 546 | 656 | 983 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Investment Cost 954,334 1,448,838 2,746,368 953,613 1,381,525 1,648,169 626,590 0 < | Contingency | 86,758 | 131,713 | 249,670 | 86,692 | 125,593 | 149,834 | 56,963 | | | | | | |
| Operation Costs Image: Construction Cost of Reclamation Image: Construction C | Total Investment Cost | 954,334 | 1.448.838 | 2.746.368 | 953.613 | 1.381.525 | 1.648,169 | 626,590 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (a) Land Cultivation (a) Land Cultivation (b) Long Cost of reclamation (70,000 feddan) (c) Lang Cultivation (c) Lang Cu | Operation Costs | | , ,,,,,,,, | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) ms binner (b) ms binner (c) ms binner< | (a) Land Cultivation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Solid of reclamation (10000 reclamy) On the observed of the clamation (100,000 feddan) On the observed of the clamation (100,000 feddan) On the observed of the clamation (100,000 feddan) On the observed of the clamation On the observed of | cost of reclamation (70,000 feddan) | | | | 431 250 | 431 250 | 431 250 | 431 250 | 431 250 | 431 250 | 431 250 | 431 250 | 431 250 | 431 250 |
| Cox of Celumitation (100,000 Redum) O | cost of reclamation (100,000 feddan) | | | | 616.000 | 616.000 | 616.000 | 616.000 | 616.000 | 616.000 | 616.000 | 616.000 | 616.000 | 616,000 |
| Initial operation Cost of Relations 0 0 0 0 1,047,250 | Total Oneration Cost of Reclamation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.047.250 | 1.047.250 | 1.047.250 | 1.047.250 | 1.047.250 | 1.047.250 | 1 047 250 | 1.047.250 | 1.047.250 | 1.047.250 |
| LOT I Construction Works 3,102 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 3,021 | (b) Construction Works | | 0 | 0 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 | 1,047,250 |
| LOT Construction Works 3,102 3,1 | LOT 1 Construction Works | | | | 3 102 | 3 102 | 3 102 | 3 102 | 3 102 | 3 102 | 3 102 | 3 102 | 3 102 | 3 102 |
| LOT 2 Construction Works 30,911 | LOT 2Construction Works | | | | 26.011 | 26.011 | 26.011 | 26.011 | 26.011 | 26.011 | 26.011 | 26.011 | 26.011 | 36.011 |
| LOT J Construction Works 33,310 | LOT 2 Construction Works | | | L | 25 216 | 25 216 | 25 216 | 25 216 | 25 216 | 25 216 | 25 214 | 25 214 | 25 214 | 25 214 |
| LO1 + Construction WORK 3/,4/1 | LOT 5 Construction Works | | | | 27.47 | 33,310 | 33,310 | 33,310 | 33,310 | 33,310 | 22,310 | 27,510 | 27,451 | 27,510 |
| (u) Institutional COSt 44< | LO1 4 Construction Works | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | 3/,4/1 | 5/,4/1 | 3/,4/1 | 5/,4/1 | 5/,4/1 | 3/,4/1 | 3/,4/1 | 3/,4/1 | 5/,4/1 | 5/,4/1 |
| Total Operation Cost 0 0 0 1,160,094 </td <td>(d) Institutional cost</td> <td></td> <td><u> </u></td> <td></td> <td>44</td> | (d) Institutional cost | | <u> </u> | | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 |
| | Total Operation Cost | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,160,094 | 1,160,094 | 1,160,094 | 1,160,094 | 1,160,094 | 1,160,094 | 1,160,094 | 1,160,094 | 1,160,094 | 1,160,094 |

| years | Year -3 | Year -2 | Year -1 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 |
|--------------------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Cash Flow (NCF) | -954,334 | -1,448,838 | -2,746,368 | -1,037,819 | -817,138 | -435,189 | 1,234,984 | 1,861,574 | 1,861,574 | 1,861,574 | 1,861,574 | 1,861,574 | 1,861,574 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cumulative Net Cash Flow | -954,334 | -2,403,172 | -5,149,540 | -6,187,358 | -7,004,496 | -7,439,684 | -6,204,700 | -4,343,127 | -2,481,553 | -619,979 | 1,241,595 | 3,103,168 | 4,964,742 |

Source: Results of financial study analysis.

The afore-mentioned table clarified that the investment proposal is not financially viable due to;

- Net present value is negative;

- WACC (Private Opportunity Cost of Capital) is much greater than IRR;

- PBP is longer than ten years.

4. The Economic Analysis:

4.1 Basis for economic evaluation:

The economic analysis is concerned by the viability of the project from the society's point of view, i.e. national profitability. In this respect, three key issues are considered and adjusted to convert financial evaluation into economic evaluation:

- Distorted financial prices are corrected to reflect shadow prices. Two sets of prices are corrected;
- Prices of equipments and pumps are adjusted, i.e. excluding custom duties and sales tax, with accounting coefficient of 0.95;
- Prices of exportable agricultural goods are adjusted (shadow prices) on the basis of export prices (FOB price), at a coefficient of 1.09.

- Land tax is excluded, i.e. land tax is a money transaction and not an expense to the society.
- Indirect benefits are added, in that the value of increase in productivity is added to the benefits. They are estimated at LE 427,296 thousand, on the basis of average increase in yield per feddan by 5%, i.e. land density is 1.6.

Adjusted financial statement, i.e. economic cash flow statement is shown in table (7) below;

4.2 Economic Indicators:

Annual net benefits are therefore adjusted and estimated to be discounted at the social discount rate, i.e. 10% to be compared with the adjusted investment cost. Economic Rate of Return is estimated in order to test the economic viability of such a project.

Economic evaluation of the project reveals that it is viable with ERR exceeding Social Discount Rate where present value of net benefits is positive as follows;

Table 8: Economic Indicators

| Item | Value |
|---------------|-----------|
| NPV (LE '000) | 3,772,654 |
| ERR | 17% |

It is obviously that ERR exceeds IRR. This implies that the second alternative is rather economically viable; however, it is much less viable than the first alternative. However, its economic returns exceed its financial returns, in that the project has a positive economic impact, where its returns to the society exceed direct financial and returns to the investor.

5. Conclusion:

The project will need to inject capital till year 4, in that it will be financially sustainable beginning from year 5 of operation. In spite of the fact that the project is not financially viable where IRR (8%) < WACC (10%), it is sustainable in that it is capable of covering cost of operation and is also economically viable (17%). However, it is advised to adopt alternative one where ERR (25%) much exceeds ERR of alternative two (17%) and where IRR (16%) would attract capital investment.

Corresponding author:

Mahmoud A. Abd El Aziz National Research Centr, Cairo. Egypt

6: References:

- Baumol W,J " Economic theory and operations Analyses" 2nd Ed.prentice-Hall of India Priv.Ltd,NEW-Delhi,1970.
- 2- Draper N.R.& Smith H."Applied Regression Analysis" John Wiley & Sons Inc. New york 1966.
- Freund, j. E., Modern elementary statistics . 5th edition prentice-Hall of India, New Delhi, 1981.

201/18/9