

Independent Terminal Evaluation

Upgrading the Medicinal and Aromatic Plant Value Chain – Access to Export Markets (EMAP)

UNIDO project number: US/EGY/10/005



UNITED NATIONS
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

UNIDO INDEPENDENT EVALUATION DIVISION

Independent Terminal Evaluation

**Upgrading the Medicinal and Aromatic Plant
Value Chain – Access to Export Markets (EMAP)**

UNIDO project number: US/EGY/10/005



UNITED NATIONS
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

Vienna, 2016

Distr. GENERAL

ODG/EVQ/IEV/16/R.1

June 2016

Original: English

This evaluation was managed by the responsible UNIDO Project Manager with quality assurance by the Independent Evaluation Division

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Mention of company names and commercial products does not imply the endorsement of UNIDO.

The views and opinions of the team do not necessarily reflect the views of the Governments and of UNIDO.

This document has not been formally edited.

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	v
Glossary of evaluation-related terms.....	vi
1. Background, objectives and methodology	12
1.1 Project background and description	12
1.2 National context	14
1.3 Objectives and methodology of the evaluation	15
1.4 Limitations.....	17
2. Findings and assessment	18
2.1 Project preparation.....	18
2.2 Relevance	19
2.3 Effectiveness.....	20
2.4 Efficiency	24
2.5 Sustainability.....	26
3. Conclusions and overall rating	28
3.1 Conclusions	28
3.2 Overall rating at exit	29
4. Recommendations and lessons learned.....	30
4.1 Recommendations.....	30
4.2 Lessons learned	31
Annex A: List of reference documents.....	32
Annex B: Persons and organizations met.....	34
Annex C: Terms of reference	36

Acknowledgements

The Evaluators would like to express their gratitude to all persons met. Special thanks go to the entire project team and to Mr. Javier Guarnizo, Chief of UNIDO's Independent Evaluation Division, for the excellent support provided in preparing and conducting this evaluation.

The evaluation team hopes that the findings, conclusions and recommendations will contribute to the successful completion of the Project and to the continuous improvement of similar projects in other countries.

Abbreviations and acronyms

ATC	Agri-business Technology Center (a predecessor of the FAITC)
AEC	Agricultural Export Council
CBI	Centre for the Promotion of Imports from developing countries
EMAP	Upgrading the Medicinal and Aromatic Value Chain – Access to Export Markets (former Project executed by UNIDO)
ETRACE	Traceability of Agro-Industrial Products for the European Market
FAITC	Food and Agro-Industry Technology Center
FEC	Food Export Council
FTC	Food Technology Center (predecessor of the FAITC)
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GTI	Green Trade Initiative (funded by Italy, implemented by UNIDO)
HYAT	United Nations Human Security through Inclusive Socio-Economic Development in Upper Egypt Project
IMC	Industrial Modernization Center
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MTR	Mid-term Review
NQS	National Quality Scheme
SECO	Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs
SIPPO	Swiss Import Promotion Programme
SMEs	Small- and Medium-sized Enterprises
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WTO	World Trade Organization

Glossary of evaluation-related terms

Term	Definition
Baseline	The situation, prior to an intervention, against which progress can be assessed.
Effect	Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to an intervention.
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved.
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.
Impact	Positive and negative, intended and non-intended, directly and indirectly, long term effects produced by a development intervention.
Indicator	Quantitative or qualitative factors that provide a means to measure the changes caused by an intervention.
Lessons learned	Generalizations based on evaluation experiences that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations.
Logframe (logical framework approach)	Management tool used to facilitate the planning, implementation and evaluation of an intervention. It involves identifying strategic elements (activities, outputs, outcome, impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and assumptions that may affect success or failure. Based on RBM (results based management) principles.
Outcome	The likely or achieved (short-term and/or medium-term) effects of an intervention's outputs.
Outputs	The products, capital goods and services which result from an intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes.
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of an intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donor's policies.
Risks	Factors, normally outside the scope of an intervention, which may affect the achievement of an intervention's objectives.
Sustainability	The continuation of benefits from an intervention, after the development assistance has been completed.
Target groups	The specific individuals or organizations for whose benefit an intervention is undertaken.

Executive Summary

Background, purpose, methodology and limitations of this Terminal Evaluation

This Independent Terminal Evaluation (“the Evaluation”) commissioned by UNIDO covers the project “Upgrading the Medicinal and Aromatic Plant (MAP) Value Chain – Access to Export Markets” (“the Project”). A field mission to Cairo and four governorates in Upper Egypt was conducted between 24 April 2016 and 16 May 2016 by Mr. Daniel P. KELLER, senior international evaluation consultant and Team Leader, and Mr. Bassem ADLY as national evaluation consultant (“the Evaluators”). Contracted by UNIDO the Evaluators fulfil the criteria of independence and are free from conflicts of interest.

The Evaluation aimed at an assessment of whether the Project as a whole provided the right type of support to achieve its key objectives in the right way, with the main purpose of drawing lessons learned. Besides providing an evidence-based assessment of project performance based on the standard evaluation criteria, the Evaluators were requested to develop recommendations for UNIDO that may help for improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of similar interventions.

Methodology: The Evaluation was guided by the Terms of Reference (ToR) dated 17 December 2015 and covered the period between 1 January 2011 and 15 May 2016. In line with the principles outlined in UNIDO’s Evaluation Policy, project quality was assessed based on the four standard evaluation criteria relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and potential sustainability of results. While maintaining independence in compliance with evaluation standards, the Evaluators applied a participatory approach, taking the views of all stakeholders into account and seeking alignment on main conclusions and recommendations. The methodological mix included an in-depth document review (see list in [Annex 1](#)), semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, including a control group of enterprises that had not benefitted from the Project (see list in [Annex 2](#)), and personal observation.

Key limitation of the Evaluation was that neither the MAP Service Centers nor the National Quality Scheme for the MAP Sector (NQS) to be established under the Project were operational. It would therefore be premature to assess their potential wider benefits for the sector or their sustainability. As the Project did neither have gender objectives or activities, it was not possible to address the “gender-related” evaluative questions of the ToR.

Project description

UNIDO designed the Project as a follow-up on its earlier activities targeting the agro-industrial sector in Egypt, in particular the project “Traceability of Agro-Industrial Products for the European Market (ETRACE)”. The Project aimed at “upgrading” the Medical and Aromatic Plan (MAP) “value chain” in Egypt and at improving the position of MAP in export markets. The overall development objectives were increased exports of MAP products and improved social welfare through better income for the MAP value chain members. The expected outcomes were (1) an upgraded supply chain for the project beneficiaries in terms of linkages, productivity, quality and compliance to TBT/SPS requirements and (2) MAP products of project target exporters have an improved position in export markets. Within these two expected outcomes, operational MAP Service Centers providing support to enterprises along the supply chain and a functioning National Quality Scheme (NQS) for the MAP sector that is widely applied and

promoted were expected key longer-term project benefits. The Project Agreement was signed on 19 December 2010. The Project's originally planned duration was four years (January 2011 – December 2014). The Project's start coincided with the uprising on 25 January 2011. Project implementation has been affected by various periods of political instability, social turmoil and economic crisis.

The project budget managed by UNIDO amounted to USD 2,870,000 (including USD 330,177 or 13% UNIDO support cost) and was fully funded by the Government of Switzerland. Around 99% of it has been commissioned or disbursed. The Project received two no-cost extensions, the latest "administrative extension" from 1 January 2016 until 30 June 2016. Some activities commissioned under a subcontract to the Food and Agro-Technology Center have not yet started and are highly unlikely to be completed before the Project's closure.

Main findings and conclusions

1. The NQIP was generally well prepared

UNIDO conducted a thorough analysis of the MAP sector and operationalized the Project through a well-managed inception phase. At the time of the design in 2010, the combination of a value chain with a trade corridor approach was innovative. The Project covered the entire value chain and identified/attempted to address all key challenges within the chain comprehensively in cooperation with partners where needed. Neither did UNIDO limit the scope of the value chain analysis areas of its core expertise only nor was the value chain analysis used to justify the provision of services out of UNIDO's standard tool box.

2. UNIDO delivered the right services to the right beneficiaries in high quality

The Project provided the right type of services to the right beneficiaries, generally in high quality. But UNIDO did not take the right measures to ensure sustainability of results and impact. A strong local project team that combined managerial with technical expertise was a key success factor. Objectives within beneficiary enterprises were achieved efficiently and are likely to be maintained. Experts trained under the project seem to continue working for the MAP sector, but mostly for private companies in the MAP sector rather than as consultants.

3. The NQS and the MAP Service Centers as key outcomes are not operational. Part of the reason was the lack of a clear, structured approach.

A Steering Committee for the NQS has been established through a Ministerial Decree, which is an achievement. The MAP Service Centers physically exist and have some basic equipment, including a car. But neither the NQS nor the MAP Service Centers are functioning or likely to function in the near future without further donor support. One of the key reasons is the lack of a clear concept for institutionalizing and operationalizing them.

Emerging evidence from this evaluation indicates that UNIDO's "approach" to operate consulting services and quality schemes under a project framework is ineffective and does not lead to sustainable results.

Institutionalizing business development services and schemes requires structured support. The Project was however not divided into distinctive "project phases" with a clear sequencing and milestones that must be achieved as a basic condition before

moving to the next phase. Activities were mostly implemented in parallel (e.g. promoting the NQS before finalizing it).

Insufficient attention was paid to sustainability aspects. The “hand-over” agreement signed in December 2015 was rather late damage control than a systematic way to ensuring a continuation of benefits beyond the Project. It must have been clear that FAITC, a longtime UNIDO partner, would have insufficient capacities to continue operating the service centers.

4. Cooperation with SIPPO as an excellent example for a useful programmatic synergy

UNIDO’s cooperation with the Swiss Import Promotion Programme (SIPPO) is an excellent example of a *mutually beneficial synergy* among two projects. SIPPO received access to potential MAP exporters while the Project’s beneficiaries received access to SIPPO’s services. This type of cooperation could serve as a model for other countries in which both SIPPO and UNIDO are involved into “export promotion activities.”

5. Little coordination with other UNIDO projects

The evaluators found no direct synergies and little evidence of a systematic cooperation with other projects within UNIDO’s portfolio. These would in particular include the ongoing Green Trade Initiative (GTI) implemented with the same local counterpart organization (FAITC).

6. Standard project planning and monitoring tools leave room for improvement

Progress reports compare planned with achieved results, but not comprehensively. Some factual information in the implementation reports proved to be inaccurate or incomplete. Little analysis is provided on why results were not achieved. Financial reporting does not present expenditures to both results and budget lines as requested by SECO.

7. No activities on gender were planned or implemented.

It was not possible to answer the relating evaluative questions of the ToR.

8. Overall, project quality was moderately satisfactory.

The Project was timely and its objectives were of high relevance. It was in general carefully designed and well operationalized through an inception phase. UNIDO also performed well in terms of delivering planned outputs. Looking at the outcome level however, effectiveness, financial efficiency and potential sustainability of the two expected key outcomes (NQS/mark, MAP Service Centers) are likely to remain unsatisfactory without a further follow-up by UNIDO or other donors. Overall, project quality was moderately satisfactory.

Recommendations

A. Project-specific recommendations to UNIDO

1. Explore the possibility for follow-up support with an exclusive focus on: Provide tailored and demand-driven support in:
 - a. Operationalizing the National Quality Scheme

- b. Consolidating support to the MAP industry in enhancing production technology on demand
- c. Consolidating the training of local experts, with a specific focus on the National Quality Scheme. The training should be open to all Egyptian experts that fulfill clearly defined eligibility criteria.

The limited support needed does not justify an entire new project. An option would thus be to provide follow-up support under the Green-Trade Initiative funded by the Italian government.

2. Possible future support should be phased and linked to clear milestones that need to be achieved to trigger subsequent funding, such as:
 - a. The establishment of a structure to host the National Quality Scheme, agreed upon by the government and exporters.
 - b. Piloting the National Quality Scheme on a product in which Egypt has a high comparative advantage.
 - c. Evaluating and documenting the pilot scheme before upscaling or promoting it.

The achievement of these milestones should be checked through regular monitoring.

3. Assess the implementation of the subcontract by FAITC at the end of May 2016
 - a. Pay FAITC pro rata for the value of those services effectively provided versus those agreed upon in the terms of reference. Services not provided in quality and quantity specified in the ToR shall not be paid.
 - b. Agree with SECO on how to use surplus funds. An option might be to use them for Egypt's benefit would be to cover the costs of preparing a possible new project in the country (if any).
 - c. Otherwise return the funds to SECO.

B. Non-project-specific recommendations to the Government of Egypt

Establish an institutional and legal framework for the technology centers (including the FAITC) that enables them to effectively and efficiently provide services to their target clients.

C. Non-project-specific recommendations to UNIDO

4. Based on recent evaluations, identify good practices in:
 - a. Establishing "quality schemes" and "quality marks" and similar tools
 - b. Building and maintaining local expertise (in particular business development services)
 - c. "Strengthening" value chains (which of models used within UNIDO is most appropriate).

Document good practices and establish guidance on how to appropriately apply these tools in a consistent manner.

5. Agreeing upon, budgeting and reporting of counterpart contributions

- a. Counterpart contributions should be budgeted and reported in detail
- b. Where inputs of counterparts are required to achieve results, they should be agreed upon in a legally binding way (not merely through a “letter of intent” or similar). Releasing donor funding should in this case be conditional to the fulfillment of counterpart obligations.

Lessons learned

- Project aiming at increasing local value added within value chains need to encompass an entire, specific value chain (one product in one location). All major challenges that prevent the unleashing of value within the chain need to be addressed comprehensively, regardless of whether this can be done by UNIDO’s internal expertise.
- Projects, in which the achievement of final results depends on intermediate results, need to be divided into phases. Within these phases, a clear sequencing of services is needed. Subsequent support shall be made conditional to the achievement of prior intermediate results. Counterpart inputs required to achieve results should be defined as pre-condition for donor-funding, budgeted in detail and included into financial reports.
- Strengthening business development services requires a specific strategy. Where a local consulting market exists, “establishing” and running service centers under a project does not seem to be an efficient approach.

Table 1: Key strengths and weaknesses of the Project

Key strengths	Key weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovative value chain approach in trade capacity building that addresses weaknesses within the chain comprehensively. • Integration of trade promotion (“connect elements”) of trade capacity building in cooperation with external partners. • Apart from some trial-and-error, practical application of value chain approach, addressing all weaknesses within the chain comprehensively. • Highly qualified internal expert team combines extensive technical expertise with management skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clear, feasible concept and strategy to institutionalize MAP Service Centers and the National Quality Scheme. Sustainability strategy only developed on SECO’s request at the time the Project ended. • Occasional management problems by UNIDO led to implementation delays. • Lack of strategic leadership of the Steering Committee (insufficient facilitation by UNIDO). • Financial and operational reporting is insufficient to ensure a well-informed decision making process.

1. Background, objectives and methodology

This Independent Terminal Evaluation (“the Evaluation”) was commissioned by UNIDO. It covers the project “Upgrading the Medicinal and Aromatic Value Chain – Access to Export Markets (EMAP)”, subsequently referred to as “the Project”.

1.1 Project background and description

The Project aimed at “upgrading” the Medical and Aromatic Plan (MAP) “value chain” in Egypt and of improving the position of MAP in export markets.

It followed upon earlier UNIDO support targeting the agro-industrial sector in Egypt, in particular the project “Traceability of Agro-Industrial Products for the European Market (ETRACE)”. ETRACE worked on enhancing international competitiveness, exports, product quality and safety of the Egyptian agro-industry in general¹. The Project benefitted from continuing using part of an existing project infrastructure, in particular UNIDO’s former “ETRACE Center”² and some of its experts. As ETRACE, the Project was from the beginning attached to the network of technology centers under the Ministry of Trade, Industry and SMEs. The main purpose of Egypt’s technology centers is to “manage” international cooperation projects and to absorb donor aid relating to trade, industry and SME development. Some of the centers also provide some limited, not donor-funded services (agricultural extension service, testing, distillation, packaging etc.). Under this network, the Food and Agroindustry Technology Center (FAITC) was UNIDO’s direct partner.

Agriculture and agro-industry had been one of the focal areas of extensive donor-funded support to Egypt over the last more than 20 years. The Project was thus implemented in a context of extensive prior and parallel support to the agricultural and agro-industry sector in Egypt. Examples include: USAID, the MDG Achievement Fund, the still ongoing Green Trade Initiative (GTI)³, the United Nations Human Security through Inclusive Socio-Economic Development in Upper Egypt Project⁴ (HAYAT) among many other initiatives.

At the time of its preparation in 2011, the Project was among the first UNIDO interventions applying a “comprehensive” value chain approach in trade capacity building⁵.

Moreover, UNIDO used to focus on “conformity” and “competitiveness” issues in trade capacity building. Integrating trade promotion (“connect elements”) of trade capacity building in its projects in cooperation with external partners was new to UNIDO.

¹ ETRACE did only marginally address “trade linkages”.

² The “ETRACE Center” was established under the ATC (Agri-business Technology Center), the predecessor of FAITC. FAITC is the result of a merger between the former Food Technology Center (FTC) and the former ATC. The network of technology centers, which also include the “Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production Center” funded by SECO. The “ETRACE Center”, which was essentially a UNIDO Project Office, is no longer operational.

³ The GTI on the strategic development of the Egyptian agro-industry to increase exports from Egypt to European markets via Italy. It claims to use the same value chain approach as EMAP. Its focus is on eight horticultural products (tomato, artichoke, grape, lettuce, pepper, strawberry, green bean and pomegranate). Funded by the Italian Development cooperation within the framework of the Italian-Egyptian Debt for Development Swap Programme, the GTI is implemented by UNIDO in partnership with the FAITC under the Egyptian Ministry of Industry, Trade and SMEs. Source: interviews and www.gti-eg.org (retrieved on 24 May 2016).

⁴ Co-funded by Switzerland, see www.hayat-eg.org (retrieved on 24 May 2016)

⁵ See also: DECD, Leveraging the Impact of Business Environment Reform: The Contribution of Quality Infrastructure, Lessons from Practice, Working Paper, by Martin Kellermann and Daniel Paul Keller, June 2014

The Project's overall impact objective was "increased exports of MAP products and improved social welfare through better income for the MAP value chain members."

Intended project outcome 1) was an enhanced productivity, quality and compliance to TBT/SPS requirements within MAP value chains. UNIDO's strategic approach was, firstly, to establish, strengthen and subsequently institutionalize "MAP Service Centers" that would subsequently continue providing support to the MAP sector beyond the Project's lifespan. Secondly, an Egyptian MAP Quality Mark (National Quality Certification Scheme) was to be designed and "operationalized". UNIDO provided extensive capacity building and hands-on support among growers, processors/traders and exporters. UNIDO's support aimed addressing key challenges of the sector, including cultivation practices, poor drying techniques, poor traceability, limited access to global buyers, low level of value addition and individualistic business practice. UNIDO also designed the National Quality Certification Scheme and procured three cars for the MAP Service Centers and FAITC.

The Project's expected outcome 2) relating to trade promotion and market linkages was an improved position of MAP products in export markets. UNIDO's approach was the "establishment" of export consortia, of a "market access programme" and of getting the MAP Quality Mark internationally recognized. The Project cooperated closely with the Swiss Import Promotion Programme (SIPPO). UNIDO's main input was capacity building in market promotion and support to exporters to participate in trade fairs.

The Project Agreement was signed on 19 December 2010. The originally planned project duration was four years (January 2011 – December 2014). The Project's start coincided with the uprising on 25 January 2011. During a four-month inception phase (15 March – 15 July 2011), UNIDO conducted an in-depth sector analysis and a needs assessment. The findings of the comprehensive project inception report resulted in major adjustments of project objectives and its approach, which were endorsed by the Steering Committee. At this time, the logical framework was revised with assistance of a monitoring and evaluation expert.

Project implementation was affected by various periods of political instability, social turmoil and economic crisis. This and difficulties to release payments during the introduction of UNIDO's new management information system in 2013 contributed to implementation delays. Also in early 2013, the Project experienced the departure of most of its field-based project team, including its National Project Coordinator.

The results of an external Mid-Term Review (MTR)⁶ commissioned by UNIDO led to significant adjustments, in particular a decisive shift from agriculture to agro-processing and export. UNIDO deliberately decided to leave the Project's logical framework unchanged in order to avoid lengthy discussions and approval processes.

As the implementation of activities were delayed, the Project obtained two no-cost extensions: A first extension by one year until December 2015 and an additional "administrative" extension of six months until 30 June 2016 limited to conducting the evaluation and to finalizing a subcontract with the Food and Agro-Industry Technology Center (FAITC).

The project budget under UNIDO's management amounted to USD 2,870,000 (including USD 330,177 or 13% UNIDO support cost). It was fully funded by the Government of Switzerland⁷. Expected counterpart contributions, mainly equipment to be funded through the Industrial Modernization Center (IMC) and some in-kind contributions, amounted to USD 1.13 million. Up to 30 April 2016, approximately 99% of the budget had reportedly been committed or spent⁸.

⁶Mid Term Review of EMAP Project by Umm e Zia, Evaluation Consultant, 6 February 2014

⁷ Represented by the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO).

⁸ It should be noted that at the time of the evaluation, none of the comprehensive activities to be implemented under a subcontract by FAITC had started. It seems unlikely that they will be completed by 30 June 2016. Some of the budget allocated to FAITC might need to be de-committed (for details, please see [Chapter 2.3](#) below)

Counterpart contributions are not specifically accounted for in financial reports, but it became clear that a significant part of them had not been made available.

The Project was governed by a Steering Committee comprising most of the key stakeholders, which however was not always able to meet as planned. This was mainly due to security issues preventing international travel of SECO and UNIDO. A Technical Committee provided advice at the more operational level, e.g. on tailoring assistance to the needs of beneficiaries and the selection of experts.

1.2 National context

This chapter briefly describes the national socio-economic context of the Project.

(a) Political and economic context

Egypt is a middle-income country and an important economic hub at the cross-roads of Africa, Asia and Europe with regional political and economic importance. The country joined the WTO in 1995. The uprising in early 2011 was followed by years of political turmoil, severe economic downturn and increasing security problems. Despite some improvements and the launch of some economic reforms, the country continues to face severe challenges. Macro-economic indicators for 2015 show some sign of improvements, but remain clearly below their pre-2011 levels. The estimated annual growth rate is expected to have doubled to around 4.2% in 2015 compared with the annual average growth between 2011 and 2014.⁹

Nevertheless, economic recovery has remained fragile. Egypt continues to suffer from “structural” macro-economic challenges, such as a high inflation rate (estimate 2015: 10.4%), a budget deficit, high public debt (estimate for 2015: 91.7% of GDP) and unemployment (estimate for 2015: 12.8%). More recently, the country also faced a decline in its foreign currency reserves. Egypt’s trade balance has been negative for a long time and reached a deficit of 37.03 billion USD in 2015 (slightly improved from 44.31 billion in 2014).¹⁰ Trade is focused towards Europe with the EU as the most important trading partner. Commercial exchange with African countries has remained low. The government now seeks to diversify export markets to its African neighbors, particularly towards South Africa and Nigeria. Sign of this development is a recent tripartite agreement between the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) of which Egypt has been a member, the East African Community (EAC) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC). External competitiveness remains a serious challenge for Egypt, ranking only 116th out of 138 countries in the World Economic Forum 2015 – 2016 Global Competitiveness Index.¹¹ Egypt’s key challenge to increasing its international competitiveness is enhancing product quality, creating more value addition in production and a diversification of trading partners.¹²

(b) Egypt’s MAP Sector in particular¹³

Egypt has been growing MAPs since ancient times. MAPs are considered as high value export crops. Around 85% of Egypt’s production is exported. The cultivation area for MAP is estimated to represent around 1% of the agricultural area and is concentrated in four Governorates of Upper Egypt: Minya, Fayum, Beni Suef and Asyut accounting together for 80% of the production

⁹ Source: CIA World Fact Book, retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/eg.html> on 24 May 2016

¹⁰ Source: idem

¹¹ Source: <http://reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness-report-2015-2016/the-global-competitiveness-index-2015-2016/>, retrieved on 24 May 2016

¹² Summarized from interviews

¹³ Summarized by the evaluators from: Inception Report, Upgrading the Medicinal & Aromatic Plants Value Chain -

Access to Export Markets, 30 June 2011, in particular Annex 2: “Value chain mapping report”.

area. While the production costs per acre similar to other crops, the average revenue per unit area is estimated by 1.5 times the average. MAP is considered as a labor intensive sector, engaging about twice as much labor per unit area than other crops. The MAP sector employs around 140,000 workers, which represents around 0.6% of the Egyptian labor force (estimate: 28.87 million in 2015, of which around 29.2% worked in the agricultural sector)¹⁴.

The main local “stakeholders” and within the value chain are the **growers, pre-processors/local traders and final processors/exporters, which were also the Project’s** key target beneficiaries.

Growers: The majority of the MAPs are cultivated by small growers. Land ownership is highly fragmented, and the average farm size is less than one acre. Many of the growers are organized in farmers’ associations, or are informally linked to them. Farmers supply to pre-processors/local traders. Small farmers implement poor agricultural and field drying practices resulting in relatively poor quality. Very few large scale growers are virtually integrated from growing to export. Most of them are able to implement good agricultural, collection, handling and manufacturing practices. Nevertheless, they source a substantial amount of dried herbs and spices from other small farmers and traders to meet the export market demand.

Pre-processors/local traders: collect the production from different small growers. They conduct drying, basic cleaning and screening, separate the products according to quality and sell them to processors/exporters. In some cases, they receive the produce already dried from the growers. As for essential oils the preprocessors/local traders receive fresh produce and perform oil extraction operations in small units. Many pre-processing facilities are located within cultivation areas and are characterized by poor manufacturing and hygiene conditions.

The two main final product categories, dried herbs/spices and essential oils, are mainly exported in bulk.

1.3 Objectives and methodology of the evaluation

The Evaluation was guided by the Terms of Reference (ToR) dated 8 February 2016, enclosed in Annex 3, UNIDO’s Evaluation Policy¹⁵ and the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards.¹⁶

The field work was carried out in Cairo and four Governorates in upper Egypt between 24 April 2016 and 16 May 2016 by two independent evaluators (“the Evaluators”)¹⁷ who were appointed by UNIDO following a transparent selection process. The Evaluators fulfill the requirements of impartiality and independence¹⁸.

The Evaluators operationalized the ToR through an inception report dated 23 April 2016, which was approved by UNIDO’s Office for Independent Evaluation as the evaluation manager. The project team provided logistical support prior and during the Evaluation.

Main evaluation purpose was an assessment of whether the Project as a whole provided the right type of support to achieve its key objectives in the right way, with the main purpose of drawing lessons learned. Besides providing an evidence-based assessment of project performance based on the standard evaluation criteria, the Evaluators were requested to

¹⁴ Source: CIA World Fact Book, retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/eg.html> on 24 May 2016.

¹⁵ Available from www.unido.org (last updated on 19 March 2015)

¹⁶ United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Norms for Evaluations in the UN System, 29 April 2005

¹⁷ Daniel P. Keller, Director, EvalCo Sarl/GmbH, Evillard/Leubringen, Switzerland, Team Leader, and Mr. Bassem ADLY, National Evaluator.

¹⁸ This principle is underlined in paragraphs 48 of the UNIDO Evaluation Policy: “For independent evaluations, the members of an evaluation team must not have been directly responsible for the policy-setting, design or overall management of the subject of evaluation (nor expect to be so in the near future)”.

develop recommendations for UNIDO that may help for improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities.

The ToR include a comprehensive list of detailed, specific evaluative questions. Accordingly, the evaluators were essentially requested to assess whether:

- (a) The Project provided the appropriate type of support in the right way,
- (b) Planned outputs were delivered in the required quality (or otherwise, why not)
- (c) Direct deliverables (outputs) led to the expected outcomes and wider changes (if not, what were the reasons), and
- (d) The benefits generated by the Project are likely to be maintained beyond its end.

Beyond the above question, the evaluators were specifically requested to look into:

- (a) The extent to which UNIDO's policies on "gender aspects" have been mainstreamed and carried out in the Project and
- (b) The need for potential follow-up support and how it could be provided.

The Evaluation covered the period from 1 January 2011 to 16 May 2016 and the Project's preparation work. Subsequent developments were not taken into account.

Despite some weaknesses in applying standard project planning tools (including not clearly separating different result levels), the Project's intervention logic and causal chain is reasonably clear. A "reconstitution" of the Project's intervention theory was not needed.

The evaluation process balanced the need for organizational learning with the purpose of ensuring UNIDO's accountability towards the Government of Switzerland as a donor and the local counterparts. While maintaining independence and complying with UNIDO's evaluation policy, the Evaluators used a highly participatory approach, seeking the views of all stakeholder groups. Enrolling them closely in the evaluation process and seeking alignment on key findings, conclusions and recommendations aimed at facilitating organizational learning. The evaluation process itself was conducted in a way to contribute to continuous improvement.

Different evaluation tools were combined to ensure an evidence-based qualitative and quantitative assessment. Particular emphasis was given to cross-validation of data and an assessment of plausibility of results obtained. The methodological mix included extensive desk study of relevant documents provided by UNIDO (see [Annex 1](#)), semi-structured interviews, focal group discussions and direct observation. In order to cross-check findings derived from interviewing beneficiary enterprises, a small **control group of enterprises that had not benefitted from the Project was consulted as well.**

Interviews were conducted in the form of open discussions following the guiding questions in the ToR, complemented by additional questions developed by the evaluators based on the desk review and the briefing with the project team on 5 April 2016. Applying an iterative approach to data collection, the Evaluators used intermediate findings to further expand their guiding questions. A list of organizations and persons met is included in [Annex 2](#).

The Evaluators' assessment of whether the Project provided the right type of support in the right way to achieve its objectives was based on the following **evaluation criteria**:

- **Relevance:** the extent to which the Project's objectives at all levels are and remained consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, national and global priorities and policies.
- **Efficiency:** the appropriateness of the approach used, the quality of program management, how economically resources/inputs (e.g. funds, expertise, time) are converted into results ("value for money"), an assessment of quality of service delivery, and possible synergies achieved with other donor-funded initiatives.

- **Effectiveness:** the extent to which objectives are achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. The Evaluation further explored possible unplanned/unexpected negative/positive outcomes; and
- **Sustainability:** an assessment of the likelihood that benefits generated will continue after the assistance/support has been completed.

Beyond these standard criteria, the evaluators were requested to assess the **quality of project design** against good practices in project preparation, including the proper application of standard project planning tools such as logical frameworks.

All stakeholders who were interviewed were ready to openly share relevant all information. Overall, evaluation findings were comprehensive, consistent and clear. Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations were discussed in details at physical de-briefings with Steering Committee members in Cairo on 16May 2016, with UNIDO in Vienna on 17 May 2016 and with the donor in Berne on 19 May 2016. Purpose of the de-briefings was a factual verification of key findings and an in-depth discussion of evaluation results.

This final version of the report takes all factual corrections and comments received from UNIDO into account.

1.4 Limitations

Firstly, two key outcomes (functioning quality scheme, MAP service centers) had not been achieved. It is thus not possible to assess possible benefits they would create and their potential sustainability. Secondly, some important UNIDO services (e.g. transfer of drying and distillation technology) had only recently been provided. Assessing their outcomes would be premature. Thirdly, UNIDO did not prepare consolidated financial report that links expenditures to budget lines and results. Moreover, counterpart contributions are not reported on. A detailed analysis of the Project's financial efficiency is thus not possible. Last but not least, the Project had no gender objectives, activities and reporting. The evaluators were unable to answer gender-related evaluation questions of the ToR. Despite these limitations, sufficient factual information for a well-founded assessment at mid-term was available.

Box 2: Value chain and trade corridor approach

The “value chain concept” looks at activities of an organization or an industry to get products to market. Value chain activities are operations that transport or transform elements of the final product. The primary value chain activities are sourcing, inbound logistics, operations (transforming inputs into finished products and services) and outbound logistics. Businesses and industries are successful when the total value added throughout the value chain is higher than (a) the cost of those activities and (b) the value added by competitors. These primary activities are either supported or constrained by policies and the legal and regulatory framework. Thus, a favorable macro-economic climate and regulatory framework is crucial to strengthen competitive advantage of the local industry. For many products sold in international markets, the profits are greater at the later stages of the chain, with the country that is the source of the raw materials gaining the lowest percentage of value. In order to boost economic development of exporting countries, value chains need to be reconfigured in a way that more value is realized at the early stages of the chain (within Egypt). This requires (a) effective and efficient organizations (b) working within a supportive infrastructure and (c) an enabling policy framework.

The “trade corridor approach” focuses on linking improvements within value chains and value streams with increased exports. Besides competitive products, promotion skills are important. Reliable market information is a crucial basis for successful and targeted promotion, both for the sector and individual companies.

Source: summarized from project document SMART Fish Indonesia, drafted by KEASER Steffen and KELLER Daniel Paul, 2010

2. Findings and assessment

2.1 Project preparation

This chapter assesses the quality of project preparation reflected in the original project document, including its identification and design.

In general, the Project was designed based on a detailed “background study” on the challenges of the MAP sector and the technical needs to address them. The initial project document was operationalized through an inception report with detailed recommendations on an updated logical framework. External experts were retained to develop the monitoring framework and to assess the market for MAP products. The Project’s core methodological approach was a “value chain” and “trade corridor” approach to trade capacity building within one specific sector (see [Box 2](#) above).

Time and budget: At the time of preparation (before the uprising), the project design (overall budget, planned duration) was realistic. Initially, UNIDO intended to mobilize a higher budget from the Swiss government. Since this was not possible, the budget for procuring some equipment was defined as a “counterpart” contribution, based on a “letter of intent” of the Industrial Modernization Center (IMC)¹⁹ annexed to the project document. This was not a legally binding commitment or even a condition precedent to Swiss funding. The reshuffling of the administration affected the IMC’s ability to continue to fund technical upgrading.

The value chain approach was properly applied at the design stage: The approach to cover the entire value chain and the attempt to address all key challenges within comprehensively was innovative for UNIDO’s trade capacity building activities. The same applies to the “trade corridor approach”. Unlike in some earlier other projects, UNIDO’s value chain analysis was not biased towards justifying the deployment of UNIDO’s standard service repertoire. The selection of services was thus demand- rather than supply driven. UNIDO did also not fall into the trap of conducting a value chain analysis under the limited scope of its core expertise only and to “overlook” other, maybe even more important challenges. In other words, UNIDO’s value chain analysis seem to have looked at opportunities to increase local value addition without a “pre-defined” agenda. Basic principles of the value chain methodology (including the trade corridor approach) are explained in [Box 2](#) above.

“One UNIDO Approach”: The Project capitalized on the expertise of two (former) UNIDO branches jointly delivering services under one project (Trade Capacity Building Branch and the Business, Innovation, Technology Service Branch). Contributions of the Swiss-funded “Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production Center” were envisaged, but not specified.

Unclear concept for institutionalizing the NQS and the MAP Service Centers: Neither the project document nor the inception report outline a clear approach on how to “institutionalize” and “operationalize” the National Quality Certification Scheme and the MAP Service Center. Both would require a step-by-step approach rather than a collection of activities implemented in discretionary order or in parallel. The Project was however not divided into distinctive “project phases” with a clear sequencing and milestones that must be achieved as a basic condition before moving to the next phase.

More generally, the concept of “MAP Service Centers” was not clearly defined: It seems that the concept of “MAP Service Centers” was primarily borne out of UNIDO’s desire to extend the “ETTRACE Center’s” lifespan rather than by carefully reflecting about a sustainable concept to strengthen business development services to the MAP industry. Emerging evidence from this and other recent evaluations showed mixed results of the Project’s approach to operate

¹⁹ Under the Ministry of Trade, Industry and SMEs

projects as service providers and then reflect about a so called “handover”. *In countries with no consulting market*, service provision through project implementation units staffed with UNIDO consultants might be the only option to provide companies with access to business development services. Egypt however is an *emerging country with an existing consulting market*. Strengthening and capitalizing on existing institutions would clearly be more appropriate. The “business plan” for the MAP Service Center was drafted based on the assumption that they would be able to technically operate as fee-based service providers against fees within Egypt’s Technology Center framework. This assumption was clearly unrealistic in a context where a large number of donors had been providing similar services free of charge! UNIDO must have known this based on prior long-term experience with support to other “technology centers” in the country and elsewhere. Moreover, the approach of “free” service provision by donor-funded projects is in general questionable, due to high risk of unfair competition and distortion of the fledgling consulting market. *There is a risk that operating projects as free service providers puts existing consultants out of business or that they become dependent on donor funding.*

Application of standard planning tools: Standard planning tools, including the logical framework, were applied. Objectives and intervention logic are reasonably clear. Different results levels (outputs for which the NQIP is directly responsible and their use or effects) are however mixed. Assumptions and risks (external conditions that need to be in place to translate outputs into effects/impact) are not clearly defined. *The establishment of institutions (MAP Service Centers, export consortia, “hubs”) by local organizations and/or the government is an effect of outputs (support such as capacity building, advice).* The private sector and not UNIDO is establishing an export consortium. The same applies for the National Quality Certification Scheme. The difference is important. UNIDO is directly responsible to deliver *outputs* in a way that they translate into the desired outcomes if the assumptions defined in the logical framework hold true. UNIDO is however *not directly* responsible if, for example, in spite of providing all relevant technical assistance, companies decide not to establish an export consortium. With assistance of an international Monitoring & Evaluation Expert, performance indicators were defined for each of the objectives. Most of them are appropriate (specific, measurable, ambitious, relevant and achievable within the project duration). Some room for improvement exists in selecting *relevant* indicators for each of the results.

In conclusion: The Project was carefully designed and well operationalized through an inception phase. Its logic and intervention theory are clear. Standard planning tools (logical framework) were applied, with some room of improvement in regards to clearly separating different result levels and defining clear assumptions. Despite its novelty for UNIDO in 2010, the value chain approach was adequately applied in preparing the Project. Not clearly defined were the strategy of “institutionalizing” the National Quality Certification Scheme” and the “MAP Service Centers” (including sequencing of the support needed). Overall, project preparation was *satisfactory*.

2.2 Relevance

The assessment of relevance looks at the extent to which project objectives were consistent with the requirements of key beneficiaries, international priorities, donor policies and UNIDO’s mandate.

A. Relevance to national priorities

Project objectives are fully aligned to the policies and priorities of the Egyptian government outlined in Chapter 1.2. They substantially contribute to the government’s key priority of shifting towards higher value added products and ensuring export diversification. The Project also fully responds to the government’s aim to enhance the competitiveness of locally manufactured products to better meet local consumption and export demands. Competitive enterprises tend to create more employment, pay higher salaries and more taxes. All of this potentially contributes to economic development, which the Egyptian government sees as a key

driver for poverty reduction. Moreover, the MAP sector is labor intensive and provides opportunities to generate higher incomes for the rural population (see [Chapter 1.2](#) above). It should be emphasized that agro-processing offers the highest potential for value addition within the value chains. This was rightly recognized in taking the strategic decision to shift more towards strengthening processing within the value chain. Even more potential for value addition could be unleashed by exporting branded rather than bulk MAP products.

B. Relevance for direct and indirect beneficiaries

The sample of company representatives (growers, traders/pre-processors and exporters) unanimously confirmed that support responded well to their needs. It should however be emphasized that addressing value chain related challenges are only *one of many factors* that contribute to competitiveness of companies. Other factors, such as the business environment (which is challenging in Egypt, see [Chapter 2.1](#) above) are equally important.

C. Relevance for the donor and UNIDO

The Project fully responds to the programmatic priorities of the Government of Switzerland, reflected in its country strategy for Egypt.²⁰ It is well aligned to its objective 1, which calls for promoting employment by strengthening trade and improving the business environment for SMEs. It should however be noted that MAP is, as explained in [Chapter 2.1](#) above, a niche sector with overall rather a marginal contribution to Egypt's overall socio-economic development. Relevance of the project for SECO was rather to pilot a value chain approach with potential for replication in other agricultural sectors both in Egypt and other countries rather than to make a significant contribution to Egypt's economic development. The Project obviously matches the operational mandate and core competencies, expertise and experience of UNIDO. Project objectives are fully aligned to UNIDO's core objective and mandate to promote sustainable industrial development.

In conclusion: The Project was fully aligned with national and international priorities, the needs of all beneficiaries, SECO's country strategy for Egypt and UNIDO's core mandate. Relevance was *satisfactory*.

2.3 Effectiveness

Effectiveness looks at the extent to which the development objectives of an intervention were or are expected to be achieved. This section assesses progress towards achieving planned outputs and outcomes.

The Project's overall impact objective were "increased exports of MAP products and improved social welfare through better income for the MAP value chain members."

A. Outcome 1: Upgraded supply chain for the project beneficiaries in terms of linkages, productivity, quality and compliance to TBT/SPS requirements

- (a) Output 1.1: Egyptian MAP Quality Mark (or "NQS") designed following international best practices
- The NQS was seen as a core pillar to assure quality and to promote Egyptian MAP products at export markets. Based on a broad consultation process involving stakeholders from the private and the public sector, UNIDO developed a concept for the NQS.²¹ The Project reported that there was a broad consensus on the NQS. Interviews with different stakeholders showed an agreement on the need of a NQS, but not on how it would be implemented.

²⁰ Swiss Economic Cooperation and Development, Egypt Country Strategy 2013-2016.

²¹ Only available in Arabic

- UNIDO developed a MAP standard in collaboration with the Egyptian Organization for Standardization and Quality (EOS) through a specialized technical committee. Following the usual standard formulation procedure, the MAP standard was officially approved and released.
- The Project conducted awareness raising sessions among different stakeholders in Upper Egypt and Cairo. A “MAP Standard Checklist” was developed and applied for technical assistance activities (see [output 1.2](#) below). The list is essentially based on commonly applied good agricultural, manufacturing and hygiene practices.
- A list of safe and approved pesticides (meeting the relevant US and European standards) was developed and submitted to the NQS Steering Committee to be approved as part of the NQS requirements. It became not clear to the Evaluators whether the list was already approved.
- An “E-learning Course” was reportedly prepared and is available online²² for those interested in more material covering quality issues. It is unclear whether the course was prepared under E-Trace and reported twice or under the Project. Also, no information on the use of this E-learning Course is available (who were the users, how has it been/will it be promoted, etc.).
- As an outcome of the Project, the Ministry of Trade, Industry and SMEs has enacted a Decree for forming a Steering Committee to implement the NQS²³. *It should be highlighted that the Decree is a significant achievement as such in the current Egyptian context.* The Decree leaves sufficient room to adapt the NQS to stakeholder needs. The Steering Committee for the NQS appears to have met regularly. The Project supported the NQS Steering Committee through a National Consultant.
- A roadmap to transferring the “ownership” of the NQS to “related public and private entities” was developed.²⁴ The Agricultural Export Council (AEC) agreed to financially and technically support implementation of the scheme during the coming years. A fund was established as a sustainable source of finance with initial inputs from the export councils. In addition, it was agreed that a percentage of the fees collected during the application process of the national export subsidy system is to be dedicated to the NQS fund. Other modalities of implementation were discussed as well. If implemented, this mechanism seems to be adequate.
- UNIDO facilitated the exchange of experience with quality schemes in other countries (in particular the MAP Quality Scheme for India) on various occasions.
- UNIDO also conducted a business and financial study on the concept of collection centers (or “hubs”). A letter of intent was signed with a company²⁵ to implement the hub concept under the Project’s supervision. The same company also benefitted from support to enhancing its pre-processing and drying facilities. Moreover, the Project introduced an international buyer to them and organized a field visit for their quality manager²⁶. Their suppliers (growers) received free technical assistance on implementing good agricultural practices and new MAP crops. According to industry representatives interviewed, the “hub” model has been used by many traders/pre-processors in Egypt for a long time. It is therefore not accurate to say that it has been introduced by UNIDO. New would be the concept of collective ownership and management of hubs, which was essentially UNIDO’s intention. “Collection centers” in other countries (e.g. for the dairy industry in Switzerland) are typically operated as cooperative or sometimes as an association (depending on the legal framework).

²² Published in UNIDO-E-Trace e-learning portal (<http://etrace-elearning.com/>).

²³ Decree Number 205 for the year 2013, issued by the (former) Ministry of Industry and Foreign Trade, unofficial English translation by the Project.

²⁴ Only available in Arabic, not on file

²⁵ See letter of intent with GOZOUR company, dated 8 June 2015.

²⁶ Worlée Natur Produkte GmbH (see <http://www.worlee.de/en/company/about-us/worlee-naturprodukte-gmbh>). Dr. Norbert Kolb, Quality Manager was invited to visit the facilities of GAZOUR in Minia. It remained unclear to the Evaluators how and why this company was selected.

- (b) Output 1.2: MAP Service Centers (SC) established to provide sustainable advisory services to supply chain members

The Project developed an operational concept for the future “MAP Service Centers.” According to the latest progress report (30 April 2016), the MAP Service Centers started offering services through consultants. This is not correct. *The evaluators found no evidence that the MAP Service Centers were conducting any activities. At the time of the evaluation mission, only the facilities of the MAP Service Centers and the cars procured under the Project existed. All services mentioned by the report were directly delivered through UNIDO-EMAP staff.* None of the (current and former) UNIDO consultants is working at the MAP service centers. Those consultants who already left UNIDO were either employed by other donor-funded projects (two persons) or by companies in the MAP sector. It became also not clear how these cars and other equipment provided by the Project will be used.

- (c) Outputs 1.3 – 1.5 “Upgrading” capacities of growers, traders/pre-processors and exporters

Mainly through national and some international experts, UNIDO provided free technical assistance to growers, traders-pre-processors and exporters. The project team clarified that the terms “cluster approach” to upgrade the “supply chain” (as opposed to “value chain”), see comments in [Chapter 2.3](#) below had no particular meaning.

The main content of UNIDO’s technical assistance included:

- The introduction of 18 new MAP varieties²⁷ and enhanced planting techniques for growers. E-learning courses were reportedly developed to support implementation of the identified ideas. The evaluators were unable to find the courses on the websites indicated by the Project.
- Enhancement of processing technology (new technology identified through study visits to Serbia, producers connected to suppliers). It should however be noted that no technology was actually “transferred”, as reported. Three firms reportedly purchased new machinery.
- The development of a new drying facility based on solar and conventional sources of energy. Funding was provided through a grant of EGP 150,000 (approximately CHF 16,000) offered by the World Bank, which replaced the expected contribution of IMC (Egyptian government).
- The implementation of food quality and safety standards: The establishment of a manual traceability system was developed at five exporting companies. According to interviews with one beneficiary company, the system traces (in documented forms) the entire supply chain (back to the farm) and seems to be accepted by international buyers.

Furthermore, the Project drafted production guidelines for MAPs (not checked by the evaluators) and provided trainings to experts (including academics and professors at one of the local university).

B. Outcome 2: MAP Project target exporters have an improved position in export markets

- (a) Output 2.1: Enterprises capacities strengthened in terms of product development and value addition

According to the project reports, a Web Portal was established, operated by the project team, and has now been integrated into two other similar portals to ensure sustainability²⁸. *The Evaluators tried unsuccessfully to access UNDP portal, which seems to have been shut down. It is not possible for*

²⁷ Dutch Fennel, Chamomile Bona and Lotia, Curly Parsley, Savory, Genovese Basil, Oregano, Stevia, Lovage, Black Carrot, German Marjoram, Chives, Chervil, Rosemary, Lemongrass, Coriander, Turkish Anise and Thyme.

²⁸ The Project added some of its material to <http://kenanaonline.com/users/Emap/posts/673198>, which seems to be an important resource of information on agro-business and SMEs. The portal appears to be run by a UNDP Project. The “MAP e-learning courses” seem to be integrated in the UNIDO-ETRAC e-learning portal (<http://etrace-elearning.com/>) - now apparently the “ATC E-learning system”. As neither the ETRACE Project nor the ATC are in existence, it is unclear who now maintains this ETRACE website.

the evaluators to distinguish between project contributions and other contributions to these two portals. The E-learning courses seem to be the same as reported under output 1.1.

Different options for new processed products and new varieties of MAPs were studied (frozen herbs, essential oils). Some limited technical assistance was provided to the extraction of essential oils (in cooperation with the Indian Flavor and Fragrance Development Center. *The assistance to the introduction of new varieties seems to be partially reported twice (under outcome 1 and 2).*

(b) Output 2.2: Export/origin consortium established²⁹

UNIDO introduced the model of export consortia (marketing and sales consortium) and provided start-up assistance. Reference was made to the Italian experience. Two export consortia were established: ROVANA and Al EHAB. One of the two consortia visited by the evaluators was actually an export company (founded by three entrepreneurs who own export businesses). New legislation on cooperatives might in the future facilitate the establishment of consortia within the Egyptian agro-processing industry (not only for export activities, but e.g. also for jointly operated processing hubs).

(c) Output 2.3: Quality mark/collective brand for MAP products recognized at export markets and effective market access programme in place

The Project facilitated different inbound and outbound trade missions and subsidized the participation in international tradeshows. This included the funding of a specialized trade fair in Cairo (“Herbs of Egypt”) in 2015. Furthermore, the Project supported the participation of two MAP exporting companies in a three months training course at the Foreign Trade Training Center (covering topics such as export logistics, export finance and export costing and pricing). Moreover, UNIDO organized various customized training material and courses on “how to export to international markets” (for participants with different levels). The AEC participated in the courses as well. *No steps towards the envisaged establishment or even promotion of a quality mark or collective mark for MAP products were taken (which would also clearly be an outcome).*

UNIDO initiated a very useful cooperation with the Swiss Import Promotion Programme (SIPPO), which was mutually beneficial. SIPPO received access to potential MAP exporters while the Project’s beneficiaries received access to SIPPO’s services. This type of cooperation could serve as a model for other countries in which both SIPPO and UNIDO are involved into “export promotion activities.” Envisaged linkages to the Centre for the Promotion of Imports from developing countries (CBI) were less successful.

In conclusion: EMAP provided the right capacity building, generally in good quality to all target groups (growers, traders, exporters). The Evaluators observed significant benefits at the level of different beneficiaries. With some exceptions, endorse the assessment provided by the Project’s detailed implementation report. Due to an initial strong bias towards the early stages of the supply chain, the Project provided rather limited input to processing that would have the highest potential for value addition. The Project provided significant input to the development of a NSQ, which is however far from being implemented. A Steering Committee for the NQS was established through ministerial decree. The Decree leaves sufficient room to adapt the NQS to stakeholder needs. The National Quality Scheme is not operationalized. Chances seem to be small that it will ever be implemented without further donor support. The “MAP Service Centers” equipped by the Project physically exist, but are not staffed and are not operating. None of the EMAP clients interviewed would use their service or pay for it. The FAITC, which was supposed to take over, has so far not delivered services to the MAP sector, even not those UNIDO commissioned in December 2015.

Effectiveness at the output level was *satisfactory*, while effectiveness at the outcome level was *unsatisfactory*. Overall, effectiveness was *moderately unsatisfactory*.

²⁹ As the EC was to be established by third parties as a result (effect) of UNIDO’s assistance.

2.4 Efficiency

This section looks at how economically inputs were converted into outputs.

A. Approach

The Project's approach has been assessed in [Chapter 2.1](#) above. Both interviews with the project team and the analysis of the work done confirmed that it was UNIDO's intention to apply a value chain approach. In practice however, the Project sometimes deviated from applying the planned value chain approach, e.g. by a bias towards enhancing the supply of herbs (growers) rather than to processing (where most of the value is added). During implementation, some confusion around the value chain approach and other UNIDO tools seems to have emerged. The latest progress report describes UNIDO's developmental approach as "(...) Adopting the "cluster approach" (unclear what this means) to guarantee comprehensive upgrading intervention for the entire supply chain" (...).³⁰ This mixes different concepts, which were not mentioned in the initial project concept. Supply chain is not equal to value chain and the cluster concept is not directly related to both.

Also, adapting the Project's strategy to the significantly changed context in the aftermath of the uprising in 2011 seems to have been challenging. This applies in particular to the approach of anchoring service provision ("MAP Service Centers") and the NQS within a sustainable institutional structure. Generally, the Project experienced significant efficiency losses through a trial-and-error approach, partially due to the specificity of a sector (MAP) that was new to UNIDO, but partially also to weak strategic/methodological leadership of UNIDO.

B. Analysis of financial implementation

Figure 3: Expenditures according to budget lines and outcomes in USD (cumulative per 30 April 2016)

<i>BL</i>	<i>Details</i>	<i>Spent in USD</i>	<i>% of Total</i>
11:00	International Experts	244,922.88	10
15:00	Local & International Travel	241,461.12	10
16:00	Staff Travel (UNIDO HQ)	57,061.11	2
17:00	National Experts	1,346,113.60	54
21:00	Contractual Services (subcontracts)	189,969.93	8
30:00	Training / Fellowship / Study Tours	165,598.71	7
43:00	Premises	1,185.23	0
45:00	Equipment	76,391.91	3
51:00	Other Direct Costs	147,393.89	6
Total (excluding support costs)		2,470,098.38	100

Source: as reported by UNIDO on 30 April 2016 (analysis checked by evaluators)

Due to the lack of detailed financial data (including on counterpart contributions), it is not possible to assess financial efficiency in detail.

An analysis of financial data provided by UNIDO in [Figure 3](#) above shows that as of 30 April 2016, USD 2,470,098.38, which is equivalent to 99% of the project budget of USD 2,495,574.94 had been committed or disbursed. This leaves a remaining budget of USD 25,476.56. All these figures exclude 13% UNIDO support cost.

³⁰ Progress report as per May 2016, page 16

Based on an assessment of the funds spent against the *output results* reported in [Chapter 2.3](#), *value for money of UNIDO's service provision* has so far been *satisfactory*.

Assessing disbursements against the rather limited outcomes that have been observed or are likely to be achieved/maintained, efficiency in financial terms would be *unsatisfactory*.

C. Management

After some initial difficulties, UNIDO recruited a technically highly qualified, motivated experienced field-based project team. After mixed experience with using a technical specialist with limited team leading experience as a project manager, the team as a whole had the right mix of technical and management expertise. Although the Project Manager in Vienna remained the only operational decision maker, the “de-facto” decentralization of project management, thus the delegation of most of the day-to-day management responsibilities to the project team contributed to the overall efficient service delivery. SECO rightly insisted on the appointment of a new local project manager after the departure of the initial team.

UNIDO also selected the right internal and external experts. *An analysis of budget lines shows that the Project used an exceptionally high percentage of national experts (52% of expenditures). International experts were systematically twinned with Egyptian experts.*

Management was generally flexible in identifying and responding to emerging needs.

Delays caused by both internal and external reasons also negatively affected efficiency. External delays were caused by frequent changes of interlocutors, in particular government officials. The security situation also negatively affected the implementation of activities. Key internal reason for delays were UNIDO's difficulties to release funding while installing a new management software. It took also almost one year and some pressure of the donor to find a definitive replacement of the original field-based manager.³¹

UNIDO's (and the Steering Committee's!) *strategic leadership* leaves room for improvement, which was partially due to frequent personnel changes among Egyptian stakeholders.

Monitoring and reporting: Progress was monitored using result indicators agreed upon at the end of the inception phase. Quality of services was however not systematically monitored and documented. Progress reports do also not identify major challenges that need to be addressed to achieve objectives, which would be one of the main purposes of monitoring. Reporting leans towards showcasing project achievements rather than to provide a comprehensive, critical analysis on progress towards results. As an example, the latest progress report does not mention the fact that “handover” of the “MAP Service Centers” to FAITC did obviously not work out as planned. It is also not explicitly mentioned that the NQS only exists on paper and had never been implemented. *“Public relations activities” need to be strictly separated from managerial reporting to project key stakeholders, in particular the donor and the beneficiary government. Otherwise, UNIDO risks to forfeit its credibility.*

An updated financial report as per 30 April 2016 based on UN-budget lines was available. The report does however not provide an analysis on type of costs per objective/cost center. Analyzing the amount and type of used to achieve a specific result would provide important input to the better planning of future interventions. This would provide UNIDO with the necessary information to compare different options to achieve a specific objective. SECO highlighted the need of a proper managerial accounting for its own information and reporting purposes. The Project started before UNIDO had the necessary software to automatically generate this type of reports.

³¹ UNIDO temporarily assigned a Programme Officer at the UNIDO Office as a field-based manager.

D. Quality of technical input

Capacity building provided by UNIDO was generally of high quality and generally met beneficiaries' needs. UNIDO selected the right experts and provided the appropriate trainings to the right beneficiaries in the right form. This is evidenced by participants' positive feed-back during interviews with the Evaluators, the generally good quality of expert reports studies and the sample of training material reviewed. As mentioned above, the Project did not systematically collect feed-back of participants on the quality of the services it provided.

E. Synergies with other donor interventions

The right synergies with SIPPO identified and practically implemented. Increased efficiency of both projects significantly. Both projects capitalized on each other's strengths. Significant economies of scale and scope. This was an excellent example of meaningful cooperation among two donor-funded projects.

Otherwise, the evaluators found no direct synergies and little evidence of a systematic cooperation with other projects within UNIDO's portfolio. These would in particular include the ongoing GTI implemented together with the same local partner organization (FAITC). As discussed in [Chapter 1.1](#) above, the GTI seems to offer essentially the same services than the Project through a very similar "integrated value chain approach", although for horticultural products rather than MAP. Furthermore, none of the envisaged synergies with the Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production Center (also funded by the Government of Switzerland and supported by UNIDO) seems to have realized.

In conclusion: With the exception of operational reporting, the NQIP is generally well managed. Services provided by UNIDO are of high quality. The NQIP's approach is appropriate. *Financial efficiency* of the Project was overall satisfactory when assessing achieved outputs against disbursement. Assessing achieved outcomes against funds spent, efficiency was unsatisfactory. Overall, project efficiency was *moderately satisfactory*.

2.5 Sustainability

This section looks at the likelihood of continued benefits beyond the Project's duration.

Extensive interviews combined with personal observation at companies from all three main target groups concluded that results at the level of indirect beneficiaries are likely to be sustainable. Exporters visited seem to continue applying improved processes and technologies introduced by the Project. They also stated that it would be possible for them to source consulting services locally where needed (e.g. support to preparing from renewal of ISO 22000 certificates). Cultivation of at least some of the new varieties recommended by Project Experts seem to continue. There is some need for consolidating the Project's support on the processing technology side, which started late and was not entirely completed. For the beneficiaries interviewed, the technical input and not financing is important.

The "hand-over agreement" signed between the government, UNIDO and SECO is a step in the right direction, but came late and was rather damage control than a strategic approach to ensuring sustainability. The handover to FAITC was a strong request of the Egyptian government, which strongly opposed to other solutions proposed by steering committee members. It is disappointing that despite a clear commitment to take over, FAITC did neither maintain any of the experts trained under the Project nor did FAITC continue providing any services, even though the Project provided funding and advise. This seems to be caused by administrative hurdles that prevent FAITC to provide services on a commercial basis. This jeopardizes the fulfillment of FAITC's mandate. If not addressed, similar problems might occur for the GTI-Project, which also implemented by FAITC.

Emerging evidence from this evaluation suggests that UNIDO's approach to establish and run consultancy operations under a project set-up and then attempting a handover to government agencies has not worked as planned. While the findings of a single evaluation do not allow to draw any broader conclusions on UNIDO's approach to strengthen business development service, further research would prevent UNIDO from replicating flawed approaches in other countries. While it seems to be highly unlikely that the "MAP Service Centers" and FAITC will continue to provide services, it should be positively noted that the "EMAP consultants" continue working in the field of MAP (mainly for private sector, two of them for donor-funded projects).

Despite the establishment of a Steering Committee and an agreement on some institutional arrangements for the NQS, significant concerns remain that the quality scheme will be implemented and maintained without further external support. The same concerns on UNIDO's strategic approach to "institutionalization" apply to the establishment of "Quality Schemes", "Quality Marks", awards etc. if they are entirely funded and run by UNIDO with the aim of a handover.

Conclusion: Key benefits generated by UNIDO services to direct beneficiaries (enterprises) are likely to be sustainable. It would be premature to assess their broader, longer term effects (e.g. on exports), as many of the services had been provided relatively recently. None of the expected two key outcomes (NQS and MAP Service Centers) have so far been achieved (see [Chapter 2.3](#) above). The potential sustainability of outcomes is unsatisfactory. Overall, sustainability of results is moderately unsatisfactory.

3. Conclusions and overall rating

3.1 Conclusions

(i) The Project was generally well prepared

UNIDO conducted a thorough analysis of the MAP sector and operationalized the Project through a well-managed inception phase. At the time of the design in 2010, the combination of a value chain with a trade corridor approach was innovative. The Project covered the entire value chain and identified/attempted to address all key challenges within the chain comprehensively in cooperation with partners where needed. Neither did UNIDO limit the scope of the value chain analysis areas of its core expertise only nor was the value chain analysis used to justify the provision of services out of UNIDO's standard tool box.

(ii) UNIDO delivered the right services to the right beneficiaries in high quality

The Project provided the right type of services to the right beneficiaries, generally in high quality. But UNIDO did not take the right measures to ensure sustainability of results and impact. A strong local project team that combined managerial with technical expertise was a key success factor. Objectives within beneficiary enterprises were achieved efficiently and are likely to be maintained. Experts trained under the project seem to continue working for the MAP sector, but mostly for private companies in the MAP sector rather than as consultants.

(iii) The NQS and the MAP Service Centers as key outcomes are not operational. Part of the reason was the lack of a clear, structured approach.

A Steering Committee for the NQS has been established through a Ministerial Decree, which is an achievement. The MAP Service Centers physically exist and have some basic equipment, including a car. But neither the NQS nor the MAP Service Centers are functioning or likely to function in the near future without further donor support. One of the key reasons is the lack of a clear concept for institutionalizing and operationalizing them.

Emerging evidence from this evaluation indicates that UNIDO's "approach" to operate consulting services and quality schemes under a project framework and then "handing them over" is ineffective and does not lead to sustainable results.

Institutionalizing business development services and schemes requires structured support. The Project was however not divided into distinctive "project phases" with a clear sequencing and milestones that must be achieved as a basic condition before moving to the next phase. Activities were mostly implemented in parallel (e.g. promoting the NQS before finalizing it).

Insufficient attention was paid to sustainability aspects. The "hand-over" agreement signed in December 2015 was rather late damage control than a systematic way to ensuring a continuation of benefits beyond the Project. It must have been clear that FAITC, a longtime UNIDO partner, would have insufficient capacities to continue operating the service centers.

(iv) Cooperation with SIPPO as an excellent example for a useful programmatic synergy

UNIDO's cooperation with the Swiss Import Promotion Programme (SIPPO) is an excellent example of a *mutually beneficial synergy* among two projects. SIPPO received access to potential MAP exporters while the Project's beneficiaries received access to SIPPO's services. This type of cooperation could serve as a model for other countries in which both SIPPO and UNIDO are involved into "export promotion activities."

(v) Little coordination with other UNIDO projects

The evaluators found no direct synergies and little evidence of a systematic cooperation with other projects within UNIDO's portfolio. These would in particular include the ongoing Green Trade Initiative (GTI) implemented with the same local counterpart organization (FAITC).

(vi) Standard project planning and monitoring tools leave room for improvement

Progress reports compare planned with achieved results, but not comprehensively. Some factual information in the implementation reports proved to be inaccurate or incomplete. Little analysis is provided on why results were not achieved. Financial reporting does not present expenditures to both results and budget lines as requested by SECO.

(vii) No activities on gender were planned or implemented.

It was not possible to answer the relating evaluative questions of the ToR.

(viii) Overall, project quality was moderately satisfactory.

The Project was timely and its objectives were of high relevance. It was in general carefully designed and well operationalized through an inception phase. UNIDO also performed well in terms of delivering planned outputs. Looking at the outcome level however, effectiveness, financial efficiency and potential sustainability of the two expected key outcomes (NQS/mark, MAP Service Centers) are likely to remain unsatisfactory without a further follow-up by UNIDO or other donors. Overall, project quality was moderately satisfactory.

3.2 Overall rating of the Project based on standard evaluation criteria at exit

Evaluation criteria	Rating by evaluators		
1. Relevance		Satisfactory	
2. Efficiency to date		Moderately satisfactory*	
3. Effectiveness to date		Moderately unsatisfactory**	
4. Prospects of sustainability		Moderately unsatisfactory*	
Overall conclusion		Moderately Satisfactory*	

Notes:

* Looking at the outcome level, effectiveness, financial efficiency and potential sustainability of the two expected key outcomes (NQS/mark, MAP Service Centers) are likely to remain *unsatisfactory* without a further follow-up by UNIDO or other donors.

** Considering the rating as satisfactory at output- and as unsatisfactory at outcome level.

Explanations:

- Satisfactory: The situation is considered as in line with requirements, but there is room for improvements. Recommendations are useful, but not vital for the operation.
- Unsatisfactory: There are issues which need to be addressed; otherwise the global performance of the operation may be negatively affected. Necessary improvements however do not require major revisions of the intervention strategy.

4. Recommendations and lessons learned

4.1 Recommendations

A. Project-specific recommendations to UNIDO

6. Explore the possibility for follow-up support with an exclusive focus on: Provide tailored and demand-driven support in:
 - a. Operationalizing the National Quality Scheme
 - b. Consolidating support to the MAP industry in enhancing production technology on demand
 - c. Consolidating the training of local experts, with a specific focus on the National Quality Scheme. The training should be open to all Egyptian experts that fulfill clearly defined eligibility criteria.

The limited support needed does not justify an entire new project. An option would thus be to provide follow-up support under the Green-Trade Initiative funded by the Italian government.

7. Possible future support should be phased and linked to clear milestones that need to be achieved to trigger subsequent funding, such as:
 - a. The establishment of a structure to host the National Quality Scheme, agreed upon by the government and exporters.
 - b. Piloting the National Quality Scheme on a product in which Egypt has a high comparative advantage.
 - c. Evaluating and documenting the pilot scheme before upscaling or promoting it.

The achievement of these milestones should be checked through regular monitoring.

8. Assess the implementation of the subcontract by FAITC at the end of May 2016
 - a. Pay FAITC pro rata for the value of those services effectively provided versus those agreed upon in the terms of reference. Services not provided in quality and quantity specified in the ToR shall not be paid.
 - b. Agree with SECO on how to use surplus funds. An option might be to use them for Egypt's benefit would be to cover the costs of preparing a possible new project in the country (if any).
 - c. Otherwise return the funds to SECO.

B. Non-project-specific recommendations to the Government of Egypt

Establish an institutional and legal framework for the technology centers (including the FAITC) that enables them to effectively and efficiently provide services to their target clients.

C. Non-project-specific recommendations to UNIDO

9. Based on recent evaluations, identify good practices in:

- a. Establishing “quality schemes” and “quality marks” and similar tools
- b. Building and maintaining local expertise (in particular business development services)
- c. “Strengthening” value chains (which of models used within UNIDO is most appropriate).

Document good practices and establish guidance on how to appropriately apply these tools in a consistent manner.

10. Agreeing upon, budgeting and reporting of counterpart contributions

- a. Counterpart contributions should be budgeted and reported in detail
- b. Where inputs of counterparts are required to achieve results, they should be agreed upon in a legally binding way (not merely through a “letter of intent” or similar). Releasing donor funding should in this case be conditional to the fulfillment of counterpart obligations.

4.2 Lessons learned

Lessons learned include:

- Project aiming at increasing local value added within value chains need to encompass an entire, specific value chain (one product in one location). All major challenges that prevent the unleashing of value within the chain need to be addressed comprehensively, regardless of whether this can be done by UNIDO’s internal expertise.
- Projects, in which the achievement of final results depend on intermediate results, need to be divided into phases. Within these phases, a clear sequencing of services is needed. Subsequent support shall be made conditional to the achievement of prior intermediate results. Counterpart inputs required to achieve results should be defined as pre-condition for donor-funding, budgeted in detail and included into financial reports.
- Strengthening business development services requires a specific strategy. Where a local consulting market exists, “establishing” and running service centers under a project does not seem to be an efficient approach.

Annex A: List of reference documents

1. Project documents

- 1.1 Project document “Upgrading the Medicinal & Aromatic Plants Value Chain - Access to Export Markets”, 30 June 2010 (US/EGY/10/005)
- 1.2 Project inception report dated 30 June 2011 with annexes:
 - 1.2.1 Kick off meeting documentation kit (presentation and minutes).
 - 1.2.2 Value chain mapping report
 - 1.2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (M&E).
 - 1.2.4 Market analysis report of Joseph Brinckmann
 - 1.2.5 Revised project logical framework
 - 1.2.6 Revised project budget
 - 1.2.7 Work Plan August 2011 – July 2012
 - 1.2.8 Sample implementation plans (2013 and 2014)
- 1.3 Evaluation Report: Mid Term Review of EMAP Project by Umm e Zia, Evaluation Consultant, 6 February 2014
- 1.4 Sample of Minutes of Meeting of the Steering Committee

2. Progress reports

- 2.1 Progress report as per 30 June 2015 (updated in August 2015)
- 2.2 Progress report as per 30 April 2016

3. Project outputs

- 3.1 The MAP standard
- 3.2 Ministerial Decree on establishing the Steering Committee for the NQS
- 3.3 The Operational Manual of the National Quality Scheme
 - 3.3.1 List of safe & approved pesticides (reviewed, not on file)
- 3.4 E-Learning Course material (reviewed, not on file)
 - 3.4.1 Post-harvest practices (reviewed, not on file)
 - 3.4.2 Production of mint (reviewed, not on file)
 - 3.4.3 Production of basil (reviewed, not on file)
 - 3.4.4 MAP production (reviewed, not on file)
 - 3.4.5 MAP processing technology (reviewed, not on file)
- 3.5 Other outputs
 - 3.5.1 “Mini Cluster Reports” AL REHAB and AMD VERDE
 - 3.5.2 Final report, based on the work of Josef Alan Brinckmann, Senior International Expert on Medicinal & Aromatic Plants (MAPs), Extracts and Essential Oils, 2014
 - 3.5.3 Final report, based on the work of Josef Alan Brinckmann, Senior International Expert on Medicinal & Aromatic Plants (MAPs), Extracts and Essential Oils, 2015
 - 3.5.4 Signed Memorandum of Understanding with GOZOUR Company (on the establishment of a Hub, 8 June 2015)

4. Documents related to subcontract with FAITC

- 4.1 Service contract between UNIDO and FAITC (dated 14 December 2015), without Terms of Reference
- 4.2 Action plan to implement service contract (dated 24 November 2015, updated proposed version by FAITC dated 15 May 2016)

5. Other documentation and material

- 5.1 UNIDO, Slides prepared for briefing meeting, May 2016
- 5.2 SECO, Egypt Country Strategy 2013-2016
- 5.3 Brochure Green Trade Initiative
- 5.4 Success Story Innovation, Proactivity, and Diligence: the birth of youth entrepreneurs in El-Edwa (HAYAT Project)
- 5.5 UNIDO promotional film on project (partially in Arab only)

Annex B: Persons and organizations met

DATE	NAME	FUNCTION
05 Apr	Mr. Javier Guarnizo	Chief, Independent Evaluation Division
	Mr. Ali Baderneh	Project Manager
	Ms. Shaimaa Amasha	Monitoring & Evaluation Officer
	Mr. Omar Abdin	Project Manager
	Mr. Gerardo Pataconi	Project Manager
	Mr. Gilles Galtieri	Function
20 Apr	Ahmed Fathy	Exporter
	Haytham Mohamed	Exporter/ pre-processor
	Mahmoud Khalifa	Exporter/ pre-processor
21 April	Remah Kamal	Exporter/ pre-processor
	Tarek Ibrahim	Draying, pre-processor
25 Apr	UNIDO Expert	Mr. Josef A. Brinckmann, Senior Expert on Marketing of MAP
25 Apr	SECO	Ms. Anne De Chambrier, Programme Manager
26 Apr	Ghaly	Draying, pre-processor
	Wahed Ahmed	Grower
	Sobhy Mahrous	Grower
28 Apr	UNIDO Expert	Professor Joachim Müller, Universität Hohenheim Institut für Agrartechnik, Stuttgart, Germany
03 May	Essam Youssef	University professor
	Omar Ahmed	University professor
07 May	Mohamed Mostafa	Trader
	Mohamed Rabbia'a	Exporter
	Ibrahim Makawe'e	Grower
	Atef Qorany	Broker
08 May	Omar Abdin Sabry El Shamy Eyad Ismail Shaimaa Amasha	PMU /EMAP Team
	Benjamin Frey	Deputy Director of Cooperation/ Swiss Development Cooperation
09 May	Dalia Kabeel Akram Fouad Saber Hindawy	National advisors Business Development Export Consortia MAPs Production and Pre-Processing
	Giovanna Ceglie & Alaa Fahmy	UNIDO Regional Office/ Representative and Director
10 May	Hussein Mansour	Head of Food Safety Authority & Head of Steering Committee of the National Quality Scheme

DATE	NAME	FUNCTION
11 May	Hany Hussein	Agriculture Export Council (AEC) Executive Director
	Ahmed Ghareeb Tarek Abou Bakr Hisham Zazooa Mostafa Hashim	Private Sector Representatives
12 May	Talall Morsy	Pre-processor / exporter
	Mohamed Mahmoud	Grower
15 May	Hanan El Hadary Arabi Fadl Siham Ahmed	Chairman of Industrial Council for Technology & Innovation Head of FAITC
	Manal Kareem Ahmed Samy	Food Export Council (FEC) Executive Director
16 May	Debriefing in the field	Names?
17 May	De-briefing with UNIDO	Mr. Ali Baderneh, Project Manager, Mr. Gilles Galtieri, Function Ms. Shaimaa Amasha, M&E Officer Name and function of Representative EVAL
19 May	De-briefing with SECO	Ms. Anne De Chambrier, Programme Manager Ms. Judika Peter, Programme Manager Mr. Ali Baderneh, Project Manager, Ms. Shaimaa Amasha, M&E Officer

Annex C: Terms of reference

Terminal Evaluation of UNIDO Project:

Upgrading the Medicinal and Aromatic Value Chain – Access to Export Markets - EMAP

UNIDO Project Number: US/EGY/10/005

June 2015

CONTENTS

I. EVALUATION BACKGROUND

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE

III. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

IV. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

V. EVALUATION TEAM

VI. EVALUATION SCHEDULE AND MAIN TASKS

VII. CONSULTATIONS AND LIAISON

VII. LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS

IX. DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING

ANNEX 1: TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR THE EVALUATION REPORT

ANNEX 2: TORS - JOB DESCRIPTIONS

ANNEX 3: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

ANNEX 4: CHECKLIST ON EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY

“Upgrading the Medicinal and Aromatic Value Chain – Access to Export Markets”

Project Country	: Egypt
Donor	: Swiss Secretariat of Economics Affairs (SECO)
Executing Agency	: The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
Counterparts/ Partners	: The Egyptian Ministry of Industry and Foreign Trade / Industry Council for Technology and Innovation, Agriculture and Agro-Industries Technology Centre (ATC)

I. EVALUATION BACKGROUND

Medicinal and Aromatic Plants Sector in Egypt

The Medicinal and Aromatic Plants (MAP) sector is one of the potential sectors in the Egyptian economy with regard to its exporting capabilities (85% of domestic production is directed to export markets), the comparative edge Egypt is enjoying (Egypt used to be ranked among the top 10 MAP exporters, FAO 2010) and the growing worldwide demand on MAP products for industrial and nutrition purposes. Despite this fact, the Egyptian MAP sector has been suffering a group of bottlenecks which are hindering its competitiveness advantage to show. These bottlenecks include: mixed / low yield seeds, propagation material, low selling prices, poor drying techniques, poor traceability, poor access to global buyers, low level of value addition and individualistic business practice.

Project description

In response to this and believing in the potentiality of Egyptian MAP products, EMAP project was designed with the aim of upgrading the MAP value chain and improving its position in export markets. In achieving this goal, EMAP provides an integrated approach that helps all supply chain members, such as producers, processors and traders, to comply with technical regulations, codes of good practices and conformity standards required by destination markets. In addition, EMAP focuses on the market front by supporting access of target groups to foreign markets and facilitating business interaction between national and international relevant bodies. In this context, EMAP is designed to ensure the achievement of the following two main outcomes and results:

Outcome 1:

Upgraded supply chain for the project beneficiaries in terms of linkages, productivity, quality and compliance to TBT/SPS requirements, through which:

- Egyptian MAP Quality Mark (National Quality Certification Scheme) will be designed following international best practices
- MAP service centres will be established to provide sustainable advisory services to supply chain members
- Compliance capacity of (10) final processors /exporters is to be enhanced in terms of productivity, quality, food safety, traceability and environment
- Capacity of major pre-processors/local traders (20 SMEs) is to be upgraded in terms of GACP/GMP/GHP, production and handling techniques (post-farm gate)
- Capabilities of growers in up to 35,000 acres (50% of MAP production area) is to be upgraded in terms of production, handling and food safety practices and responsiveness to demanded varieties (pre-farm gate)

Outcome 2:

MAP products of the target exporters have an improved position in export markets

- Enterprises capacities is to be strengthened in terms of product development and value addition
- Export/origin consortium is to be established

- Quality mark for MAP products is to be recognized at export markets and effective market access program is to be in place.

Budget Information

Project Total	USD 2,539,823
Support Cost (13%)	USD 330,177
Grand Total	USD 2,870,000
Counterpart Contribution (in kind)	USD 1,130,000

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the:

1. Project relevance with regard to priorities and policies of the Government of Egypt, and UNIDO;
2. Project effectiveness in terms of the outputs produced and outcomes achieved as compared to those planned;
3. Efficiency of implementation: quantity, quality, cost and timeliness of UNIDO and counterpart inputs and activities;
4. Prospects for development impact; and
5. Long-term sustainability of the support mechanisms results and benefits.

The evaluation should provide the necessary analytical basis and make recommendations to the Government of Egypt, the donor and UNIDO.

The evaluation should also draw lessons of wider applicability for replication of the experience gained in the project in other interventions.

Key question of the final evaluation is to what extent the project has achieved the expected results, i.e. to what extent has the project improved functionality of the supply chain in terms of linkages, productivity, quality and compliance with international standards as well as access to international markets in order to reflect on accessibility to new markets and hence fostered business to target groups..

III. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance to agreed evaluation standards and requirements. More specifically, it will fully respect the principles laid down in the “UN Norms and Standards for Evaluation” and Evaluation Policies of UNIDO.³²

The evaluation shall determine as systematically and objectively as possible the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, achievements (outputs, prospects for achieving expected outcomes and impact) and sustainability of the project. To this end, the evaluation will assess the achievements of the project against its key objectives, as set out in the project document and the inception report, including a review of the relevance of the objectives and of the design. It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of planned objectives.

While maintaining independence, the evaluation will be carried out based on a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all relevant and involved parties.

³² All documents are available on the website of UN Evaluation Group: <http://www.uneval.org/>

IV. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This terminal evaluation will address the following issues:

Project identification and formulation

- The extent to which a participatory project identification process was applied in selecting problem areas and counterparts requiring technical cooperation support;
- Relevance of the project to development priorities and needs;
- Clarity and realism of the project's development and immediate objectives, including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries and prospects for sustainability.
- Clarity and logical consistency between inputs, activities, outputs and progress towards achievement of objectives (quality, quantity and time-frame);
- Realism and clarity in the specification of prior obligations and prerequisites (assumptions and risks);
- Realism and clarity of external institutional relationships, and in the managerial and institutional framework for implementation and the work plan; and
- Likely cost-effectiveness of the project design.

Project ownership

- The extent to which the project was formulated with the participation of national counterpart and/or target beneficiaries;
- The extent to which counterparts have been appropriately involved and have been participating in the identification of their critical problem areas, in the development of technical cooperation strategies and in the implementation of the project approach;
- The extent to which counterpart contributions and other inputs have been received from the Government as compared to the project document work plan, and the extent to which the project's follow-up is integrated into Government budgets and work plans;
- The extent to which identified counterparts (government and private sector) have supported the project into carrying out the planned activities; and
- The extent to which ownership of project's results / contributions has been transferred to relevant national counterparts for future sustainability.

Project coordination and management

- The extent to which the national management and overall field coordination mechanisms of the project have been efficient and effective;
- The extent to which the UNIDO based management, coordination, quality control and input delivery mechanisms have been efficient and effective;
- The extent to which monitoring and self-evaluation have been carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and objectives and using that information for project steering and adaptive management;
- The extent to which changes in planning documents during implementation have been approved and documented;
- The extent to which the steering committee had provided the required support and anticipated follow up on the project's implementation and achievements; and
- The extent to which synergy benefits can be found in relation to other UNIDO and UN activities in the country.

Efficiency of Implementation

Efficiency and adequacy of project implementation including:

- Availability of funds as compared to the provisional budget (donor and national contribution);
- The quality and timeliness of inputs delivered by UNIDO (expertise, training, equipment, methodologies, etc.) and the Government as compared to the work plan(s);

- To what extent were the recommendations of mid-term evaluation (Feb 2013) of this project implemented;
- Managerial and work efficiency;
- Implementation challenges and difficulties;
- Adequacy of monitoring and reporting;
- The extent of national support and commitment and the quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by UNIDO and the Government.

Effectiveness and Project Results

- Full and systematic assessment of outputs produced to date (quantity and quality as compared with work plan and progress towards achieving the immediate objectives);
- Quality of outputs produced and how target beneficiaries use these outputs, with particular attention possibility of replication; and
- Outcomes, which have occurred or which are likely to happen through utilization of outputs.

Prospects to achieve expected outcomes, impact and sustainability

Prospects to achieve expected outcomes and impact and prospects for sustaining the project's results by beneficiaries and host institutions after termination of the project, and identification of developmental changes (economic, environmental, social) that are likely to occur as a result of the intervention, and how far they are sustainable.

Cost-effectiveness of the Project

Assess whether the project's approach represented the best use of given resources for achieving the planned objectives.

Recommendations for a possible next project phase, or replication elsewhere

Based on the above analysis the evaluator will draw specific conclusions and make proposals for any necessary further action by the Government of Egypt and/or UNIDO and/or the UN or other donors to ensure sustainable development in the medicinal plants sector or related activities, including any need for additional assistance and activities of the project prior to its completion.

The mission will draw attention to any lessons of general interest. Any proposal for further assistance should include precise specification of objectives and the major suggested outputs and inputs.

Specific evaluation questions for Outcome (1): Upgrading the value chain of MAP sector in Egypt

- Was the national quality scheme established and launched?
- Had the ownership of the national quality scheme been effectively transferred to national / sustainable stakeholders?
- Were the service centers established and fully functional?
- How would the role / function of service centers be sustained after project lifetime?
- To what extent had the role of national counterparts (government of Egypt, private sector, etc.) supported the implementation of the project's outputs?
- To what extent had the technical capacity of the field staff developed over the lifetime?
- To what extent had the capacity of targeted exporters, pre-processors / traders and growers/cultivated areas been upgraded under the project?
- To what extent had the newly introduced varieties supported better linkages and / or income generation over the supply chain?

Specific evaluation questions for Outcome (2): market access

- How many value addition initiatives were undertaken and to what extent were they utilized by beneficiaries;
- To what extent was the concept of export consortia accepted and effectively deployed in the sector;
- To what extent had the role of national counterparts (government of Egypt, private sector, etc.) supported the implementation of the project's outputs;
- To what extent had target groups benefited from the undertaken business development activities including tradeshows and matchmaking events;
- To what extent had collaboration with the international trade promotion bodies supported better doing business for target groups;
- How could the collaboration with the indentified international institutions be sustained in future; and
- How would the market access initiatives taken by the project be sustained after the project lifetime.

Procurement issues

The following evaluation questions that will feed in the Thematic Evaluation on Procurement have been developed and would be included as applicable in all projects (for reference, please see Annex 5 of the ToR: UNIDO Procurement Process):

- To what extent does the process provide adequate treatment to different types of procurement (e.g. by value, by category, by exception...)
- Was the procurement timely? How long does the procurement process take (e.g. by value, by category, by exception...)
- Did the procured product / item(s) arrive as planned or scheduled? If no, how long were the times gained or delays. If delay, what was the reason(s)?
- Were the procured product(s) acquired at a reasonable price?
- To what extent were the procured product(s) of the expected/needed quality and quantity?
- What were the main bottlenecks / issues in the procurement process?
- What good practices have been identified?
- To what extent roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the different procurement stages are established, adequate and clear?
- To what extent there is an adequate segregation of duties across the procurement process and between the different roles and stakeholders?

V. EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will include:

1. One Senior International Evaluation Consultant with extensive experience in conducting evaluations to design, supervise, guide the evaluation and formulate the evaluation report and related documents;
2. One National Evaluation Consultant with extensive experience in conducting evaluations to conduct field surveys and assessments, assist the Senior International Evaluation Consultant in field activities as well as preparation of the final report.

The evaluation team must have the necessary technical competence and experience to assess the quality of technical assistance provided to project counterparts/beneficiaries.

The Senior International Evaluation Consultant will be responsible for elaboration of an evaluation strategy, including the design of field surveys and elaboration of questionnaires; guiding the national evaluator for his/her field work; analysis of survey results; gathering of complementary information from project staff, collaborators and stakeholders through the relevant means; and preparing PowerPoint presentation of conclusions and recommendations as well as a final evaluation report.

The National Evaluation Consultant will be responsible for carrying out the field surveys (under the guidance of the Senior International Evaluation Consultant). The field surveys will provide foundation for the evaluation and must therefore be executed in line with the highest standards of professionalism and impartiality. She/He will also provide the required translation during field interviews.

All consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of the consultants are specified in their respective job descriptions, attached to this ToR as Annex 2.

The functions, competencies and skills as described in the respective Job Descriptions may be distributed among several persons in the evaluation team. Team members may be located in different countries but an effective coordination mechanism will have to be demonstrated. Evaluation team members must be independent and not have been involved in the formulation or, implementation of the project.

The UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation will be responsible for the quality control of the evaluation process and report. They will provide inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other evaluations, ensuring that the evaluation report is in compliance with established evaluation norms and standards and useful for organizational learning of all parties.

The project office in Cairo will logistically and administratively support the evaluation team to the extent possible. However, it should be understood that the evaluation team is responsible for its own arrangements for transport, lodging, security etc.

VI. EVALUATION SCHEDULE AND MAIN TASKS

The final evaluation is scheduled to take place in October 2015, including field visit to Cairo. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of preliminary findings by the international and / or national evaluation consultant to stakeholders involved in this project in Egypt.

After the field mission, the evaluation team leader will come to UNIDO HQ for debriefing and a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project.

The draft final evaluation report will be submitted one week after the end of the mission. After quality review of the draft evaluation report by UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and the Project Manager, the evaluation team should deliver the final evaluation report.

VII. CONSULTATIONS AND LIAISON

A proposed list of Government officials, private sector representatives and other relevant individuals will be provided by the Project Manager to the evaluation team.

The evaluation team will maintain close liaison with the representatives of UNIDO, other UN agencies as well as with the concerned national agencies and with national and international project staff. The evaluation team is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment. However, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Government, the donor or UNIDO.

VII. LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS

Local interviews and surveys can be conducted in Arabic or English in presence of national independent translator. Telephone interviews may be conducted in English (by the Senior International Evaluation Consultant). All data and interview reports must be translated into English. Performing a linguistic quality control of all interview reports is part of the scope of contract. The evaluation report must be delivered in English. An executive summary of the final evaluation report will be produced in Arabic.

IX. DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING

The main documents to be delivered by the evaluation team are:

1. Inception report
2. Draft evaluation report (English)
3. Final evaluation report (English)
4. PowerPoint presentation debriefing on the process, findings, and recommendations (English)

The reporting language will be English. The executive summary, recommendations and lessons learned shall be an important part of the presentations to be prepared for debriefing sessions in Cairo and Vienna.

Draft reports submitted to UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation are shared with the corresponding Project Managers and National Project Director for initial review and consultation. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. The evaluators will take the comments into consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

The evaluation will be subject to quality assessments by UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation. These apply evaluation quality assessment criteria and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback. The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality (see Annex 4).

Annex 1: Table of contents for the evaluation report

Template of in-depth evaluation reports

I. Executive summary

- Must be self-explanatory
- Not more than five pages focusing on the most important findings and recommendations
- Overview showing strengths and weaknesses of the project

II. Introduction

- Information on the evaluation: why, when, by whom, etc.
- Information sources and availability of information
- Methodological remarks and validity of the findings
- Project summary ("fact sheet", including project structure, objectives, donors, counterparts, timing, cost, etc)

III. Country and project context

This chapter provides evidence for the assessment under chapter IV (in particular relevance and sustainability):

- Brief description including history and previous cooperation
- Project specific framework conditions; situation of the country; major changes over project duration
- Positioning of the project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
- Counterpart organization(s); (changes in the) situation of the relevant institutions and counterparts in terms of mandate, scope of cooperation, etc.

IV. Project Planning

This chapter describes the planning process as far as relevant to the assessment under chapter IV:

- Project identification (stakeholder involvement, needs of target groups analysed, depth of analysis, etc.)
- Project formulation (stakeholder involvement, quality of project document, coherence of intervention logic, etc.)
- Description of the underlying intervention theory (causal chain: inputs-activities-outputs-outcomes)
- Funds mobilization

V. Project Implementation

This chapter describes what has been done and provides evidence for the assessment under chapter IV:

- Financial implementation (overview of expenditures, changes in approach reflected by budget revisions, etc.)
- Management (in particular monitoring, self-assessment, adaptation to changed circumstances, etc.)
- Outputs (inputs used and activities carried out to produce project outputs)
- Outcome, impact (what changes at the level of target groups could be observed, refer to outcome indicators in project document if any)
- Types of collaboration that took place with different counterparts and stakeholders

VI. Assessment

The assessment is based on the analysis carried out in chapter II, III and IV. It assesses the underlying intervention theory (causal chain: inputs-activities-outputs-outcomes). Did it prove to be plausible and realistic? Has it changed during implementation? This chapter includes the following aspects:

- Relevance (evolution of relevance over time: relevance to UNIDO, Government, counterparts, target groups)
- Ownership
- Efficiency (quality of management, quality of inputs, were outputs produced as planned?, were synergies with other initiatives sufficiently exploited? Did UNIDO draw on relevant in-house and external expertise? Was management results oriented? was the planning process flexible to accommodate country based changes?)
- Effectiveness and impact (assessment of outcomes and impact, reaching target groups)
- Sustainability
- If applicable: overview table showing performance by outcomes/outputs
- Procurement issues

VII. Issues with regard to a possible next phase

- Assessment, in the light of the evaluation, of proposals put forward for a possible next phase
- Recommendations on how to proceed under a possible next phase, overall focus, outputs, activities, budgets, etc.
- Recommendations on how to capitalize on the achieved result and possibility of replication for broader benefit / impact

VIII. Recommendations

- Recommendations must be based on evaluation findings
- The implementation of the recommendations must be verifiable (indicate means of verification)
- Recommendations must be actionable; addressed to a specific officer, group or entity who can act on it; have a proposed timeline for implementation
- Recommendations should be structured by addressees:
 - UNIDO
 - Government and/or Counterpart Organizations
 - Donor

IX. Lessons learned

- Lessons learned must be of wider applicability beyond the evaluated project but must be based on findings and conclusions of the evaluation

Annex 2: ToRs - Job Descriptions

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

Independent Evaluation of the UNIDO Projects

“Upgrading the Medicinal and Aromatic Value Chain – Access to Export Markets”

Project No: US/EGY/10/005

Title:	Senior International Evaluation Consultant
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	Cairo, Egypt and one mission to Vienna, Austria
Start of Contract (EOD):	1 October 2015
End of Contract (COB):	15 November 2015
Number of Working Days:	25

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes.

PROJECT CONTEXT

See evaluation terms of reference (attached).

The senior international evaluation consultant will act as a Team leader in this project evaluation according to the terms of reference. She/he will be responsible for the preparation of the evaluation report, including the coordination of inputs from other team members. This concerns in particular the overall assessment of evaluation issues in section IV of the TOR. The Team Leader will perform the following tasks:

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data...); determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments (questionnaires, surveys, logic models...) to collect these data	List of detailed evaluation questions to be clarified; questionnaires/ interview guide; logic models; list of key data to collect, draft list of stakeholders to	5 days	Home-based

through interviews and/or surveys during and prior to the field missions	interview during the field missions		
Briefing with the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation, project managers and other key stakeholders from UNIDO HQ Preparation of the Inception Report	Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant Inception Report	2 days	Home-based (telephone interviews)
Provide guidance to the national evaluator and supervise her/his field surveys' findings and outcomes Conduct interviews of project counterparts/beneficiaries, the UNIDO project personnel and of any other relevant institutions/individuals in accordance with the evaluation terms of reference: analyse the information received from interviews	Key evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the missions. Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks	6 days	Cairo and / or Upper Egypt
Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ (incl. travel)	Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed	3 days	Vienna, Austria, UNIDO HQs
Prepare the evaluation report and PowerPoint presentation according to TOR Coordinate the inputs from the National Consultant and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report	Draft evaluation report and PowerPoint presentation	6 days	Home-based
Revise the draft project evaluation reports based on comments from UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards	Final evaluation report and PowerPoint presentation	3 days	Home-based
Total		25 days	

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:

1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Team orientation
5. Client orientation
6. Organizational development and innovation

Managerial competencies (as applicable):

1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree preferably in agribusiness, developmental studies or related disciplines.

Technical and Functional Experience:

- A minimum of ten years practical experience in the field of development projects, including evaluation experience at the international level involving technical cooperation in developing countries.
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Proven experience in monitoring and evaluation.
- Proven experience in the value chain approach is a plus.

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English is required.

Absence of Conflict of Interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the Office for Independent Evaluation.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

Independent Evaluation of the UNIDO Projects

“Upgrading the Medicinal and Aromatic Value Chain – Access to Export Markets”

Project No: US/EGY/10/005

Title:	National Evaluation Consultant
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	Upper Egypt
Start of Contract (EOD):	1 October 2015
End of Contract (COB):	15 November 2015
Number of Working Days:	20

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes.

PROJECT CONTEXT

See evaluation terms of reference (attached).

The senior international evaluation consultant will act as a Team leader in this project evaluation according to the terms of reference. She/he will be responsible for the preparation of the evaluation report, including the coordination of inputs from other team members. This concerns in particular the overall assessment of evaluation issues in section IV of the TOR. The Team Leader will perform the following tasks:

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data...); in cooperation with Team Leader: determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments (questionnaires, logic models...) to collect these data through interviews and/or surveys during and	List of detailed evaluation questions to be clarified; questionnaires/ interview guide; logic models; list of key data to collect, draft list of stakeholders to interview during the	3 days	Home-based

prior to the field missions	field missions		
Briefing with the evaluation team leader, UNIDO project managers and other key stakeholders Assist in setting up the evaluation mission agenda, coordinating meetings and site visits Assist Team leader in preparation of the Inception Report	Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions Division of evaluation tasks with the international Consultant Inception Report	3 days	Home-based (telephone interviews)
Conduct field mission Assist the senior international consultant in conducting the overall evaluation, including: -Undertake field surveys as required by the evaluation and in accordance with pre-defined terms of reference -Collect information and data to be communicated to the senior international consultant -Support the senior international consultant in preparing a the inception and final evaluation reports; draft an executive summary in Arabic -Provide interpretation/ translation assistance as required by the evaluation	Presentations of evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission. Agreement with the International Consultant and Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks	7 days (including travel days)	Cairo and Upper Egypt
Prepare inputs to the evaluation report and PowerPoint presentation according to TOR and as agreed with Team Leader	Draft evaluation report and PowerPoint presentation	5 days	Home-based
Revise the draft project evaluation reports based on comments from UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards	Final evaluation report and PowerPoint presentation	2 days	Home-based
Total		20 days	

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:

1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust

4. Team orientation
5. Client orientation
6. Organizational development and innovation

Managerial competencies (as applicable):

1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgment and decision making
4. Conflict resolution

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree preferably in agribusiness, developmental studies or related disciplines.

Technical and Functional Experience:

- A minimum of five years practical experience in the field technical cooperation, monitoring and/or of evaluation of development projects,
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- experience in project management, monitoring and evaluation.
- experience in the value chain approach would be an asset
- experience in the medicinal and aromatic plants sector is a plus.

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English and Arabic is required.

Absence of Conflict of Interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the Office for Independent Evaluation.

Annex 3: Project Logical Framework

RBM Code (main):	Results Chain (Intervention Logic)	Indicators			Sources of Verification	Assumptions
Impact	Increased exports of MAP products and improved social welfare through better income for the MAP value chain members	– National average prices relative to international prices of individual crops exported	<u>Baseline</u> \$ TBD	<u>Targets</u> TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – National statistics (Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Industry, CAPMAS) – UN COMTRADE – Project data capturing system as per M&E manual (surveys, questionnaire, forms, checklists, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – National statistics are usually one year lagged (not updated) – Data at the national level lacks accuracy and credibility
		– Volume of export (tons)	TBD	TBD		
		– Net income of MAP products for the target growers	TBD	TBD		
Outcome (1)	1. Upgraded supply chain for the project beneficiaries in terms of linkages, productivity, quality and compliance to TBT/SPS requirements	– Number of rejections of MAP products in country at exporters gate	<u>Baseline</u> \$ TBD	<u>Targets</u> TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF) Portal/Food and Drug Administration (FDA) – Secondary data available for MAP rejections databases of export destinations – Project data capturing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Government is committed to support MAP project – The demand for MAP projects is still relevant and increasing
		– Number of rejections for MAP products at export gate	TBD	TBD		

			– Per unit productivity of MAP products for the project beneficiaries (3 levels) in the targeted governorates	TBD	TBD	system as per M&E manual (surveys, questionnaire, forms, checklists, etc.)	
			– New job opportunities created throughout the MAP value chain	TBD	TBD		
			– Number of sensitive practices promoted throughout the supply chain (training, recruitment, technical support, etc)	TBD	TBD		
			– Number of environmental friendly practices promoted throughout the supply chain	TBD	TBD		
Outputs (1)	1.1. Egyptian MAP Quality Mark (National Quality Certification Scheme) designed following international best practices	RBM: ****	– MAP Quality Mark exists and launched by the stakeholders	<u>Baseline</u> £ TBD	<u>Targets</u> TBD	– Project data capturing system as per M&E manual (surveys, questionnaires, forms, checklists, etc.)	
	1.2. MAP Service Centres established to provide sustainable advisory services to supply chain members		– Number of service centres established	<u>Baseline</u> £ TBD	<u>Targets</u> TBD	– Project data capturing system as per M&E manual (surveys, questionnaires, forms,	– MAP service centres are recognized and used by the clients.

			– Newly recruited staff and consultants in line with demand	TBD	TBD	checklists, etc.) – Service centres documentation system	
			– Rate of staff turnover	TBD	TBD		
			– Satisfaction level of the clients	TBD	TBD		
			– Number of relevant stakeholders recognizing the centres as a reference point and an information centre by relevant stakeholders (mainly the value chain member)	TBD	TBD		
			– Number of services offered by the service centre	TBD	TBD		
			– Number of services implemented by the service centre	TBD	TBD		
			– Number of new clients benefitting from the centre	TBD	TBD		
			– Level/degree of cost coverage based on business plan	TBD	TBD		

	<p>1.3. Compliance capacity of (10) final processors /exporters enhanced in: productivity, quality, food safety, traceability and environment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Number of production facilities that adapt and implement food safety and quality schemes (GFSI, National Certification Scheme, traceability etc.) 	<p><u>Baseline</u> £</p> <p>TBD</p>	<p><u>Targets</u></p> <p>TBD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Project data capturing system as per M&E manual (surveys, questionnaires, forms, checklists, etc.) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Number of production facilities adapted resource efficient and cleaner production practices 	<p>TBD</p>	<p>TBD</p>		
	<p>1.4. Capacity of major pre-processors /local traders (20 SMEs) upgraded in terms of GACP/GMP/GHP, production and handling techniques (post-farm gate)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Number of pre-processors/traders upgraded, supported and integrated in the Quality Mark 	<p><u>Baseline</u> £</p> <p>TBD</p>	<p><u>Targets</u></p> <p>TBD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Project data capturing system as per M&E manual (surveys, questionnaires, forms, checklists, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The capacities build to major pre processors and local traders are recognized and give an added value to the supply chain products
	<p>1.5. Capabilities of growers in up to 35,000 acres (50% of MAP production area) upgraded in terms of production, handling and food safety practices and responsiveness to demanded varieties (pre-farm gate)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Number of growers/area upgraded, supported and integrated in the Quality Mark 	<p><u>Baseline</u> £</p> <p>TBD</p>	<p><u>Targets</u></p> <p>TBD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Project data capturing system as per M&E manual (surveys, questionnaires, forms, checklists, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There is sufficient land/ha available for growers to produce more MAP products. – There is sufficient labour available for increase production
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cultivating new demanded varieties by the beneficiaries 	<p>TBD</p>	<p>TBD</p>		

Activities (1)	1.1.1. Design the mark framework (Requirements. Guidelines, protocol, management system) and provide options on the ownership, scope and modalities of implementation including the ownership following a stock taking for all existing models and practices	
	1.1.2. Conduct intensive stakeholder consultation and validation exercise to secure agreement on the final structure of the mark.	
	1.1.3. Support the counterparts in studying similar examples in other countries to establish cooperation.	
	1.1.4. Design the mark through developing all standards, protocol, templates and management system	
	1.1.5. Validate the mark through pilot application in cooperation with the SCs	
	1.1.6. Launch and promote the mark at national level to start full scale implementation through the SCs	
	1.1.7. Identify areas of policy interventions needed for addressing certain issues which might have a negative impact on the project success (water safety, waste management, pesticide registrations, cooperative laws,...etc) , report the cases to the concerned governmental institutions and the Steering Committee to lobby for government actions.	
	1.2.1. Establish infrastructure of the centres	
	1.2.2. Prepare organizational structure/system	
	1.2.3. Recruit technical and administrative staff of the centres	
	1.2.4. Establish portfolio of technical and training services to different categories of beneficiaries in the supply chain (pre-farm and post-farm gate)	
	1.2.5. Implement intensive capacity building programs for the centre's workforce including training of trainers and on the job	
	1.2.6. Involve the centre workforce in the implementation of the technical activities to project beneficiaries	
	1.2.7. Monitor the service provision process and implement corrective actions where necessary	
	1.2.8. Develop performance evaluation programs	
1.2.9. Establish sustainability plan of the centres		

<p>Identify target clusters (exporters/SMEs/growers) based on a demand driven strategy, and accordingly implement the following activities on these clusters:</p> <p>1.3.1. Conduct a diagnostic study on existing processing facilities/exporters and identify upgrading needs</p> <p>1.3.2. Provide technical assistance, coaching and training on identified upgrading needs</p> <p>1.3.3. Conduct training programs on common production key issues and on updated technologies</p> <p>1.3.4. Upgrade quality and food safety management systems at beneficiary processors</p> <p>1.3.5. Improve and refine the “one-step-back” traceability systems to reach individual supplying farms</p>	
<p>As part of the cluster identified under 1.3, the pre-processors/traders will be supported through the following activities:</p> <p>1.4.1. Conduct a technical study to propose and evaluate different technical solutions for effective transport, storing, drying, extraction and pre-processing of fresh MAPs under hygienic conditions</p> <p>1.4.2. Organize study tours to transfer knowledge and experiences on MAP drying, extraction and pre-processing technologies from other countries (technology transfer)</p> <p>1.4.3. Establish feasible model non-traditional drying and pre-processing facility in cooperation with project partners</p> <p>1.4.4. Demonstrate the model facility to relevant stakeholders and promote for replication</p> <p>1.4.5. Assist beneficiaries through the MAP centres on implementing effective quality assurance programs and monitoring critical moisture levels throughout the supply chain to eliminate product contamination</p> <p>1.4.6. Provide training and advisory services through the MAP centres on best practices in drying, extraction and pre-processing with focus on GMP/GHP and reduction of post harvest losses as part of the National Quality Mark</p>	
<p>As part of the cluster identified under 1.3, the growers will be supported throughout the following key activities:</p> <p>1.5.1. Evaluate current practices adopted and identify existing gaps and bottlenecks</p> <p>1.5.2. Prepare an overall plan for training and technical assistance and identify short term experts needed as part of the cluster</p> <p>1.5.3. Conduct class-room and field trainings by the project's national and international experts</p> <p>1.5.4. Prepare technical manuals for each of the MAP crops that include all technical details on production, harvest and post-harvest handling including food safety</p>	

	1.5.5. Follow up visits through the MAP-SCs technical staff to assure the implementation of recommendations provided by the experts		
Outcome (2)	2. MAP products of project target exporters have an improved position in export markets	– Level of satisfaction of existing international buyers on Egyptian MAP products	<p><u>Baselines</u></p> <p>TBD</p> <p><u>Targets</u></p> <p>TBD</p>
		– Level of perception of potential buyers against quality of MAP products from Egypt	<p>TBD</p> <p>TBD</p>
Outputs (2)	2.1. Enterprises capacities strengthened in terms of product development and value addition	RBM: ****	<p>– Up to 5 new value addition opportunities identified and supported</p> <p>– Up to 5 solutions provided through technical requests received by the project (requests for technical assistance)</p>
		<p>– Online tools (Evaluation Form, updating records, new material uploaded)</p> <p>– Product Development Form</p> <p>– Client registration/Response Form and SC activity reports</p>	

		– Up to 5 enterprises starting value addition initiatives (business cases) with the assistance of the project	0	5	– Checklist	
2.2. Export/origin consortium established		– One export/origin consortium is formally established	<u>Baselines</u> 0	<u>Targets</u> 1	– Consortium’s statute, action/business plans, project’s reports, communication tools developed by the consortium, joint specifications document (in case of origin consortium), etc.	– Coherence among member firms in terms of size, export experience, quality of products and production methods. – Commitment of member firms to invest human and financial resources in joint activities. – Egyptian supply chain members acknowledge the importance of being organized in a consortium
		– At least 2 joint actions implemented by the consortium during the project life time	0	2		
2.3. Quality mark/collective brand for MAP products recognized at export markets and effective market access program in place		– At least 3 market access activities successfully implemented	<u>Baselines</u> TBD	<u>Targets</u> 3	– B2B follow-up forms – Mission follow-up forms – Market access program proposal	– Financial and human commitment of beneficiary enterprises to implement the market access program and to follow-up on business contacts
		– 50 to 100 new business contacts established (also in cooperation with SIPPO)	TBD	50-100		

			– Proposal for a sustainable 3 years market access program formulated and validated by beneficiaries	TBD	TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Established linkages are used to improve businesses – Branding is recognized in the market as valuable
Activities (2)	2.1.1.	Develop a web portal to gather information on applicable standards and product requirements (including product specifications, quality standards, packaging, labelling etc.)					
	2.1.2.	Disseminate the above information through the web portal with a view to increase enterprise awareness of global market requirements					
	2.1.3.	Assist local enterprises in assessing opportunities for product development in relation with actual market demands					
	2.1.4.	Identify new value addition opportunities and provide solutions for their implementation					
	2.2.1.	Organize awareness building activities					
	2.2.2.	Identify and select a group of firms wishing to establish the consortium according to potential joint target export channels (fair trade					
	2.2.3.	Assist the group in the establishment of the consortium					
	2.2.4.	Assist the consortium in the implementation of its first joint pilot activities (other than those included in the market access program below): implementation of joint marketing tools (website					
	2.3.1.	Introduce the quality mark (developed under outcome 1) and collective brand (in case of origin consortium) to potential customers in export markets jointly with market access and investment promotion activities					
	2.3.2.	Implement promotional campaigns, matchmaking activities and business ventures to introduce the MAP sector as an attractive investment/trade option in cooperation with UNIDO Network and other relevant institutions					
	2.3.3.	Provide support for the preparation of promotional events, participation in trade fairs, follow-up on business contacts					
	2.3.4.	Coordinate efforts with other international initiatives supporting trade capacity building, investment promotion and market access, such as SIPPO and CBI and link beneficiary enterprises to their services					

	2.3.5. Assist beneficiaries to formulate a proposal to ensure the sustainability of a three years market access program to be implemented by the consortium after project completion	
	2.3.6. Identify areas of policy interventions needed for addressing certain issues which might have a negative impact on the project success (water safety, waste management, pesticide registrations, cooperative laws,...etc) , report the cases to the concerned governmental institutions and the Steering Committee to lobby for government actions.	

Notes:

* Results are the output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a development intervention.

** Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and results Based Management, OECD 2010. ISBN: 92-64-08527-0. www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork

*** Risk analysis: An analysis or an assessment of factors (called assumptions in the logframe) affect or are likely to affect the successful achievement of an intervention's objectives.

**** If the RBM code for an Output is different from the main RBM code for the entire logframe, note the **different** code in this column.

***** Milestones for the activities are to be specified separately in the Work Plan

Annex 4: Checklist on Evaluation Report Quality

Report quality criteria	UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation Assessment notes	Rating
Report Structure and quality of writing		
<p>The report is written in clear language, correct grammar and use of evaluation terminology. The report is logically structured with clarity and coherence. It contains a concise executive summary and all other necessary elements as per TOR.</p>		
Evaluation objective, scope and methodology		
<p>The evaluation objective is explained and the scope defined.</p> <p>The methods employed are explained and appropriate for answering the evaluation questions.</p> <p>The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder's consultation process in the evaluation.</p> <p>The report describes the data sources and collection methods and their limitations.</p> <p>The evaluation report was delivered in a timely manner so that the evaluation objective (e.g. important deadlines for presentations) was not affected.</p>		
Evaluation object		
<p>The logic model and/or the expected results chain (inputs, outputs and outcomes) of the object is clearly described.</p> <p>The key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object are described.</p> <p>The key stakeholders involved in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles are described.</p> <p>The report identifies the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.</p>		
Findings and conclusions		

<p>The report is consistent and the evidence is complete (covering all aspects defined in the TOR) and convincing.</p> <p>The report presents an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives.</p> <p>The report presents an assessment of relevant external factors (assumptions, risks, impact drivers) and how they influenced the evaluation object and the achievement of results.</p> <p>The report presents a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes or it explains why this is not (yet) possible.</p> <p>The report analyses the budget and actual project costs.</p> <p>Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report and are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report.</p> <p>Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, are identified as much as possible.</p> <p>Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.</p> <p>Relevant cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights, and environment are appropriately covered.</p>		
Recommendations and lessons learned		
<p>The lessons and recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions presented in the report.</p> <p>The recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?').</p> <p>Recommendations are implementable and take resource implications into account.</p> <p>Lessons are readily applicable in other contexts and suggest prescriptive action.</p>		

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.