



2018:25

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Greg Moran
Flor E Healy
Julia Leiss

Mid-Term Review of the Project 'Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade Linkages in the East African Community 2 (PACT EAC 2)'

Final Report

Mid-Term Review of the Project
'Promoting Agriculture, Climate and
Trade Linkages in the East African
Community 2 (PACT EAC 2)'

**Final Report
September 2018**

**Greg Moran
Flor E Healy
Julia Leiss**

Authors: Greg Moran, Flor E Healy, Julia Leiss

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2018:25

Commissioned by Sida

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: 4 September 2018

Published by Nordic Morning 2018

Art. no. Sida62176en

urn:nbn:se:sida-62176en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of contents

Table of contents	2
Abbreviations and Acronyms	3
Preface.....	4
Executive Summary	5
1 Background	14
2 Relevance	20
3 Effectiveness.....	25
4 Efficiency	36
5 Outcomes and impact.....	39
6 Sustainability.....	45
7 Linkages with bilateral Sida support	48
8 Conclusion and recommendations	51
Annex A - Terms of Reference	57
Annex B – Documents.....	64
Annex C – People consulted	65
Annex D – Research conducted by PACT EAC 2.....	69

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACORD	Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development
ADIR	Action, Développement et Intégration Régionale
CHF	Swiss Franc
DFID	Department for International Development
EAC	East African Community
ESRF	Economic and Social Research Foundation
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
ITC	International Trade Centre
KES	Kenyan Shilling
NRG	National Reference Group
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PACT EAC 2	Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade Linkages in the East African Community
RAN-T	Research, Advocacy, Networking and Training
SEATINI	Southern and Eastern African Trade, Information and Negotiations Institute
SEK	Swedish Krona
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
ToR	Terms of Reference
trapca	Trade Policy Training Centre in Africa
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNIDO	United Nations International Development Organisation
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Preface

This Mid-term Review of the Project ‘Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade Linkages in the East African Community 2 (PACT EAC 2)’ was commissioned from NIRAS Sweden by Sida Headquarters in Stockholm. The review took place from July-August and was conducted by:

- Greg Moran, Team Leader.
- Flor E Healy, Technical Expert.
- Julia Leiss, Evaluator.

Emelie Pellby managed the review process at NIRAS Sweden. Ted Kliest provided the quality assurance. Rebecca Ygberg Amayra managed the review at Sida Headquarters in Stockholm.

Executive Summary

The ‘**Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade Linkages in the East African Community 2 (PACT EAC2)**’ project runs from October 2015 to end September 2019. PACT EAC2 builds on its previous phase with a continued focus on the linkages between climate change, agriculture, food security and trade, and how these might better be addressed by policy reform at the international, regional and national levels. It includes an increased focus on gender than under Phase 1, a new focus on agro-processing (as identified by stakeholders and in line with the East African Community (EAC) Industrialisation Strategy (2012-2032), and the establishment of a Climate Change Negotiators Forum to complement the EAC Negotiators Forum established in Phase 1. Sida is the sole Cooperating Partner supporting PACT EAC2, providing a budget of 32 million Swedish Krona (SEK). The current mid-term review was conducted in the period July to August 2018 and included on-site missions to Geneva and Nairobi, as well as telephone and Skype interviews with partners and stakeholders in Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda, regional partners including the EAC Secretariat and the Trade Policy Training Centre in Africa (trapca), and various international stakeholders. The review was based on the standard evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, with an additional focus on linkages between the project and other Sida supported programmes in partner countries.

Relevance

The PACT EAC2 project is regarded as highly relevant for EAC countries, which are heavily dependent on agriculture and trade, require an increased focus on agro-processing, and which face considerable effects of climate change. The project design is mindful of differences in context in member countries, based on an analysis of progress and lessons learned during Phase 1, and included impressive levels of consultations with all partners and stakeholders during the design phase. The project is closely aligned with key regional policies - including the EAC Industrialisation Policy and Strategy (2012-2032) - and responds to gaps in various national policies and strategies and the needs of stakeholders in this regard. The increased focus on gender in Phase 2 is relevant, particularly given how many women are involved in agriculture, trade, agro-processing and ensuring food security in the region, as is the inclusion of the EAC Climate Change Forum. Relevance is also greatly enhanced by the fact that many of the activities are demand-driven and thus respond well to the particular needs of partners at national, regional and international levels. Importantly, while Sida and other Cooperating Partners support agriculture, trade and climate change in partner countries, occasionally including support to policy reform at national level, PACT EAC2 is the only project identified during the review that focuses on policy reform at all three levels. For most of the period under review, no major challenges have arisen to which the project would have been expected to adapt to remain relevant. However, with the changes in attitude to trade, tariffs and climate change under the new United States administration, the impact of these on the EAC has yet to be specifically considered. The main issues raised during the review and related to the

question of relevance were the fact that some key research is not available in French (and thus difficult for many people in Rwanda and Burundi to read), Kiswahili or local languages; and that more could be done to make it easier for laypeople to understand the impact of climate change and what can be done to adapt to and mitigate it.

Effectiveness

PACT EAC2 activities centre around the ‘Research, Advocacy, Networking and Training (RAN-T)’ approach and include:

- A variety of **research** and publication of findings in the form of country research studies, country update notes, technical notes, rapid response notes, briefing papers and action alerts. Research is demand-driven and National Reference Groups established under the project in each partner country identify issues on which to focus, assist in formulating the Terms of Reference for research; examine and discuss the draft research findings; and provide input, feedback and critique into the finalisation of the reports produced. All research undertaken to-date was widely acknowledged by those consulted as of high-quality, improving progressively over time.
- **Networking** at and across national, regional and international levels. National Reference Groups (NRGs) form the backbone to promoting bottom-up deliberative and collaborative working relationships between the key stakeholders in each country and also facilitate engagements with government officials (who are included as members of the NRGs) for two-way understanding and feedback to be fostered and to inform overall positions to be addressed by relevant policies. Regional Annual Meetings bring together around 60 participants, including selected members of the NRGs, representatives of regional organisations, partners, regional organisations such as the East Africa Business Council and East Africa Grain Council, trade and climate change negotiators, and representatives of international organisations such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). These meetings are also used to facilitate side-events and training events, which helps to reduce project costs and to maximise efficiency of time and resources, and allow participants to engage with the Project Advisory Committee made up of members of the FAO and UNEP, regional partners (trapca and the EAC Secretariat), a former Minister of Environment, Uganda, and the Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Permanent Mission of Uganda to Geneva.
- The **EAC Geneva Forum** and the **EAC Climate Change Negotiators Forum** bring together negotiators from partner countries to the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) respectively. The Geneva Forum, continued from Phase 1 of the project, continues to be highly effective. The Climate Change Negotiators Forum is increasingly effective – although the establishment of a virtual forum has been hampered by issues of electricity supply and Internet connectivity in some countries, opportunities have been created for it to meet during Regional Annual Meetings and on the side-lines of relevant international meetings related to climate change.
- **Advocacy** is an integral and distinct part of the project, leverages the research undertaken, and articulates the positions formulated at the NRGs. The NRGs play a central role in ensuring a wide range of views are elicited and by providing a platform for sharing these views with government ministry staff attending NRG meet-

ings. And campaigns also leverage other networking platforms to disseminate information through: (1) e-networking platforms (Google Groups); (2) the CUTS website; (3) country partner websites; (4) Action Alerts; and (5) media articles and features. In addition to the five on-going national advocacy campaigns, a **regional advocacy campaign** is also being developed to target the planned review of the EAC Private Sector Development Strategy that is scheduled in 2018-20. And research provided to members of the Geneva Forum and Climate Change Negotiators Forum greatly assists them to advocate for an increased focus on the linkages between agriculture, trade and climate change at the international policy and practice levels.

- To meet a limited budget, the need expressed in the evaluation to focus more attention at the advocacy levels, and similar requests from partners and stakeholders during the formulation of PACT EAC2, **training** is limited to the development of a generic manual and four workshops (based on a learning needs analysis and implemented in partnership with trapca) under the current phase. To date, the project is on track with its overall planning: one workshop was held in 2017, two are planned for 2018, and a fourth is contemplated during 2019.

All of these activities are on track in terms of the projects overall plan and annual work plans, and all targets are expected to be achieved by the project's end date of September 2019. Although the review team were concerned with the low percentage of those who attended the 2018 achieving Certificates of Competence (44%), steps to address the factors that contributed to this (not sending out pre-course assignments in time and the loss of interest by some participants in submitting post-course assignments) are being implemented already. But while the project has been most effective at the national and international levels, it has faced challenges at the regional level – partly as a result of countries focusing on national priorities rather than regional positions, and partly as a result of limited involvement and ownership by the EAC Secretariat. NRG meetings might also be improved through greater participation and commitment from some government officials and by making presentations on climate change less technical and more relevant to ordinary people's lives.

In the area of **gender equality**, Phase 1 of the project already included a strong focus on women, many of whom are small-scale farmers and traders. This has increased markedly during the PACT EAC2 with many NRGs now including significantly more women (far more than 50% in most cases), the inclusion of agro-processors (the majority of whom are women), and a concerted effort to include equal numbers of men and women in training. Three action alerts (out of a total of 23) and three briefing papers (out of a total of 18) have had a specific focus on gender or women and, as far as possible, gender issues and dimensions are mainstreamed into all research conducted. But while recognising that the majority of government representatives on NRGs and WTO and climate change negotiators are men – which is outside of the project's control – it is noted that only 32% of participants at NRG meetings and 29% of participants at Regional Annual Meetings are women.

The project has done well to respond to requests to include a focus on **agro-processing** under Phase 2. NRGs include numerous agro-processors, many of whom are small-scale and/or driven by women entrepreneurs, who are provided with opportunities to display and sell their produce at meetings. Agro-processing has also featured

strongly in research and events, and agro-processors also attended training for climate change negotiators in 2017. Finally, effectiveness in **Burundi** has been negatively affected as a result of the political and security situation that has slowed down politics and decision-making processes.

Efficiency

The project has been very efficiently implemented. There have been no delays in funding from Sida, no excessive levels of over- or under-expenditure and the absorption capacity of PACT EAC2 is good. The bulk of the income to end March 2018 has gone to networking including the Geneva Forum and Climate Change Forum (32%), research (25%) and advocacy (18%). Training costs have been minimal to date (8%) since only one training activity has been conducted during the period under review (in line with the project document and work plans), but is expected to rise once the remaining three scheduled / planned trainings are provided. ‘Project management’ costs constitute a significant portion of the budget each year, but staff in Geneva play a number of substantive roles in terms of implementation and, as a result, funds allocated to project management in the budget also cover the costs of technical assistance and support to activities. At the national level, the project covers all costs related to project activities within each country and includes a contribution of CHF 500 to each partner monthly to cover any additional costs (including a contribution to the salaries of staff). Funds from CUTS International Geneva are received by partners timeously and no delays were reported in this regard.

However, CUTS International Geneva has noted that a shortfall of more than 100,000 Swiss Francs (CHF) is expected over the entire project period as a result of adverse foreign exchange rates between SEK and CHF. This has been pointed out by the auditors and raised with Sida and is to be further discussed with during the annual review meeting with Sida in September 2018. Although an immediate solution (as suggested by CUTS International to the evaluation team) would be to cancel the 2019 training activity in the project document, if this were to happen it would mean only three trainings will have been provided over the entire period: 25% less than planned. Whatever is decided though should be communicated to, and agreed with Sida before any decisions are implemented.

Outcomes and impact

Even though CUTS International acknowledge the targets set in the revised logframe are conservative and is currently revising these, evidence was found that the project has achieved results in all areas. According to self-assessment surveys of beneficiaries conducted by CUTS¹, the project has led to a significant increase in knowledge and understanding of the linkages between agriculture, trade and climate change, as well as understanding on how agro-industrial development can be more climate-

¹ Monitoring of outcome indicators in the logframe (such as the degree to which knowledge and understanding has increased) is done using self-assessments by partners and stakeholders at the end of national and regional meetings measured against the baselines identified by survey at the project inception meeting. A feedback form has been developed and the same form is used at all NRG meetings and Regional Annual Meetings, which allows for time-based evolution assessment.

aware, trade-driven and food security-enhancing. Although questions are raised in the body of the report as to how accurate self-assessment is, this increase in knowledge and understanding was supported by all of the relevant stakeholders consulted with most crediting the research publications as well as participation in NRGs and the Regional Annual Meeting as key to this increase. The project has also contributed to negotiators at the international level reporting that they are better able to contribute to policy dialogues as a result of their increased knowledge and understanding. Although progress is less pronounced at the regional level as a result of countries prioritising national interests over regional positions and difficulties engaging with the EAC Secretariat, the project has had some success when it comes to getting issues related to climate change, agriculture and trade onto the regional policy agenda. Support to the EAC Secretariat's environmental team to prepare EAC countries' climate change negotiators for negotiations under the UNFCCC Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture was also reported to have increased their ability to participate in negotiations related to agriculture and climate change.

Networks established and supported by the project and research have contributed well to outcomes in the area of policy reform. NRGs have been expanded under Phase 2 to include members of key government departments, agro-processors, women groups and other categories which has had very positive outcomes. Civil society members of NRGs greatly appreciate the opportunity to engage with policy makers during NRG meetings, and many have been included on fora established by various government ministries engaged in policy reform. Policy makers also reported that their participation in NRG meetings and other consultative processes allows them to hear the views of those on the ground who will be most affected by the policies they introduce or amend. The Regional Annual Meeting was also reported to allow for experience and information sharing between partner countries.

The project's primary focus is on the policy level, which is usually regarded as one of the issues to consider when determining a project's impact. There are thus **two levels of impact** implied in the project document:

- Impact on policy development and practice change.
- Higher-level impact (and in particular, poverty reduction).

Although policy and practice change takes time, the project is already contributing to **national policy** development and review within all five partner countries that should increase the focus of relevant policies on trade, agriculture, agro-processing and climate change. Impact on policy at this level faces challenges related to high staff turnover within Ministries / policy makers which makes it difficult to maintain linkages with advocacy targets; policy timelines that are unpredictable and often change; and in the case of Tanzania, the recent movement of the ministries to Dodoma – all of which are beyond the control of PACT EAC2 / CUTS International. As a result, it is difficult to imagine how these may be mitigated other than through a longer-term programmatic approach and a comprehensive formulation process, as is suggested in the overarching recommendation to this report.

At the **regional level**, there has been input (research) into a common position on the trade in second hand clothes, although this was hampered by pressure and threats from the United States which reportedly caused some countries to shy away from any

agreement on the issue, as well as the successful preparation and submission of a common EAC position under the UNFCCC Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture. Impact at this level reportedly also faces challenges in the fact that governments tend to focus on national issues rather than on developing common regional positions. At the **international level**, the Geneva Forum has contributed to significant increases in knowledge and understanding as well as opportunities for joint positions to be developed and articulated. Even though negotiations are currently stalled at the WTO, this has not affected engagement by EAC countries in the WTO since it remains important to support the multilateral trading system through well-informed and active participation and activities have continued to increase levels of understanding of WTO Negotiators. However, while levels of understanding were reported to have increased by all of the members of the Geneva Forum and Climate Change Forum, impact at this level is affected by the fact that both trade and climate change negotiators struggle to have their voices heard given how small their delegations are compared to those from other countries. While this is of course beyond the control of the project, both of the fora could be supported to focus on building coalitions with other like-minded countries outside of the EAC in future to strengthen their voice and bargaining power during critical meetings.

Measuring the degree to which a project has contributed to a **reduction in poverty** is of course difficult and changes in either direction can seldom if ever be attributed to any one programme or project. Nonetheless, it was widely reported by partners that the project contributes directly to a reduction of poverty / increased earnings for some stakeholders, such as agro-processors who are able to sell their products and find future customers through their participation at NRGs.

The monitoring and evaluation system developed by CUTS International is effective when it comes to quantitative data and output monitoring and certainly cost-efficient. But measuring outcomes relies heavily on self-assessments that are by their nature subjective and some level of overly positive reporting can be expected. When it comes to training, there is no systematic follow up after six months to a year have passed to see what people have been able to do with the training.

Sustainability

Given that Sida is the only Cooperating Partner supporting the project, there are obvious concerns about how **financially sustainable** it would be were Sida to reduce or stop funding at the end of Phase 2. Attempts to increase the funding base during Phase 1 did not bear any results, and there has been no attempt under PACT EAC2 to find additional donor support. The project has significant potential to contribute to **sustainability of benefits and results**. Policies that better address the nexus between trade, agriculture and climate change could continue to reap benefits long after the project comes to an end; networks created may remain in place informally and/or virtually; training programmes and materials are already being used by trapca in other training it provides; and knowledge and skills acquired by partners and stakeholders will remain of use to them and their countries even after the project ends. However, all of these face challenges and the bottom line is that, should the project come to a final end in September 2019, many of the benefits and results achieved so far will in all likelihood be lost. There is thus an urgent need for discussions to take place between Sida and CUTS International around the possibilities of a third phase to allow

for CUTS to implement an exit strategy and/or seek to find other Cooperating Partners to fund a further phase. Sustainability might also be improved if the project were to transition into a more programmatic approach, which would allow CUTS an opportunity to develop a thorough resource mobilisation strategy to attract other Cooperating Partners and reduce its current total dependency on Sida.

Linkages with bilateral Sida support

Potential linkages between PACT EAC2 and support provided bilaterally by Sida were found in both Tanzania and Kenya. Programmes in both countries offer funding and training opportunities for partners and NRG members, while the advocacy skills and experience of partners and NRG members and the networks they have established would in turn benefit the Sida-supported programmes in both countries. However, levels of awareness of the PACT EAC2 is low in the Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania (as well as elsewhere) and there has been no attempt by partners to engage with the Embassies in either country.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made in the report:

1. Immediate recommendations

For Sida

- As soon as possible:
 - Agree with CUTS International whether the expected shortfall in funding for the final year will be covered by Sida or whether activities will need to be reduced in the remaining period of PACT EAC 2.
 - Begin discussions with CUTS International and internally as to the prospects of future funding, what amount this may entail, and communicate the results to CUTS International as soon as possible.
- Efforts to raise awareness of the current PACT EAC 2 project amongst Embassies in partner countries and those implementing regional programmes in the EAC region should continue, and information on these programmes and projects should be shared with CUTS International to share with partner organisations.
- Given that it is highly unlikely that the project will ever achieve financial sustainability, Sida should seriously consider funding a further phase. Ideas for what such a phase might focus on, including the possibility of converting the project into a programme, are provided in the overarching recommendation below.

For CUTS International

- Should there be no prospect of additional funding to cover the anticipated shortfall for the remaining year of the project, immediately begin a process to identify where costs could be reduced, to set new targets and communicate any such changes to Sida for its approval.
- In the event that there will be no further support from Sida, or that it might not cover additional activities, begin a process to develop an exit strategy and/or resource mobilisation strategy as soon as possible. Suggestions for what this might entail are contained in the body of the report.
- Immediately encourage partners to meet with the Embassies in Kenya, Tanzania and possibly Uganda to identify what synergies exist with Sida programmes and

where opportunities lie for the members of their NRGs to access funding or other support.

- Together with project partners, begin the process of mapping which development co-operation partners are supporting trade, agriculture, agro-processing and climate change, in-country and regionally, to identify potential opportunities for funding, training and other support to partners and members of NRGs and share the results widely.
- Consider supporting members of the EAC Geneva Forum and Climate Change Negotiators to build coalitions with like-minded countries to strengthen their voice and bargaining positions during negotiations.
- Continue to focus on engaging and building relationships with the EAC Secretariat by maintaining high level political engagement (e.g. through the DSG of the EAC Secretariat who is a member of the PAC of PACT EAC2); remaining engaged at the technical level; working with national governments of partner states on the regional agenda because the EAC Secretariat is reportedly more responsive when the pressure comes from Partner states.
- Engage with partners around the possibility of preparing in-house translated versions of key findings from / summaries of research into French (where these are not yet available), Kiswahili, and additional local languages as appropriate.
- Consider using the existing budget for 2018/19 to include research / a publication specifically focused on gender when it comes to trade, agriculture, agro-processing and mitigating the effects of climate change, especially when it comes to dealing with the impact on food security.
- Continue to encourage Climate Change Negotiators to simplify presentations to NRGs and to focus particularly on making presentations more relevant to participants. Should funds allow, develop a practical, easy to follow publication on the relevance of climate change to ordinary people's lives and translate as far as possible in-house.
- Conduct an assessment of what research (if any) is already being conducted into the impact of United States 'policy' on trade and climate, including the impact of tariff increases, withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and undermining of multilateralism and, should the budget allow, prepare research into this specifically aimed at project partners.
- Develop a standard template to use for all research / publications, to include the PACT EAC 2 logo and to properly acknowledge the contribution from Sida.
- Begin a process to gather and house research conducted by and publications of partners and members of NRGs and to raise awareness amongst stakeholders of how to access these.

2. Overarching recommendation

Given how well the PACT EAC 2 is doing at present, that the current phase will end in less than a year, and recognising that 'projects' usually have a narrow set of objectives and results that are achievable within a specific, relatively short timeframe, it is suggested that consideration be given to adopting a more programmatic approach during a further phase of the project. While that might prove challenging in terms of securing longer-term commitments from Sida (and/or development partners) and require additional funding, it does allow for a more long-term approach that would allow the 'programme' to focus on:

- Mitigating factors beyond its control (such as high staff turnover within the EAC Secretariat and Ministries).
- Providing on-going assistance to new negotiators and build relationships when new staff come on board.
- Focusing on institutionalisation of fora, networks and knowledge within partners.
- Strengthening regional ownership.
- Considering how to promote a more gender-sensitive perspective.
- Allowing time for the implementers to focus on how sustainability of results might be better achieved.
- Allowing CUTS, with Sida support, to find additional funders to support the approach, reduce the current reliance on a single Cooperating Partner, and contribute to longer-term sustainability.

Some specific suggestions from partners for what a future phase might focus on are included in the body of the report. However, it is also recommended that any future phase should go through a proper formulation process to identify how best all of the above issues may be addressed.

1 Background

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Sweden, through Sida, has been supporting CUTS International Geneva² and its implementation of the Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade Linkages in the East African Community project since its first phase (2011-2015) and continues to support the second phase, the **‘Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade Linkages in the East African Community 2 (PACT EAC 2)’** project that runs from October 2015 to end September 2019. Sida is the sole Cooperating Partner supporting PACT EAC 2, providing a budget of 32 million Swedish Krona (SEK).

PACT EAC 2 builds on the previous phase with a continued focus on the linkages between climate change, agriculture, food security and trade, but with an increased focus on gender, a new focus on agro-processing (as identified by stakeholders and in line with the East African Community (EAC) industrialisation strategy (2012-2032), and the establishment of a Climate Change Negotiators Forum that builds on the successes with the EAC Negotiators Forum in Phase 1.

According to the accepted project proposal (‘the project document’) the overall objective of the PACT EAC 2 project is:

To build capacity of relevant stakeholders (individuals, networks and institutions) to identify and promote appropriate and holistic policies for the development of agro-value-addition in the EAC region, that is climate-friendly, trade-oriented, and contribute to food security.

The project has three specific objectives:

1. Increasing knowledge and capacity of national and regional stakeholders on agro-value-addition vis-à-vis climate change, food security and trade to contribute to holistic policies and their implementation.
2. Increasing knowledge and capacity to negotiate in the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) on issues related to agro-value-addition in a coherent manner.

² CUTS International, Geneva is a non-profit NGO that catalyses the pro-trade, pro-equity voices of the Global South in international trade and development debates in Geneva. It collaborates closely with developing country trade negotiators, providing technical knowledge and updates on the situation on the ground, and has consultative status at the World Trade Organisation, the United National Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

3. Improving communication and coordination between and across stakeholders at national, regional and multilateral levels for holistic approaches and regular information flow between and across stakeholders³.

Through this approach, it is ultimately anticipated that PACT EAC 2 will also contribute to poverty reduction in partner countries and the region.

The project implements four main types of activities: research, advocacy, networking, and training in line with the ‘RAN-T’ approach adopted by the project (and as described more fully in Chapter 3: Effectiveness below). It has five national partners in Burundi⁴, Kenya⁵, Rwanda⁶, Tanzania⁷, and Uganda⁸, that implement activities and also coordinate multi-stakeholder networks, called ‘National Reference Groups’ (NRG) in their countries. Members of NRGs include stakeholders from government, businesses, civil society, media, academia, farming communities, traders and agro-processors who meet to network with each other and who also participate in project activities.

The project partners at the regional level with the EAC Secretariat and has a memorandum of understanding with the Sida-supported Trade Policy Training Centre in Africa (‘trapca’) in Tanzania to provide training on its behalf. The project also collaborates with several international organisations such as the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Note

With Sida support, CUTS International Geneva revised the logical framework (‘logframe’) to include more measurable indicators and targets, which was adopted in March 2016. The logframe revised the objective into a goal statement and a purpose. According to this document, the goal of PACT EAC 2 is ‘to contribute to agro-industrial development in the EAC countries that is conscious of challenges related to climate change, food security and trade’. And the project’s purpose is: ‘East African national, regional and multilateral stakeholders pursue the inclusion of climate-change, food security and trade concerns in their policy efforts to develop agro-processing in the region’. It then goes on to include five outputs that link quite well to the three specific objectives in the project document, but that create a few challenges for the review that are detailed in Section 1.4: Limitations below.

³ It is noted that the logframe included in the project’s Second Results Progress Report does not include these specific objectives, but instead includes five outputs related to them. The implications of this in terms of measuring results is discussed in more detail in Section 2.4 – Limitations, below.

⁴ Action, Développement et Intégration Régionale (ADIR).

⁵ CUTS International Nairobi, responsible for national activities in Kenya, coordinating regional activities in the EAC, and facilitating for other national partners.

⁶ Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD) Rwanda.

⁷ Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF).

⁸ Southern and Eastern African Trade, Information and Negotiations Institute (SEATINI).

1.2 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

According to the Terms of Reference (ToR)⁹, **the main purpose** of the review is to provide evidence-based input to allow for a strategic discussion between Sweden (Sida Headquarters and the Swedish Embassy in Addis Ababa) and CUTS on the on-going support, and beyond, with a specific focus on:

1. Helping to assess progress of the on-going project to learn from what works well and less well and inform decisions on how project implementation may be adjusted and improved to fulfil the main objectives and poverty focus.
2. Considering possible synergies with Sida's bilateral support in the EAC region.

The review is expected to be analytical and forward-looking to its character, making concrete recommendations concerning possible improvements and adjustments.

The **evaluation object** is a mid-term review of the project PACT EAC 2. Falling as it does to be conducted in the period July to August 2018, the review focuses on activities conducted from 1 October 2015 to end June 2018, with a future-looking perspective in terms of recommendations for improvement.

The **geographical area** covered by the evaluation is the five countries supported by PACT EAC 2 - Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda – but will include both an international and regional (EAC) focus. The review also includes a specific focus on the degree to which efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability might be improved (if at all) through the creation or strengthening of synergies with Sida's bilateral support in the five partner countries and the region.

1.3 METHODOLOGY

The methodology for the review, evaluation questions and data collection and evaluation approaches was included in the inception report, which forms an integral part of the evaluation process. The overall approach was anchored in and guided by the project document, logframe and annual work plans.

The review began with an **inception phase** during which the process of reviewing all available documents began¹⁰ and the inception report was prepared and finalised¹¹. The **data collection phase** began with an inception meeting with Sida and CUTS International Geneva on 19 July 2018. The team then travelled to Geneva from 23 to 25 July 2018 and to Nairobi from 30 to 31 July 2018. To deal with the fact that the budget did not allow for any further travel to partner countries (as explained in more

⁹ The ToR are attached as Annex A.

¹⁰ The list of documents consulted is attached as Annex B.

¹¹ The inception report was approved on 23 July 2018.

detail in the section on limitations below), the team also conducted numerous telephone and Skype interviews with partners and stakeholders in Tanzania, Uganda, Burundi and Rwanda, as well as international organisations, EAC Secretariat, and trapca in the period 26 to 27 July 2018 and 1 to 3 August 2018¹². A total of 67 people were consulted, of whom 30 (45%) were women.

At the end of the data collection process, a debriefing note was prepared and the team held a virtual **feedback / validation** meeting with representatives from Sida and CUTS International on 10 August 2018 to elicit comments to their main findings and recommendations before writing the draft and final reports.

1.4 LIMITATIONS

The main challenges encountered related to the limited time and budget available for the review. In particular, there was insufficient time to visit all five national partners, which on-site missions only possible to Geneva and Nairobi and the remaining countries covered by Skype and telephone interviews and discussions. Although the team were able to speak to almost all of the interviewees identified in the inception report, more than enough to constitute a representative sample and to allow for triangulation of data and responses, conducting roundtable discussions by teleconferencing was hampered at times because of difficulties with Internet connections. As a result, neither the Burundi nor the Tanzania roundtables could be conducted as planned and it was agreed with Sida and CUTS International to replace both with individual calls¹³. A further challenge in this regard that was not immediately evident at the inception stage or mentioned in the ToR was that many of those to be consulted in Burundi and Rwanda are French-speaking and could not be interviewed or consulted in English. This challenge was identified early in the consultation process and addressed by the inclusion of a French-speaking evaluator with Sida's approval.

The only other challenges encountered by the team were those related to the changes in the logframe from the original project document mentioned in the note to the introductory chapter of this report. According to the information provided to the team, Sida approved the project proposal in late 2015 but indicated that the logframe attached to it would need to be revised. With the assistance of an external consultant provided by Sida, training on results-based management was provided to CUTS International staff in the first quarter of 2016 and, and under the guidance of the external expert, CUTS staff developed the revised logframe to include goal and purpose statements, and revised the three specific objectives in the original project document into

¹² A list of all of those consulted is attached as Annex C.

¹³ The only other interviews suggested in the inception report that did not take place were with the UN-FCC (where the person had only recently been appointed and did not feel competent to discuss the project), with the Ugandan Ambassador and Permanent Representative to Geneva (who sits on the Geneva Forum but was unfortunately ill), and with one member of a Swedish Embassy where the team was unable to secure a meeting. None of these had any impact on the findings in the report: the team was able to speak to Climate Change Forum members as well as those with whom they interact; spoke to all other members of the Geneva Forum (as well as WTO representatives and others they engage with); and spoke to two of the three Embassies in those countries implementing programmes on agriculture, trade and/or climate change.

five more specific, measurable and achievable ‘outputs’ (which is the level at which ‘effectiveness’ is usually measured):

1. National and regional stakeholders better understand how agro-industrial development can be more climate-aware, trade-driven and food security-enhancing.
2. National and regional stakeholders are better capable to contribute to policy dialogue and policy change in this regard.
3. EAC delegates to the WTO and UNFCCC are better capable to promote their interests in this regard.
4. National, regional and multilateral stakeholders interact more regularly with each other in this regard.
5. National, regional and multilateral stakeholders seek to collaborate more with each other in this regard.

The revised logframe was then approved by Sida and has since been the basis for annual work plans, monitoring and evaluation of implementation, and Annual Results Progress Reports. But while the link between these five outputs and the three specific objectives in the original document are relatively easy to see, most of the indicators linked to these in the logframe are outcome indicators (to be addressed under ‘outcomes and impact’)¹⁴. The logframe also does not clearly show activities as per the original project document – research, advocacy, networking, and training. Instead, it recognises that these activities are often linked to more than one outcome – for example, research leads to greater understanding of the nexus of trade, agriculture and climate change amongst stakeholders, but is also a key component of advocacy activities.

None of the challenges created by the changes introduced by the logframe are insurmountable though. Since monitoring and evaluation and reporting since 2016 have been against the indicators in the logframe, the starting point for the review has been the logframe, but with one eye on the objective and specific objectives in the project document. In addition, the report:

- Considers what activities have been conducted under each of the four headings (research, advocacy, networking, and training) in Chapter 3: Effectiveness, based on the activities listed in the approved budget and ‘topped’ up with any output indicators in the logframe.
- Addresses the outcomes and impact achieved based on indicators in the logframe in Chapter 3 and on interviews conducted in the chapter on Impact and Outcomes.

¹⁴ It is not unusual for confusion to arise in distinguishing between outputs and outcomes. In the interests of full disclosure, as explained in the introduction to Chapter 3: Effectiveness below, the review team also confused these issues in the inception report, where the questions relating to effectiveness ought really to have been put under the ‘outcomes and impact’ heading.

Recognising that there is limited time for implementation and that changes to the logframe at this stage would be disruptive¹⁵, no revision of the logframe is suggested at this point. However, should a future phase of the project be considered, these issues should be borne in mind to avoid similar confusion and to improve monitoring and evaluation in future.

Finally, it is important to note that the mid-term review is a review of the project, as implemented by CUTS International, and not a review or evaluation of any of the partners or approximately 460 members of the National Reference Groups. The review does provide an assessment of the support provided by the project and whether it has made any difference to the partners and members of the National Reference Groups. It also needs to be stressed that this is not an ‘impact evaluation’ *per se* (in the sense that there will be a treatment and a control group) but rather a ‘reasoned contribution analysis’, where the evaluators used a structured approach to understand the extent to which observed outcomes are a consequence of or can be ‘linked’ to PACT EAC 2 activities as opposed to other factors. Measuring impact at the highest level – poverty reduction – and attributing changes in either direction to one project is impossible and while some anecdotal evidence was found (see Chapter 5), the report does not attempt to measure impact at that level in any detail.

¹⁵ It was suggested by CUTS International in comments to the debriefing note that the terminology used in the logframe could be changed from ‘outputs’ to ‘outcomes’. This would certainly clarify the confusion in the terminology, but it is not regarded as a necessary change at this late stage.

2 Relevance

Questions from ToR (as revised in the inception report) dealt with in this section
How relevant was the project at design stage given the needs of partners and beneficiaries and the lessons learned during Phase 1?
To what extent were partners and beneficiaries consulted during the design stage, and what opportunities to participate in the design were provided?
How closely aligned is the project with regional policies and strategies dealing with climate change, trade, agriculture, agro-processing and food security?
What changes have occurred since October 2015 that might have impacted on the relevance of the project that could present new opportunities for PACT EAC 2 or that could negatively affect its ability to meet its objectives, and to what extent has the project responded to changes in the context in which it operates to ensure it remains relevant over time?
To what extent is the (unwritten) theory of change valid, including the key assumptions underlying it?
At which level is the project most important – international, regional or national – where is there more focus and why?

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The project document contains a detailed account of the linkages between climate change, agriculture and food security and trade, as well as the importance of agro-processing and agro-value-addition in relation to food security, trade and the impact of climate change on all of these. The need for policy change or new policy to specifically focus on climate, trade, agriculture and agro-processing is also clearly made in the document and in the *Climate, Food, and Trade: Where Is the Policy Nexus*¹⁶ report.

Given the importance of agriculture and trade in the EAC, the increasingly negative impact of climate change on both, and the need for better policy and practice at national, regional and international levels, this chapter considers the extent to which the project was relevant to the needs of partners and stakeholders at its start in late 2015. It also considers the extent to which the project has remained relevant over time. Before that though, it begins with a brief overview of the project's theory of change.

2.2 THEORY OF CHANGE

Although the project has yet to develop a written theory of change, the following is implied by project proposal (very briefly):

If the project is able to increase the knowledge and capacity of regional and national stakeholders on agro-value-addition *vis-à-vis* Climate Change-Food Security-Trade,

¹⁶ CUTS International, 2013.

and the knowledge and capacity of national negotiators to negotiate in the WTO and UNFCCC on issues related to agro-value-addition in a coherent manner. **And if** the communication and coordination between and across stakeholders at national, regional and multilateral levels for holistic approaches and regular information flow between and across stakeholders is enhanced. **Then** beneficiaries and stakeholders will be able to identify better policy options at national, regional and international levels, make recommendations, advocate for change, and contribute to holistic relevant policies and their implementation. **And if** better policy options are identified, advocated for, adopted and implemented, including through an increased focus on gender, agro-processing and agro-value-addition in the EAC region that is climate-friendly, trade-oriented, and contributes to food security. **Then** better preconditions for people living in poverty in the EAC will be established, **ultimately leading to** a reduction in poverty in the region.

Assumptions

The following assumptions underlie the theory of change:

- At the national level, government will be receptive to lobbying and advocacy efforts by better capacitated national organisations and individuals.
- At the regional level, better communication between and coordination amongst stakeholders will lead to relevant actors identifying, amending existing or developing new policy that reflects and responds to issues amongst member countries and feeds into responsive changes to existing policies and rules at the regional level.
- At the international level, better capacitated negotiators at the WTO and UNFCCC will be able to argue for and achieve changes to rules and policy that respond to and reflect the needs of the region and individual countries.

The theory of change, including the key assumptions underlying it, is valid. Although the assumptions are relatively lofty, evidence of ‘success’ at all three levels suggests that they hold true, particularly at the national level and with some outcomes also achieved at the regional and international levels. At the overall objective level of poverty reduction, changes are harder to determine and more difficult to ascribe to any one project or intervention, but some evidence of direct change – such as for agro-processors who have gained access to more customers – can be expected.

Identifying or reconstructing a theory of change at this late stage in project’s cycle is problematic though and consideration should be given to developing a clear theory of change for the next phase, should there be one.

2.3 RELEVANCE AT ADOPTION AND OVER TIME

As described in the project document and confirmed during interviews, the project design is mindful of differences in context in member countries, based on lessons

learned during Phase 1 and analysis of progress, an external evaluation in mid-2014¹⁷, and extensive consultations with all partners and stakeholders during the design phase that included surveys and dedicated sessions/discussions at national, regional, and international meetings from early 2014¹⁸. The project recognises the importance of trade and agriculture in the region and the contribution that these can make to addressing poverty, as well as the ‘positive’ and negative impacts of climate change on both agriculture and trade.

The project is closely aligned with key regional policies, including the EAC Industrialisation Strategy (2012-32), the EAC Climate Change Master Plan (2011-2031), EAC Food Security Plan of Action (2011-2015), the Rural and Agricultural Development Strategy (2005-2030), and the EAC Common Market Protocol (2010). The nexus between trade, agriculture and climate change is well articulated. And the focus on policy change at all three levels is very relevant given the need for policy reform to better articulate the nexus and to highlight the importance of agriculture, agro-processing and trade for food security and economic advancement in the region.

The degree to which the project responds to gaps in various national policies and strategies when it comes to the inclusion of issuers related to trade, agriculture and climate change and the needs of stakeholders in this regard is best illustrated by one key example. PACT EAC 2 includes a specific focus on agro-processing and agro-value-addition, not covered in Phase 1 that comes directly from a need expressed by the EAC Secretariat to better align the project with the EAC Industrialisation Policy and Strategy (2012-2032). This request was discussed with stakeholders during National Reference Group meetings and Regional Annual meetings, where it was widely supported and is thus included under PACT EAC 2.

The increased focus on gender in Phase 2 is also regarded as relevant, particularly given how many women are involved in agriculture, trade, agro-processing and ensuring food security in the region. And given the importance of climate change when it comes to trade and agriculture, the inclusion of a Climate Change Negotiators Forum in Phase 2 is highly relevant. Relevance is also greatly enhanced by the fact that many of the activities are demand-driven and thus respond well to the particular needs of partners at national, regional and international levels. Partners are involved in identifying research needs for their countries, developing advocacy campaigns (under the guidance and with the support of CUTS International Geneva), and in devel-

¹⁷ Report dated 11 July 2014.

¹⁸ According to the approved project proposal (page 11): ‘Taking into account the feedback and requests in the 2nd Regional Annual Meeting held in Kampala, in September 2013, the ideas and concepts related to the follow up project were discussed in the 5th National Reference Group meetings in the five countries in early 2014, as well as in the International Conference held in Geneva in June 2014. This led to the development of the draft concept note for the follow-up project. The initial draft concept note was presented for discussion and feedback in the 6th National Reference Group meetings held in the five countries in September 2014. Finally, a revised draft concept note was presented for further discussion and feedback in the 3rd Regional Annual Meeting held in Bujumbura, Burundi in November 2014’.

oping terms of reference for country update notes and research. Partners are also consulted and given opportunities to input into annual work planning during National Reference Group and Regional Annual Meetings. A learning needs analysis was conducted during 2016 that also ensures that training is relevant to participating stakeholders' needs. The project is thus closely aligned with partners' and stakeholders' needs and was understandably uniformly regarded as highly relevant by all of those consulted.

Importantly, while Sida and other Cooperating Partners support agriculture, trade and climate change in partner countries, occasionally including support to policy reform at national level, PACT EAC 2 is the only project identified during the review that focuses on policy reform at all three levels.

For most of the period under review, no major challenges have arisen to which the project would have been expected to adapt to remain relevant. However, with the changes in attitude to trade, tariffs and climate change under the new United States administration, the impact of these on the EAC has yet to be specifically considered.

2.4 NATIONAL, REGIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL?

A question was included in the inception report at the suggestion of Sida as to which level the project prioritises – national, regional or international – and the reasons for this. The team is of the opinion that the project correctly identifies all three levels as equally important when it comes to policy on climate change, trade, agriculture and agro-processing. Although the most direct impact is currently at national and international levels, there are reasons why changes at regional level face challenges, including the following identified by CUTS International and other stakeholders consulted (and as amplified where relevant throughout the report):

- Limited EAC Secretariat staff with heavy work and travel agendas.
- Staff turnover at EAC Secretariat level.
- EAC Secretariat staff see their primary purpose as servicing the EAC partner states, with the work to support PACT EAC2 seen as secondary to this purpose, meaning less time and resources are dedicated to the project's activities.
- EAC Secretariat staff have raised issues such as the project not providing business class travel, substantial per diems, or honoraria for participation in meetings and activities, that lower their desire to participate.
- Political reasons, where partner states may tend to pull in different directions on particular issues – for example, the ongoing serious spat between Burundi and Rwanda as a result of which, Burundian government officials are not allowed to travel through Kigali to make connecting flights to attend PACT EAC2 activities and meetings.

2.5 MAIN FINDINGS

Based on the above assessment, the support provided under the PACT EAC 2 is generally regarded as highly relevant. However, a few issues affecting relevance were raised during consultations.

- Research studies, country update notes and other materials for Burundi are produced in French and two CUTS Geneva staff are native French speakers and have been assigned to deal with Burundi and Rwanda respectively. Steps are also taken to ensure that those attending training and meetings are fluent in English. Nonetheless, many of the ‘general’ research studies and documents are only available in English (as opposed to those specifically for Burundi and Rwanda), which impacts on their relevance to those who are not fluent in English. Similarly, members of National Reference Groups (NRGs) also raised the point that the country update notes and many of the briefing notes are highly relevant to them and their constituencies, but that not all members of their constituencies are fluent enough in English to make use of them at ‘grassroots’ level. Translating materials into French and other languages is an expensive and labour-intensive process, but the project might have considered no- and low-cost options such as requesting partners to translate at least the key findings or summaries of research into French, Kiswahili and local languages as appropriate using language skills available in their offices.
- Climate Change Negotiators are regularly invited to provide presentations to NRGs on what climate change entails, its impact on trade, agriculture and agro-processing, and processes underway at the regional and/or international level to prevent or mitigate the impact of climate change. However, it was reported by various project partners and members of NRGs, and confirmed by Climate Change Negotiators themselves, that some of the presentations are overly technical and some NRG members lose interest as a result. Recognising that those Negotiators consulted during the review are aware of the issue and have taken steps to make presentations more relevant, those conducting presentations should remember to focus on the practicalities involved and the direct impact on members’ lives and welfare. A simple language publication on the impact of climate change on trade and agriculture, from a very practical level, might also be considered if and when funds allow.

Questions were raised by partners and members of NRGs at the national level, as well as members of the EAC Secretariat, as to whether the project might be more relevant if it were to include more support to implementation of policy (for example, through funding to the establishment of agro-processing facilities) and to supporting grassroots members of NRGs financially. These concerns are valid, but the project is specifically designed to focus on the policy level. But, and as dealt with in more detail in Chapter 7 below, the project could play more of a role in identifying opportunities under other Sida and other donor-supported projects and programmes without losing its focus on policy development.

3 Effectiveness

Questions dealt with in this section
To what extent has the project met its targets in work plans and project documents (including budgets) during the period under review, particularly when it comes to research and publications, networking, advocacy and training?
How likely is the project to meet its targets by the end of the project period (2019)?
To what extent has the project increased its focus on gender under Phase 2?
How effective has the project been when it comes to adding agro-processing and agro-value-addition as a new, major focus under Phase 2?
To what extent do (or will) the activities conducted and supported by the project contribute to its stated objectives?

3.1 INTRODUCTION

‘Effectiveness’ is a measure of whether or not a project has achieved (or is likely to achieve) its stated objectives, and a determination of what led to the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives. With that in mind, the team is of the opinion that the questions on effectiveness included in the inception report would be better addressed in Chapter 4: Outcomes and Impact rather than in the current chapter. The questions to be addressed in this Chapter have therefore been revised in the table above to be more accurate when it comes to addressing the effectiveness criterion and this Chapter is thus organised around the core activities supported by the project.

Focusing on PACT EAC 2 outputs, outlined in the approved project proposal, the Budget and a ‘Substantive Outputs’ document, the main emphasis of project activities revolves around Research, Advocacy, Networking and Training (RAN-T). The RAN-T approach is logical and progressive, where research is the platform on which networking through the NRGs (and other fora) gains relevance, from which advocacy is articulated and around which training is devised and delivered on a demand-driven basis.

The following RAN-T outputs are identified compared to those identified in the approved budget:

3.2 RESEARCH

Table 1 reflects research conducted to-date, measured against the full project targets in the budget, with the balance reflecting the expected research to be undertaken in the remaining timeframe of the project, which is broadly on schedule¹⁹.

Table 1: Research

1	Research and Technical Analysis & Support	Budget	Done	Bal- ance
1.1	Country Research Studies – 5 each in years 1 & 3	10	5	5
1.3	Country Update Notes (CUNs) – Geneva EAC Forum – 6 per year per country	120	85	35
1.4	Technical Notes – Geneva EAC Forum – 6 per year	24	17	7
1.5	Country Update Notes (CUNs) – EAC Climate Change Forum – 4 per year per country	80	50	30
1.6	Technical Notes – EAC Climate Change Forum – 4 per year	16	10	6
1.7	Rapid Response Notes (RRNs)	20	5	15
1.8	Briefing Papers	24	18	6
2.4	Action Alerts	40	23	17

Source: CUTS International Geneva data

The demand-driven nature of research increases both its relevance and its effectiveness. The NRGs assist in formulating the Terms of Reference for research activities undertaken; examine and discuss the draft research findings; and provide input into the finalisation of the research reports/studies produced, providing feedback and critique. Based on interviews and feedback provided by stakeholders, all research undertaken to-date is widely acknowledged as of high-quality, improving progressively over time.

The first set of **Country Research Studies** were undertaken for each country in the first year of the project and focused on agro-industrial development policies: the nexus of climate, food security and trade. These research studies feed into the generic training manual (developed in partnership with trapca) and one key recommendation of each Country Research Study was selected for the country advocacy campaign by the respective NRGs. The second set of Country Research Studies was undertaken for each country in the third year and focused on the topics identified for, and to contribute to the country advocacy campaigns then underway:

- **Burundi:** Climat, Commerce, Alimentation – Orientations pour une Stratégie de Mise en œuvre de L’agro-industrie.
- **Kenya:** Leveraging the ‘Buy Kenya, Build Kenya’ - Strategy to Promote Sustainable Agro-processing.
- **Rwanda:** Towards Effective Implementation of the Industrial Policy for Agro-Processing - Reaching-out to agro-processors through a National Agro-Processing Forum.
- **Tanzania:** Sustainable Industrial Development Policy – What Role for Climate Change, Food Security and Trade.
- **Uganda:** National Industrial Development Policy – Mainstreaming Agro-Processing, Trade, Climate Change, Food Security and Gender.

¹⁹ A full list of research conducted is attached as Annex D.

The second set of Country Research Studies has been finalised, printed and the studies are to be formally released at the respective NRG meetings in August 2018. At this stage, all planned Country Research Studies have been produced as planned.

Action Alerts are short subject-matter specific documents raising awareness and highlighting the need for action (and possible research). By end July 2018, 23 have been produced (with 40 envisaged by project end).

Briefing Papers are six to eight page demand-driven outputs to provide crisp information, analysis and recommendations to policymakers, negotiators and other relevant stakeholders. These focused on issues relating to (amongst others) industrial development policy in Tanzania and Uganda; ‘Buy Kenya, Build Kenya’ and Greening of Trade Policy in Kenya; Climate Change - Koronivia Joint Working Group, Climate Adaptation and the Paris Climate Agreement; value-chains; agro-processing; and gender. By end July 2018, 18 have been produced (with 24 envisaged by project end).

Technical Notes, together with the **Country Update Notes**, are used to inform and guide discussions at the Geneva Forum and Climate Change Forum meetings. The issues for discussion at these fora are selected by participating EAC delegates. Technical Notes are then prepared to provide a short, technical analysis of the relevant issue. Country Update Notes are provided to inform country delegates to the WTO and UNFCCC on country-specific aspects of the issue. By end July 2018:

- 17 Technical Notes and 85 Country Update Notes have been produced for the Geneva Forum (with 24 Technical Notes and 120 Country Update Notes envisaged by project end).
- 10 Technical Notes and 50 Country Update Notes have been produced for the Climate Change Forum (of the total of 16 Technical Notes and 80 Country Update Notes planned by project end).

Rapid Response Notes were originally envisaged as rapid demand-driven short notes requested by Geneva Forum and Climate Change Forum negotiators to assist them in the negotiations on a real time basis. However, few requests for Rapid Response Notes have been received and only five have been produced since September 2016 (of which 20 are envisaged by project end). The continuance of Rapid Response Notes may be reconsidered in an effort to save on budget and to perhaps prioritise focus on other areas, on a demand-driven basis, in the balance of the project implementation timeframe.

In general, very useful and high-quality outputs are provided on a demand-driven and timely basis by the project in support of the NRGs (at national level) and in support of the Geneva Forum and Climate Change Forum negotiators at international level (taking negotiating positions and instructions from their capitals). The production of various research outputs is broadly on schedule and all categories of research are anticipated to be fully utilised by project end, with the exception of RRNs, which have not often been requested and may, therefore, be stopped in favour of other more demand-driven activities under the Research heading or elsewhere (to meet budgetary shortfall requirements). Critically, the introduction of the awareness of the nexus between agro-processing, agriculture, trade and climate change is proving very effective

in promoting greater policy dialogue and policy formulation, informed by the research undertaken.

3.3 NETWORKING

The following meetings have been held to end July 2018:

Table 2: Networking

		Budget #	Achieved #	Balance #
3	Networking			
3.2	Reference Group Meetings - 2 per country per year	40	25	15
3.3	Geneva EAC Forum Meetings - 6 per year	24	17	7
3.4	Joint Forum Meeting - Geneva EAC Forum & EAC Climate Change Forum - 1 per year	4	2	2
3.5	Regional Annual Meeting (RAM) - 1 per year (50 participants)	4	2	2
3.6	Annual Geneva Meetings: Annual visit of EAC Stakeholders at key WTO meetings	4	2	2

Source: CUTS International Geneva data

Informed by the research conducted, networking forms a critical component of building trust and professional interaction between government, private sector agro-processors, farmers/producers, civil society organisations, academia, researchers and the media. This is a key contributor to informed policy formulation that is rooted in reality, based on feedback provided from different stakeholder perspectives affected by the policy and enabled to influence its formulation and/or reformulation/updating. The various networking fora are designed appropriately to address networking and collaborative relationships at national, regional and international levels.

National Reference Group (NRG) Meetings form the backbone to promoting bottom-up deliberative and collaborative working relationships between the key stakeholders in each country. Facilitated by the project, the NRGs meet bi-annually in each country to explore issues of significance, identify demand-driven research requirements, discuss and monitor the implementation of country advocacy campaigns, and formulate stakeholder feedback from different perspectives to government on policy (re-)formulation and issues to be addressed in WTO and climate change negotiations. The NRGs are critical in facilitating engagements with government officials and for two-way understanding and feedback to be fostered, and to inform overall positions by way of position papers, memoranda, terms of reference and so on. The NRGs have met 25 times (five meetings per country) by end July 2018, out of the total of 40 envisaged by the end of the project.

NRG members also engage with each other ‘virtually’ through e-platforms (such as google groups), which enables them to nominally engage with their regional counterparts in other EAC countries and to engage on an on-going basis around the bi-annual NRGs. There are 112 active online members to-date, which is low compared to the NRG ‘community’ that exists in each country (approximately 100 members in each country, save Burundi where membership currently stands at around 60). Given limited access to the Internet and often intermittent electricity supply in some countries, face-to-face meetings thus remain most effective, allowing participants to engage dynamically and promoting greater preparation, robust discussions, dialogues and more formalised records of decision-making and follow-up action.

Regional Annual Meetings take place annually (as their name implies), rotating between member states and bringing together around 60 participants, including selected members of the NRGs, representatives of regional organisations, partners, regional organisations such as the East Africa Business Council and East Africa Grain Council, trade and climate change negotiators, and representatives of international organisations such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). These meetings are also used to facilitate side-events and training events, which helps to reduce project costs and to maximise efficiency of time and resources. By end July 2018, two Regional Annual Meetings have been held with a further two envisaged by project end (the next being September 2018).

Regional Annual Meetings also provide an opportunity for participants to meet and engage with the **Project Advisory Committee** made up of the following members:

- Jamie Morrison, Director FAO (Alternate) Aziz Elbehri.
- Peter Kiuluku, Executive Director, Trapca.
- Christophe Bouvier, Director, UNEP Nairobi.
- Christophe Bazivamo, Deputy Secretary-General, EAC Secretariat.
- Flavia Nabugere, Former Minister of Environment, Government of Uganda.
- Christopher Onyanga Aparr, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Uganda.

As its name implies, the Project Advisory Committee's main role is to provide input, guidance and advice to the project, but it also helps to ensure high-level buy in from partners such as the EAC Secretariat and to allow for discussion and input on matters receiving attention at both regional and international levels. Although it was suggested that the Committee might meet more frequently than only at the Regional Annual Meeting, PAC reports are sent on a quarterly basis by email providing an opportunity for comments and remarks and the Committee was reported to be effective by those consulted.

The **Geneva Forum** meets six times per annum to focus on WTO negotiations and is regarded as highly effective by all of those consulted. In the period under review, 17 Geneva Forum meetings have been held of the 24 envisaged by project end.

The **EAC Climate Change Forum** is an innovation under PACT EAC 2, based on the success of the Geneva Forum during Phase 1. Although members of the Forum confirmed it increases knowledge and understanding, the attempt to run the Forum as a virtual forum (based on the fact that, unlike members of the Geneva Forum, members of the Climate Change Forum are based in their respective capitals) has encountered some challenges mainly as a result of intermittent power supply and limited access to the Internet in some countries. To address this, the project attempted to stagger virtual meetings over a number of days using phone calls, skype calls and WhatsApp. But while this has improved the situation, challenges in communication

using the Internet remain. As a result, face-to-face meetings of the climate change negotiators have been organised on the side-lines of UNFCCC meetings²⁰, attended by members of the Forum and CUTS International staff, and as part of Regional Annual Meetings where **Joint Forum Meetings** are held to bring members of the Geneva Forum and Climate Change Forum together. Two such meetings have been held as part of the two Regional Annual Meetings convened to end July 2018.

An **annual visit of selected EAC stakeholders** (including project country partners, selected civil society organisations, private sector agro-processors, relevant government ministries and relevant EAC staff) is also organised around an important WTO meeting each year. This meeting provides participants with an opportunity to observe the WTO functioning first hand, meet with their WTO ambassadors and delegates to understand their needs and to inform them about the situation on the ground, to meet with the staff of other relevant organisations (such as the WTO, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and the International Trade Centre), and to build contacts and working relationships. Two such visits have been organised by end July 2018: the first to facilitate the participation of selected EAC stakeholders in the WTO Ministerial Conferences held in Nairobi, Kenya (December 2015); and Buenos Aires, Argentina (December 2017).

3.4 ADVOCACY

Advocacy is an integral and distinct part of the project, leverages the research undertaken, and articulates the positions formulated at the NRGs. National advocacy campaigns follow a clear plan and strategy. The process begins with NRGs selecting one of the recommendations from the first Country Research Study on which to focus. A strategy is then developed by the country partner, with guidance and inputs from CUTS Geneva and based on a standard template developed by CUTS Geneva. The strategy is then discussed and approved by the respective NRGs. Advocacy activities are then undertaken accordingly with quarterly updates and even more frequent discussions between CUTS Geneva and respective country partners to monitor progress and deal with issues as these arise. The NRG meetings also include dedicated sessions on on-going national advocacy campaigns to monitor and advise as appropriate. Advocacy also leverages networking platforms to disseminate information through: (1) e-networking platforms (Google Groups); (2) the CUTS website; (3) country partner websites; (4) Action Alerts; and (5) media articles and features. However, it is not clear that care is taken to ensure that sufficient visibility is given to PACT EAC 2 and Sida in the technical support provided to campaigns and that they are based on research and stakeholder inputs supported by way of funding and technical assistance from PACT EAC 2 and Sida.

In addition to the five on-going national advocacy campaigns, a **regional advocacy campaign** is also being developed to target the planned review of the EAC Private Sector Development Strategy that is scheduled in 2018-20. The process will start by

²⁰ The UNFCCC normally holds two meetings each year – the Conference of the Parties in December and the meetings of Subsidiary Bodies in April/May.

receiving inputs from the five NRG meetings scheduled for August 2018 (where one session is being devoted to this issue at each meeting), and the full regional advocacy strategy will then be finalised and launched at the next Regional Annual Meeting scheduled for September 2018. Research provided to members of the Geneva Forum and Climate Change Negotiators Forum reportedly assists them to advocate for an increased focus on the linkages between agriculture, trade and climate change at the international policy and practice levels.

As described in Chapter 5: Outcomes and Impact, advocacy efforts are bearing fruit. However, advocacy campaigns could be even more effective if they included increased outreach to the grass-roots level, through credible and legitimate media channels in a less-technical and informative manner to ensure that those at grassroots level are better informed of the issues and thus better able to participate, through their representative NGO, collectives etc. during NRG meetings and other fora. Similarly, for dissemination of information based on research to be effective, it needs to become less technical and more tailored in tone and content to suit the needs of laypeople (as opposed to policy makers). The role of the NRG in making research findings more user-friendly is critical and should be given more attention in the rest of the current phase.

3.5 TRAINING

Based on the fact that the overall budget for PACT EAC 2 was essentially the same as that under the first phase, the results of the evaluation conducted at the end of Phase 1 and the request for more attention to be focused on advocacy and networking from partners and others consulted during the process to formulate the second phase, less funds are dedicated to training under PACT EAC 2 than during the first phase. As a result, it was agreed that training would be limited to four key demand-driven courses (identified during a learning needs analysis conducted during the first year of the project and based on feedback of networking activities) and the production of a generic training manual (since finalised by trapca). Specific manuals have also been developed for training provided in 2017 and to be provided in 2018.

Training is on schedule, with one training course provided by trapca during September 2017 for those involved in climate change (including government officials, research and private sector agro-processors) and focusing on relevant trade and agriculture aspects in UNFCCC negotiations, two currently scheduled for 2018, and the final training to be provided during 2019. All 16 participants in the 2017 training received a Certificate of Attendance but only seven (44%) received a Certificate of Competence. The main reasons advanced for this include the fact that trapca is well known to set very high standards generally²¹, but also that there were problems encountered in the completion of pre-course assignments that were sent out late by the external expert contracted by trapca that did not allow sufficient time for participants to complete them. As a result, more emphasis had to be placed on post-course assignments,

²¹ Trapca receives funding from Sida to conduct a range of other training to that provided under the PACT EAC 2 and these comments relate to all of the training they provide.

where some participants were either too busy to complete those or had lost interest after the course was completed.

The project is mindful of these challenges and has already taken steps to address them: principally, not relying exclusively on the external expert to manage the pre-course assignments and ensuring that those for the upcoming training have already been sent out; and putting in place plans to focus on follow-up with participants when it comes to post-course assignments. Even with these challenges though, all of those consulted who had attended the 2017 training confirmed that it provided them with strong insights and increased their confidence to negotiate better on technical climate issues and the nexus effect.

3.6 GENDER AND AGRO-PROCESSING

Key changes expected from the first phase (based on the evaluation and stakeholder consultations) included an increased focus on gender and the inclusion of agro-processing and agro-value-addition under PACT EAC 2.

3.6.1 Gender

Phase 1 of the project already included a strong focus on women, many of whom are small-scale farmers and traders. According to project data and all of those consulted, this has increased markedly, with many NRGs now including significantly more women (far more than 50% in most cases), the inclusion of agro-processors (the majority of whom are women), and a concerted effort to include equal numbers of men and women in training. Of course, achieving gender parity is in some cases outside of the project's control – for example, the majority of WTO and climate negotiators are men, but these are appointed by their governments and the PACT EAC 2 has no say in who governments appoint. Three action alerts (out of a total of 23) and three briefing papers (out of a total of 18) have had a specific focus on gender or women and, as far as possible, gender issues and dimensions are mainstreamed into all research conducted. However, despite the fact that the majority of NRG members are women and although attendance by women at NRGs and during Regional Annual Meetings has increased, only around 32% of participants at NRG meetings and 29% of participants at Regional Annual Meetings are women (again, partly as a result of the fact that government employees attending these are predominantly men).

3.6.2 Agro-processing

Project data and all of those consulted confirm that PACT EAC 2 has implemented the request from the EAC Secretariat and others that agro-processing becomes a main area of focus under the second phase. NRGs include numerous agro-processors, many of whom are small-scale and/or driven by women entrepreneurs, who are also provided with opportunities to display and sell their produce at meetings. Agro-processing has also featured strongly in research and events²², and agro-processors also attended training for climate change negotiators in 2017. By way of example:

²² At least seven Action Alerts; seven Briefing Notes; one technical note; five research studies; and three events.

- 145 policymakers have participated in project advocacy activities in favour of more climate-aware, trade-driven and food security-enhancing agro-processing development in the EAC region (against the target of 30 in the revised logframe).
- Eight policy efforts by EAC governments pursue the inclusion of climate change, food security and trade concerns in agro-processing development (against the target of three in the revised logframe).
- Two official submissions by EAC countries to UNFCCC integrate elements relevant to agro-processing, trade and food security (against the target of one in the revised logframe).
- Two official submissions by EAC countries to WTO integrate elements relevant to agro-processing, climate change and food security (against the target of one in the revised logframe).

While some of those consulted suggested that the project should provide more direct financial support to agro-processors, the review team does not share this sentiment. Instead, the team agrees that the focus of the project needs to remain at the policy level, but notes too that more could be done to identify linkages with other projects and programmes in the region, including those funded by Sida, and where support to small scale farmers and agro-processors is included (as explained more fully in Chapter 6 below).

3.7 MAIN FINDINGS

PACT EAC 2 is generally highly effective, particularly in the areas of research, advocacy, networking, and training²³, and is well on its way to meeting its targets by September 2019. Activities are also closely aligned with the projects objectives and are already contributing to achieving those objectives. The only issues raised during the review:

Networks have been the most effective at the national and international levels and project outcomes and impact are being achieved as a result. The project has been less successful though at the regional level. While the EAC Secretariat has positively supported a separate EAC submission to the UNFCCC on the COP23 Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture (in addition to a national submissions) highlighting the nexus between climate change, trade, food security and agro-processing²⁴, the extent of ‘ownership’ of the project by the EAC Secretariat (dealt with in Section 2.4 above) needs to be reviewed and addressed. The Secretariat is well placed to promote a co-ordinated approach to trade, climate change and agriculture in the context of regional integration and the wider Tripartite and Continental Free Trade Area arrangements, including adopting a more forward looking strategic position to better prepare for emerging shifts and/or sudden shocks. And while senior leadership is very supportive

²³ Effectiveness when it comes to training being harder to measure given that only one training activity has taken place in the period under review.

²⁴ This is a significant output in terms of: (1) contributing to the recognition at international level of the need for climate actions to address vulnerabilities of agriculture and food security; and (2) promoting a position at EAC regional level on climate change under the Koronivia Joint Working Group.

of PACT EAC 2 (a memorandum of understanding has been signed with the EAC and the Deputy Secretary-General sits on the Project Advisory Committee), the level and extent of the Secretariat's involvement under the project remains a challenge, especially at the technical level where staff turnover is reportedly high and where there have been issues related to per diems and the Secretariat's expectations of amounts to be paid for travel and honoraria. The impact on the project when it comes to policy is relatively minor given that the Secretariat has no direct relationship with the WTO and is only an observer to the UNFCCC, and negotiations at this level are undertaken by government officials from each country. A common EAC position on climate change for the UNFCCC has been developed and the EAC will also revise its 2006 Private Sector Development Strategy, which will create an opportunity for PACT EAC 2 to engage with the process²⁵. But efforts to better engage the Secretariat are nonetheless required, including those already identified by the project to encourage national partners to push for greater EAC Secretariat participation, particularly given that the Secretariat is the most appropriate partner for the project at the regional level.

Recognising budget limitations, many stakeholders called for an increase in the frequency of **NRG meetings** (ideally quarterly) to enable more effective interaction between stakeholders and to address technical issues more effectively and collaboratively. Future NRG meetings might also be used to prepare for a successful close-out of PACT EAC 2 should no future phase be contemplated, including exploring how best the NRG might be institutionalised and co-owned at national level by government and/or private sector stakeholders. Further, there is a need to improve participation by government officials during these meetings: many of those consulted reported that high-level officials who are members of the NRG sometimes send alternates with less influence or decision-making ability. To address this and ensure that discussion and decisions at NRG meetings reach higher levels within government, it was suggested by some of those consulted that NRGs could consider formulating their positions and transmitting these to high-level government officials by way of memoranda to maintain a degree of formal engagement with government in the event that high-level officials are absent from key sessions and decisions of the NRG Groups. And while the Rwandan NRG did invite members of the Swedish Embassy to attend an NRG, this has not been tried in other countries even though opportunities for synergies with bilateral Sida-supported programmes exist in at least Kenya and Tanzania.

As many issues related to trade and climate change are highly technical in nature, the extent to which the project's **research and publications** are understood and absorbed by wider stakeholders is questionable, especially in rural communities. The use of public media articles to disseminate information is noted, but the extent of its perceived effectiveness and influence may not be sufficiently validated or attributable to the project. Further, few of the publications seen by the review team use the PACT EAC 2 logo or recognise Sida's contribution to the project and the support provided is also not attributed to Sida on the CUTS International website.

²⁵ Discussions on what the Strategy might include are on the agenda for all NRG meetings scheduled for August 2018.

Recognising that **training** was reduced to accommodate an increased focus on advocacy and networking without an increase in funding under PACT EAC 2, training is especially important given the high turnover in government staff and negotiators, the fact that the landscape in trade and climate change is shifting, and new issues in agriculture, trade and climate change constantly arise. Many of those consulted also raised the need for training of NRG members to build their capacity and develop competencies to sustain the NRGs beyond PACT EAC 2.

Finally, effectiveness in **Burundi** has been negatively affected as a result of the political and security situation that has slowed down politics and decision-making processes. This in turn has had a chilling effect of advocacy efforts in the country. The situation in Burundi is obviously beyond the project's control, but CUTS International has responded well by adjusting its support to Burundi as a result, including by converting its advocacy work into capacity-building for an implementation strategy for the National Industrialisation Policy and by still including participants from Burundi in Regional Annual Meetings and training.

4 Efficiency

Questions from ToR (and added in the inception report) dealt with in this section
How efficiently are activities implemented generally – what causes delays, what has been done to address them, and how effective have these been (lessons learned)?
What is the ratio of income to expenditure in the years under review? Has there been over- or under-expenditure in any given year, what are the causes, what has been done to address them, and how successful have these efforts been?
What is the ratio of cost of activities to project management expenses?
Have there been any delays in the flow of funds from Sida? Why, what impact did it have on the ability to implement activities, and what was done to address this?

4.1 INTRODUCTION

‘Efficiency’ is a measure of whether the activities, outputs and results of the project have been achieved in a cost-efficient way. It also measures whether activities were achieved on time, the causes of any delays, and what impact they may have had on the ability of PACT EAC 2 to achieve its objectives. To assess its efficiency, this chapter focuses on levels of income and expenditure over the period under review; whether there have been any delays in funding from Sida and the impact such delays might have had; and the evaluation team’s main findings when it comes to how efficiently the project is implemented at a more general level.

4.2 INCOME AND EXPENDITURE

PACT EAC 2’s only source of income is Sida funding, which is provided in two tranches each year – each tranche in the region of 420,000 to 490,000 Swiss Francs (CHF). Total disbursements to 31 March 2018 are reflected in Table 3 below.

Table 3 – Budget, actual income and actual expenditure (CHF): 1 Oct 2015 – 31 March 2018

Period	Budgeted Amount	Actual Income (Sida Disbursements)	Actual Expenditure	Ratio income to expenditure
1 Oct 15 – 31 March 16	490,205	488,745	370,283	1,32
1 April 16 – 31 March 17	1,048,216	898,923	972,955	0,92
1 April 17 – 31 March 18	1,038,014	943,203	928'528	1,02
Total	2,576,435	2,330,871	2,271,766	1,09

There have been no delays in funding from Sida. And based on Table 3, there have been no excessive levels of over- or under-expenditure and the absorption capacity of PACT EAC 2 is good, which implies that the project would be able to absorb and spend additional funding if it were available.

Although there was a relatively high rate of under-expenditure in the first period (1 October 2015 to 31 March 2016), this was due to the late final approval of the project (the first Sida disbursement was received towards the end of November 2015) and the holiday period almost immediately thereafter. This created a knock-on effect in that the Project Inception Meeting could only be organised in February 2016 and the launch of several activities was only possible after that. Some knock-on effect was then experienced with expenditure exceeding income during the period 1 April 2016 – 31 March 2017, but that is to be expected.

Similarly, the percentage of under expenditure for each period might appear high at first glance:

- 24% in the period 1 October 2015 to 31 March 2016.
- 7% in the period 1 April 2016 – 31 March 2017.
- 11% in the period 1 April 2017 – 31 March 2018.

However, these figures are skewed by the fact that the project document is based on the October-September cycle whereas project reporting is on an April-March cycle – which means that every year the project annual work plan and budget is prepared for April-March period, transposing the activities/budget from the project document into a different period. Although activities are reportedly almost always on track when viewed against the project document cycle (October to September), it may not look this way when seen within the April-March cycle.

4.3 RATIO OF COST OF ACTIVITIES TO PROJECT MANAGEMENT EXPENSES

The bulk of the income to end March 2018 has gone to networking (including the Geneva Forum and Climate Change Forum (32%), research (25%) and advocacy (18%). Training costs have been minimal to date (8%) since only one training activity has been conducted during the period under review (in line with the project document and work plans), but is expected to rise once the remaining three scheduled / planned trainings are provided²⁶.

‘Project management’ costs constitute a significant portion of the budget each year: on average, 34%, which rises to 42% when overheads such as office rental and other such costs are added. However, staff in Geneva play a number of substantive roles in terms of implementation (such as assisting to prepare terms of reference for research and training, consultations with stakeholders, advocacy support and quality assurance and direct input into research). As a result, the ‘project management costs’ reflected in financial documents also cover the costs of technical assistance and support to activities. According to CUTS, if the staff costs are split between time spent on management and time spent on substantive inputs and technical assistance, the percentage

²⁶ The issue of whether or not a fourth training will be possible during 2019 within the available budget is discussed elsewhere in Section 4.5 below.

spent on management costs would drop to around 17% of the budget, which is logical and acceptable.

4.4 EFFICIENCY GENERALLY

All of those consulted agreed that activities are implemented efficiently at all three levels. At the national level, the Project covers all costs related to project activities within each country such as research, NRG meetings, country update notes and advocacy campaigns. In addition, a contribution of CHF 500 is provided to each partner monthly to cover any additional costs, including a contribution to the salaries of staff assisting implementation of activities. Funds from CUTS International Geneva are received by partners on time and no delays were reported in this regard.

4.5 MAIN FINDINGS

PACT EAC 2 is very efficient given the context in which it operates and the level of support it provides at all three levels. There has been no major under- or over-expenditure to date and the project is on track to fully utilise the entire budget provided. However, CUTS International Geneva has noted that, as a result of adverse foreign exchange movement between SEK and CHF, a shortfall of more than 100,000 CHF is expected over the entire project period. This has been pointed out by the auditors and raised with Sida and is to be further discussed with during the annual review meeting with Sida in September 2018.

Should the projected shortfall materialise, questions obviously arise as to where savings can be made to cover the shortfall. The option suggested by CUTS International would be to cancel the fourth training activity in the project document, currently planned for 2019. Although this would free up significant funds, the concern this raises is that training is already significantly reduced from the previous Phase, and if this training workshop were to be cancelled, it would mean only three trainings will have been provided over the entire period: 25% less than planned. The issue may be premature given that discussions still need to take place between Sida and CUTS International, but if the shortfall will not be covered, it is suggested by CUTS International that a better alternative would be to see whether it is possible to ‘trim’ expenditure on other activities to cover the gap before deciding whether or not to cancel the training proposed for 2019. However, such a proposal is not without problems, notably the fact that the shortfall is one that has accumulated over the entire project and, while trimming might have been possible if it had been done over the project’s duration, it is really in the final year that the shortfall will materialise. Whatever is decided though should be communicated and agreed with Sida before any decisions are implemented.

5 Outcomes and impact

Questions from ToR (as revised in inception report and subsequently ²⁷) dealt with in this section
To what extent have various PACT EAC 2 interventions contributed to its intended outcomes generally, and particularly when it comes to the development and adoption of appropriate policies for the development of agro-value-addition in the EAC region that are climate-friendly, trade-oriented, and contribute to food security?
In particular: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have outputs and activities led to an increase in knowledge and capacity of national and regional stakeholders on agro-value-addition vis-à-vis climate change, food security and trade to contribute to holistic policies and their implementation? 2. Have outputs and activities increased knowledge and capacity to negotiate in the WTO and UN-FCCC on issues related to agro-value-addition in a coherent manner? 3. Have outputs and activities improved communication and coordination between and across stakeholders at national, regional and multilateral levels for holistic approaches and regular information flow between and across stakeholders?
What are the challenges PACT EAC 2 faces in achieving its outcomes (if any)? What has been done to address these, what has/has not worked and why / why not (lessons learned)?
Are there examples of higher-level impact in any of the partner countries? In particular, to what extent has the project contributed to poverty reduction in these countries and the region?
How are outcomes and impact measured – who is responsible for monitoring and evaluation, how is it done, how effective is the system, how realistic are the indicators in the logframe, and to what extent does it specifically attempt to measure outcomes and impact?

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The OECD defines impact as ‘the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators’²⁸. This definition conflates outcomes (short-term changes directly for those targeted by a programme) with impact (longer-term changes that affect society as a whole – such as a reduction of poverty). Both of these are dealt with in this chapter.

²⁷ As mentioned in the introduction to the chapter on Effectiveness, the questions raised in the inception report under that heading belong better in the current chapter. Conversely, questions on gender and the inclusion of agro-processing are better dealt with in the Chapter 3: Effectiveness and have been moved there as a result.

²⁸ www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

5.2 OUTCOMES

As already identified by CUTS International Geneva and Sida, the outcome indicators in the logframe were set at relatively low levels and most (if not all) have already been achieved or exceeded by this stage. While not undermining the fact that progress is being made across key output areas, it has been agreed that these will be revised to be more realistic. With that in mind, the following was noted during the review:

According to CUTS International Geneva's internal monitoring, the project has led to a significant increase in knowledge and understanding of the linkages between agriculture, trade and climate change, as well as understanding on how agro-industrial development can be more climate-aware, trade-driven and food security-enhancing²⁹. Although a question is raised in the section on monitoring and evaluation below as to how accurate self-assessment by beneficiaries is, this increase in knowledge and understanding was supported by all of the relevant stakeholders consulted with most crediting the research publications as well as participation in NRGs and the Regional Annual Meeting as key to this increase.

The project has also contributed to national stakeholders (including representatives at the WTO and UNFCCC) reporting that they are better able to contribute to policy dialogues as a result of their increased knowledge and understanding. Progress is less pronounced at the regional level due to logistical issues (physical meetings, e-platforms etc.) and a challenge in engaging EAC Secretariat, but even then, there has been some progress. For example, even though countries cannot agree on a regional policy on second hand clothes, the research conducted under the project is reportedly being used and has affected other policies such as that related to leather and textiles where the focus has shifted away from banning of footwear to the development of the value chain and enhancing the effectiveness of it. A meeting was also held at the request of the EAC Secretariat's environmental team to prepare the EAC countries' climate change negotiators for their negotiation under the UNFCCC Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture where it was reported to have increased the team's ability to participate in negotiations related to agriculture and climate change.

Networks established and supported by the project have contributed (together with research) to outcomes in the area of policy reform. NRGs have been expanded under phase 2 to include members of key government departments and agro-processors, which has had very positive outcomes. Civil society members of NRGs greatly appreciate the opportunity to engage with policy makers during NRG meetings, and many have been included on fora established by various government ministries engaged in policy reform. Policy makers also reported that their participation in NRG meetings and other consultative processes allow them to hear the views of those on the ground

²⁹ Relevant indicators in the logframe have been exceeded in all cases. For example: 97% of respondents to internal surveys (conducted at NRGs and Regional Annual Meetings) report a better understanding compared to the target of 70% in the logframe; 75% of trained policymakers report increased technical capacity to coherently take into account climate change, trade and food concerns into their agro-processing related policy efforts compared to the target of 50%.

who will be most affected by the policies they introduce or amend. The Regional Annual Meeting was also reported to allow for experience and information sharing between partner countries.

5.3 IMPACT

Although the project's primary focus is on the policy level, policy change is ordinarily regarded as one of the issues to consider when determining a project's impact. There are thus two levels of impact implied in the project document:

- Impact on policy development and practice change.
- Higher-level impact (and in particular, poverty reduction).

5.3.1 Impact on policy development and practice change

As already noted, changes in these areas take considerable amounts of time, but there are already examples of PACT EAC 2 activities contributing to policy development and review.

Examples at the **national level** include:

- Participation in the process to review the National Industrialisation Policy in Burundi, where the partner (ADIR) and NRG championed the integration of climate, food security, agro-processing and trade elements into the policy and where ADIR are included in the drafting team for the policy. Pending the approval of the policy, ADIR has also already developed elements to be considered during the campaign for the future implementation strategy, and encouraged the Ministry to request UNIDO to support it to organise an industrial strategy training (successfully conducted in September 2017).
- CUTS Nairobi's participation in the Kenyan trade policy has led to inclusion of a chapter on trade and environment. The partner and NRG have also influenced the development of the 'Buy Kenya, Build Kenya' strategy to integrate elements of trade, climate change and food security into the strategy.
- ACORD and the Rwandan NRG (together with others) have successfully advocated for the establishment of a National Agro-Processors Forum in 2019 as a key component in national industrial policy development. The Forum will be the first of its kind in the region and is expected to have around 60 permanent members, of which 15-20 are NRG members³⁰.
- ESRF in Tanzania has advocated for the kick-starting of the Sustainable Industrial Development Policy review process due for 2020 and for it to include agro-processing and climate change nexus issues. The NRG has produced terms of reference for the review, which were presented to government and which have met with approval.

³⁰ The Forum will be hosted by the private sector under the Rwanda Association of Manufacturers under an agreement with the Ministry of Trade (responsible for the Industrial Development and Export Council which is the organ in charge of implementing the Industrial Policy and the highest decision-making body).

- Advocacy for synergies in the National Industrialisation Policy by SEATINI in Uganda, where the suggestions this institute has made can already be seen in the draft policy. In addition, the NRG has put forward a position paper on the Climate Change Bill currently being drafted where a number of key phrases from the paper are reported to be included in the Bill.

Realising impact in policy at the national level faces challenges related to high staff turnover within Ministries / policy makers which makes it difficult to maintain linkages with advocacy targets; policy timelines that are unpredictable and often change; and in the case of Tanzania, the recent movement of the ministries to Dodoma.

At the regional level, there has been input (research) into a common position on the trade in second hand clothes, but while this is reported to be useful in development of other policies, no common position has been developed yet. Impact at this level faces challenges in the fact that governments tend to focus on national issues rather than on developing common regional positions and when it comes to the issue of second hand clothes in particular, some countries continue to push for this while others have backed off under pressure and threats from the United States.

At the international level, the Geneva Forum was widely regarded as very effective and has contributed to significant increases in knowledge and understanding as well as opportunities for joint positions to be developed and articulated. Even though negotiations are currently stalled at the WTO, this has not affected engagement by EAC countries in the WTO since it remains important to support the multilateral trading system through well-informed and active participation and activities have continued to increase levels of understanding of WTO Delegates and their participation in the regular WTO work (for example, in the committees on sanitary standards and agriculture). Similarly, the Climate Change Forum has contributed to the improved understanding and more active participation of EAC climate change negotiators in the UNFCCC negotiations on agriculture. With support from the project, a national (Burundi) and a regional (EAC) submission were also made under the Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture of UNFCCC. However, even though levels of understanding were reported to have increased by all of the members of the Geneva Forum and Climate Change Forum, real impact at this level is affected by the fact that both trade and climate change negotiators struggle to have their voices heard given how small their delegations are compared to those of other countries. Although this is of course beyond the control of the project, both Climate Change and WTO negotiators could be supported to engage with other like-minded countries outside of the EAC to develop combined positions and strengthen their voice and bargaining power during negotiations (budget permitting).

5.3.2 High level impact - poverty reduction

An impact on poverty is implied in the description of the project's overall objective (and elsewhere) in the project document. Measuring the degree to which a project has contributed to a reduction in poverty is of course difficult and changes in either direction can seldom if ever be attributed to any one programme or project. Which is not to say poverty reduction should not be included as a goal. The overall objective or goal level of any programme is usually understood as follows: what will be the ultimate result if this project, together with all other projects and programmes, are successful

over many years? As a result, no analysis of changes in poverty levels in partner countries is attempted or provided. It was reported though by all partners consulted that the project does contribute directly to a reduction of poverty / increased earnings for some stakeholders, such as agro-processors who are able to sell their products and find future customers through their participation at NRGs. And there are examples of the project having a ‘knock-on’ effect in some countries that in turn contribute to greater food security and a reduction in poverty – as illustrated by the following case study³¹:

Case study

Inspired by her participation in PACT EAC 2, an official from the Burundi Trade and Industry Ministry, Anitha Nshimirimana, decided to launch a multi-stakeholder association in 2016 to promote greater awareness of climate challenges in agro-processing, towards greater food security. Anitha and her partners have already secured World Bank funding and launched two grassroots projects involving agro-processors, farmers, jobless people and local authorities and communities. Together, they have organised four regional training workshops for agro-processors and planted over 10,000 maracouja plants in Kayanza province for environmental conservation.

5.4 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Monitoring and Evaluation are conducted by the CUTS Geneva office and is based on the use of the indicators in the logframe³². The system is very well developed and is based on an integrated electronic system (google sheets) drawing data from e-records of post-meeting feedback; download tracking statistics; forum participation statistics; an e-record of meeting participants in NRG lists; partners’ quarterly reports; and manual inputs.

Monitoring of outcome indicators in the logframe (such as the degree to which knowledge and understanding has increased) is done using self-assessments by partners and stakeholders at the end of national and regional meetings measured against the baselines identified by survey at the project inception meeting. A feedback form has been developed and the same form is used at all NRG meetings and Regional Annual Meetings, which allows for time-based evolution assessment.

³¹ Provided to the team by CUTS Geneva and repeated *verbatim*.

³² The system includes: Integrated electronic system (google sheets), drawing data from: (i) e-records of post-meeting feedbacks; (ii) download tracking statistics; (iii) Forum participation statistics; (iv) e-record of meeting participants in NRG lists; (v) partners’ quarterly reports; (vi) manual inputs. Feedback form remains the same for all NRG/RAM meetings, allowing for time-based evolution assessment. It is reportedly very effective and flexible since spreadsheet formulas and tracking tables are used to analyse raw data on a real time basis. This includes not only logframe indicators, but also activity completion, report tracking etc.

The system described by CUTS Geneva is effective when it comes to quantitative data and output monitoring and certainly cost-efficient. But self-assessments are by their nature subjective and some level of overly positive reporting can be expected. When it comes to training, there is no systematic follow-up after six months to a year have passed to see what people have been able to do with the training in terms of absorption, application to the workplace and skills transfer within the organisation (and/or beyond).

6 Sustainability

Questions from ToR (as revised in inception report) dealt with in this section
How financially sustainable is the PACT EAC 2 project?
How could financial sustainability be enhanced – what has been tried in the past, what worked and what did not (lessons learned)?
How sustainable are the benefits and results achieved to date?
What could be done to enhance sustainability of benefits and results?

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The OECD defines sustainability as an assessment of whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Determining sustainability thus includes two broad questions – financial sustainability and whether there are benefits or results that might continue to bear fruit even if the PACT EAC 2 project were to come to an end.

6.2 FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

Given that Sida is the only Cooperating Partner supporting the project, there are obvious concerns about how financially sustainable it would be were Sida to reduce or stop funding at the end of Phase 2. The chances of national governments agreeing to cover the costs of the project, even though they ought to, are remote, which essentially means that the project would cease to exist if Sida funding was to come to an end unless another donor could be found. Attempts in this regard during Phase 1 did not bear any results, there has been no attempt under PACT EAC 2 to find additional donor support. As a result, there are no lessons that could be learned from previous attempts in this regard.

6.3 SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS AND RESULTS

At one level, the PACT EAC 2 has the potential for remarkable long-term benefits and results: policies influenced by the project could potentially remain in place for decades and continue to address trade, climate change, agriculture, agro-processing, food security and poverty long after the project has ended. However, policy development is a lengthy process and, should funds no longer be available to support advocacy efforts, progress made in this area might easily be lost.

There is potentially sustainability of benefits and results in other areas as well: networks created may remain in place informally and/or virtually, especially where there are no major costs involved. Training programmes and materials, including those developed under Phase 1, are already being used by Trapca in its other training activities. These will remain available on the CUTS website and could feasibly be used by others in future. Partners and members of NRGs have acquired advocacy skills that

they could continue to use in future, and WTO and UNFCCC negotiators have increased knowledge and understanding of the issues, and negotiation skills, that could continue to bear fruit if the project came to an end.

However, challenges are evident in all of these areas:

- Networks may continue at an informal level, but the meetings being supported under the project would almost certainly collapse over time unless they were ‘adopted’ and supported by partner countries and/or the EAC Secretariat. Staff turnover amongst CSOs, ministries, negotiators and others would also lead to informal networks collapsing.
- Training materials might be used by others, but since these target negotiators in most cases, this would be rare unless a similar project or programme was being implemented by others.
- Advocacy skills have been built, but advocacy is mainly conducted through the NRGs and RAMs and through the relationships built by partners and CUTS International and with the support of CUTS staff. Should these meetings no longer take place, and should there be no one to assist with advocacy activities, it is unlikely that advocacy attempts would have anywhere near the same level of success.
- Although negotiators have acquired knowledge and skills, the staff turnover amongst these is very high, which would mean these gains are rapidly lost.

6.4 MAIN ISSUES

As already suggested, the project will be hard to sustain in the absence of donor funding. As a result, and while perhaps premature at mid-term review stage, there is a real need for this issue to be discussed at the scheduled meeting between Sida and CUTS International Geneva in September 2018, which is already on the agenda for that meeting. The reason for this is simply that, if funding is to cease, CUTS need to urgently devote attention to an exit strategy to ensure that gains made are not lost, combined with a resource mobilisation strategy and a concerted fundraising drive if they wish the project to continue with other Cooperating Partner support. Some ideas for what this combined strategy might include are advocating for government to take over some of the responsibilities (unlikely as that may be); conducting a donor mapping to identify where support for partners might be found; including linkages with Sida bilateral programmes; and encouraging country partners to seek support from other sources to carry on some of the activities.

In addition, the project generates a significant amount of knowledge products – as do many of the partners. Knowledge developed directly by PACT EAC 2 (in the form of country update notes, briefing papers and other research) is currently readily available on the CUTS International website, but knowledge generated by partners is not captured, shared with or readily available to other partners. While knowledge management can be expensive (and might best be addressed during a further phase of the project), some consideration could be given to what knowledge can be captured during the remainder of the project, and how this can be housed on existing websites and made available if the project is to come to an end in 2019 (or how it could be built on if a future phase materialises).

Finally, both financial sustainability and sustainability of benefits and results might be greatly enhanced were the project to transition in future to a programme with a longer-term programmatic approach. Projects are generally seen to be shorter and more fixed-term than programmes, with more immediately achievable results. Policy development and changes in practice require longer terms to achieve, and capacity in these areas amongst all stakeholders needs to be constantly built not least to address the impact of high levels of staff turnover. Such an approach would most likely require additional funding from a much broader funding base to ensure financial sustainability, and careful consideration given how rare it is for projects to transition to programmes³³. But it may well be an issue worth considering.

³³ One example of a project transitioning into a programme is the National Initiative for Civic Education (NICE) in Malawi. NICE began life as a project that ran from 2001-2005, funded by the EU and implemented by GIZ. At the end of the project cycle, it was agreed that the project would need to continue for some time given its potential to support and to coordinate all of the various civic education campaigns being run. It was then reformulated as a programme before being 'combined' with another EU programme on rule of law, and remains as a component of successor programmes to this day.

7 Linkages with bilateral Sida support

Questions from ToR (as revised in inception report) dealt with in this section

What synergies currently exist between the project and its activities and other projects or programmes supported bilaterally by Sida in partner countries and the region?

To what extent could efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability be improved through the creation or strengthening of synergies with Sida's bilateral support in the EAC Region?

7.1 SYNERGIES WITH SIDA BILATERAL SUPPORT

Potential synergies (and potential overlap) between PACT EAC2 and Sida-supported programmes were found in Kenya and Tanzania³⁴.

In **Kenya**, the Swedish Kenya Country Strategy (since 2016) includes a focus on, *inter alia*, agriculture, trade, climate change and the environment. In line with this, Sida supports:

- The Agriculture Sector Development Support Programme, which also includes some focus on policy, climate change and value chain development. The programme supports the government's Agriculture Sector Development Strategy (2010-2020) and is currently in its second phase that runs from 2017-2022. It has a budget of Kenyan Shillings (KES) 7.5 billion, of which Sida contributes KES 5.6 billion. The programme includes a major focus on the commercialisation of small-scale agriculture and value-chain development, and also provides support to CSOs. The programme has obvious synergies with PACT EAC 2 and could provide a source of funding for partners and members of the NRG.
- A Public Private Development Partnership with Tetra Laval (a new dairy hub project supporting approx. 30,000 dairy farmers), that indirectly includes capacity building for dairy farmers but which has less potential direct synergies with PACT EAC 2.
- The International Trade Centre is currently running a project on Climate resilience, funded by Germany, and will soon launch a local 'Green Hubs' project in Kenya, to be funded by Sida Headquarters in Stockholm. The hubs are expected to provide integrated solutions to micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in the implementation of green business practices and act as one-stop shops for enterprises to build green business strategies and to access green finance and international markets for sustainable products. Each hub will offer services in relation to

³⁴ Sida does not provide bilateral support in Burundi. The Swedish bilateral strategy for Rwanda does not include agriculture, although there is some support to a limited number of agricultural value chains within the Access to Finance Rwanda Programme. And attempts to interview a representative of the Embassy in Uganda proved fruitless, with two agreed meetings missed by the representative.

five areas (circular economy, sustainability standards, climate resilience, positioning sustainable products in the international market, and accessing green finance and markets for sustainable products).

- A Trade Facilitation intervention is currently in the design phase but is expected to have the overall objective to address challenges in domestic (cross-county) trade as well as cross-border trade through partnerships with the private sector aimed at reducing trade transactional costs³⁵. The focus sectors will include agriculture, trade and manufacturing, retail, transport and logistics and service industry (amongst others still to be decided).
- The Strengthening Competitiveness Through Climate Resilience in International Value Chains, implemented by the ITC, aims at strengthening climate change resilience of tea, coffee and cut flowers supply chains in Morocco and Kenya between international buyers and African suppliers. In the first phase (until end November 2018), the project is working with local cooperatives and companies on creating climate adaptation strategies. Thereafter, the project will link cooperatives/companies with suitable finance and technology partners to support them in implementing their measures.

In **Tanzania**, Sida supports:

- The Agriculture Market Development Trust, which is also supported by Ireland and Denmark. The Trust is in its second phase that runs from 2016-2021 with a budget of SEK 48m. It focuses on farmers and the whole value chain when it comes to maize, pulses and sunflowers. It also has a pillar on policy advocacy where synergies could be created, especially given that the Embassy reports that the Trust is particularly weak in this area.
- The Tanzania Horticulture Association where Sida is the core funder³⁶. The Horticulture Association is an association of agricultural players including small farmers, farmer groups, service providers and exporters with the objective to develop a unified voice and to advocate for policy change (where the Embassy reported that progress has been slow and that assistance from PACT EAC2 might assist them to improve).

There are obviously synergies between PACT EAC 2 and these programmes and projects, but what was clear from those consulted is that they are very unaware of PACT EAC 2 and only became aware of it once they had been contacted by Sida Headquarters as part of the mid-term review. None of the partners consulted were very aware (if at all) of any other of Sida bilaterally supported programmes either, which suggests there is a real need for better communication between Sida Headquarters and the Embassies in partner countries, as well as a need for partners (supported by CUTS

³⁵ The project is a public private development partnership (PPDP) with a private technology company, Women in Business (WIB) which is an arm of the Kenya National Chamber of Commerce & Industry (KNCCI), Kenya Markets Trust (KMT), Export Promotion council (EPC), Financial Sector Deepening Kenya (FSD-K) and Sweden.

³⁶ Others supporting the programme include USAID and Norway (amongst others).

Geneva) to consult with project managers in Tanzania and Kenya to see how synergies might best be established and/or maximised. Sida is mindful of the need for better communication and has already begun a process at Headquarters to raise awareness internally of the support they provide and to increase information sharing, which should of course continue.

As a final note, the team also became aware of other programmes in the region where other opportunities for synergy might exist. For example:

- The DFID-funded TradeMark East Africa Programme, based in Nairobi, which is a complementary programme for trade.
- The EAC Secretariat is also supported by the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation and funded by South Korea to prepare industrial reports and prepare relevant data.

Communication with implementers of these, and others, could lead to greater synergies, avoidance of overlap, and potential funding sources for partners, NRG members, and a future phase of the PACT EAC project.

8 Conclusion and recommendations

8.1 CONCLUSION

PACT EAC 2 is highly relevant given how important trade, agriculture and agro-processing are for the region and in partner countries. It is very well aligned with the priorities of the partners, beneficiaries and stakeholders, regional and national policies, and is the only project that supports policy development at national, regional and international levels. Although it would be advisable to develop a written theory of change for any future phase, the theory is contained in various parts of the project document and both the theory and the assumptions underlying it remain valid. There are opportunities for relevance to be increased during the remainder of the project, mainly when it comes to low- or no-cost attempts to translate some key research findings into French and to produce simple language variations in indigenous languages, particularly when it comes to climate change, but these do not impact on overall relevance. However, there is a growing and relatively immediate need to begin to consider the impact of new policy positions coming out of the United States in the area of trade and climate change, perhaps beginning with an assessment of what research is already being conducted into this in the region.

The project continues to be highly regarded by all internal and external stakeholders consulted, is largely very effective, and is well on its way to achieving the targets set in the project document and revised logframe. Some of the targets may have been set too conservatively, which is acknowledged by CUTS International, but that does not change the fact that a significant amount of work has already taken place. There is a need to increase visibility of both the project and Sida's contribution to it though, which could easily be addressed by preparing a template for the cover and inside pages of all research produced under the project and with Sida funding. Effectiveness in the area of advocacy could also be enhanced by having partners assist in summarising key research findings in plain language, translating and disseminating these more widely. Further research into the relationship between gender, trade, agriculture and climate change could also be undertaken within the remaining period should the budget allow. But given the fact that there is only a little over a year left under the project, no further changes are suggested, especially if the project needs to start winding down. Should a further phase be contemplated, more training, more frequent NRG meetings, and more face-to-face meeting opportunities for the Climate Change Forum should be considered (which in turn might require an increase in the overall budget). At the regional level, increased focus on building relationships with the EAC Secretariat should continue, mindful of the challenges these face. Immediate training needs for NRG members could also be at least partly addressed by partner organisations conducting a scoping of what other training opportunities exist in partner countries.

The project is efficiently implemented, which in turn contributes to its effectiveness and impact. Even though there are limitations when it comes to monitoring and evalu-

ation at the outcomes level, results of ‘surveys’ conducted by CUTS International Geneva were widely confirmed during consultations where all beneficiaries confirmed that their levels of knowledge and understanding, and their capacity, have greatly increased as a result of research, networking and other support provided. Of immediate concern though is the question of the projected shortfall of around 100,000 CHF in the final year. Recognising that a simple trimming exercise will not make up the shortfall and that the issue will be discussed between Sida and CUTS International in September 2018, the review team are also reluctant to simply recommend that the training for 2019 be set aside and would urge Sida to consider making up the shortfall if at all possible.

Although policy development takes time, there is already evidence of impact in the development of policy, particularly (but not exclusively) at the national level, including in the processes being followed, levels of consultation involved, and draft policies already under development. However, all of these gains are at risk if the project were to come to an end or Sida funding cease in September 2019 as planned. The project is simply not financially sustainable without donor support and even though some sustainability of results has been achieved, these would rapidly be lost if the project were to close. As a result, the team would recommend that a further phase be seriously contemplated, with an attempt to increase the resource base to allow for, *inter alia*, an increase in training, more regular NRGs, the inclusion of a web-based knowledge management platform, where all existing research, publications and knowledge products developed by CUTS International, project partners and others (which process could already begin using the existing website), and the increased management and implementation costs that this would entail.

8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following **recommendations** are made (ranked in order of importance and urgency for each of those to whom the recommendations are addressed). Given that the project is being well implemented, is achieving or on the way to achieving results, and that the time period remaining is comparatively short, the recommendations have been split between those that should be considered now, and an overarching recommendation for a future phase following a more programmatic approach.

8.2.1 Immediate recommendations

For Sida

- As soon as possible:
 - Agree with CUTS International whether the expected shortfall in funding for the final year will be covered by Sida or whether activities will need to be reduced in the remaining period of PACT EAC 2.
 - Begin discussions with CUTS International and internally as to the prospects of future funding, what amount this may entail, and communicate the results to CUTS International as soon as possible.
- Efforts to raise awareness of the current PACT EAC 2 project amongst Embassies in partner countries and those implementing regional programmes in the EAC region should continue, and information on these programmes and projects should be shared with CUTS International to share with partner organisations.

- Given that it is highly unlikely that the project will ever achieve financial sustainability, Sida should seriously consider funding a further phase. Ideas for what such a phase might focus on, including the possibility of converting the project into a programme, are provided in the overarching recommendation below.

For CUTS International

- Should there be no prospect of additional funding to cover the anticipated shortfall for the remaining year of the project, immediately begin a process to identify where costs could be reduced, to set new targets and communicate any such changes to Sida for its approval.
- In the event that there will be no further support from Sida, or that it might not cover additional activities, begin a process to develop an exit strategy and/or resource mobilisation strategy as soon as possible. Suggestions for what this might entail are contained in the body of the report.
- Immediately encourage partners to meet with the Embassies in Kenya, Tanzania and possibly Uganda to identify what synergies exist with Sida programmes and where opportunities lie for the members of their NRGs to access funding or other support.
- Together with project partners, begin the process of mapping which development co-operation partners are supporting trade, agriculture, agro-processing and climate change, in-country and regionally, to identify potential opportunities for funding, training and other support to partners and members of NRGs and share the results widely.
- Consider supporting members of the EAC Geneva Forum and Climate Change Negotiators to build coalitions with like-minded countries to strengthen their voice and bargaining positions during negotiations.
- Continue to focus on engaging and building relationships with the EAC Secretariat by maintaining high level political engagement (e.g. through the DSG of the EAC Secretariat who is a member of the PAC of PACT EAC2); remaining engaged at the technical level; working with national governments of partner states on the regional agenda because the EAC Secretariat is reportedly more responsive when the pressure comes from Partner states.
- Engage with partners around the possibility of preparing in-house translated versions of key findings from / summaries of research into French (where these are not yet available), Kiswahili, and additional local languages as appropriate.
- Consider using the existing budget for 2018/19 to include research / a publication specifically focused on gender when it comes to trade, agriculture, agro-processing and mitigating the effects of climate change, especially when it comes to dealing with the impact on food security.
- Continue to encourage Climate Change Negotiators to simplify presentations to NRGs and to focus particularly on making presentations more relevant to participants. Should funds allow, develop a practical, easy to follow publication on the relevance of climate change to ordinary people's lives and translate as far as possible in-house.
- Conduct an assessment of what research (if any) is already being conducted into the impact of United States 'policy' on trade and climate, including the impact of

tariff increases, withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and undermining of multi-lateralism and, should the budget allow, prepare research into this specifically aimed at project partners.

- Develop a standard template to use for all research / publications, to include the PACT EAC 2 logo and to properly acknowledge the contribution from Sida³⁷.
- Begin a process to gather and house research conducted by and publications of partners and members of NRGs and to raise awareness amongst stakeholders of how to access these.

8.2.2 Overarching recommendation

Given how well the PACT EAC 2 is doing at present, that the current phase will end in less than a year, and recognising that ‘projects’ usually have a narrow set of objectives and results that are achievable within a specific, relatively short timeframe, it is further suggested consideration be given to adopting a more programmatic approach during a further phase of the project. While that might prove challenging in terms of securing longer-term commitments from Sida (and/or development partners) and require additional funding, it does allow for a more long-term approach that would allow the ‘programme’ to focus on:

- Mitigating factors beyond its control (such as high staff turnover within the EAC Secretariat and Ministries).
- Providing on-going assistance to new negotiators and build relationships when new staff come on board.
- Focusing on institutionalisation of fora, networks and knowledge within partners.
- Considering how to promote a more gender-sensitive perspective.
- Strengthening regional ownership.
- Allowing time for the implementers to focus on how sustainability of results might be better achieved.
- Allowing CUTS, with Sida support, to find additional funders to support the approach, reduce the current reliance on a single Cooperating Partner, and contribute to longer-term sustainability.

Projects v programmes

Many definitions of projects and programmes exist, but these may be summarised as follows: A project is a ‘temporary undertaking to create a unique product or service. A project has a defined start and end point and specific objectives that, when attained, signify completion. A programme, on the other hand, is defined as a group of related projects managed in a coordinated way to obtain benefits not available from managing the projects individually. A programme may also include elements of on-going, operational work. So,

³⁷ According to comments to the draft version of this report, such a template has been developed as a result of the recommendation in the draft report. However, since the template was developed after the review was completed and has not been seen by the team, this recommendation has been left in.

a programme is comprised of multiple projects and is created to obtain broad organizational or technical objectives'³⁸.

Projects by definition have a shorter timespan than programmes, with a programmatic approach accepting that change in some areas can take a long time and might best be addressed incrementally.

Although it is ordinarily beyond the scope of a mid-term review - particularly one conducted with limitations on time and budget - to identify or provide specific recommendations for what such a project or programme might include, the issue was raised by numerous stakeholders and the following suggestions for what a next phase of the PACT EAC might include were suggested during consultations:

- Specifically focus on the issue of technology in agriculture and trade, particularly those technologies that can contribute to reducing the impact of climate change.
- An increased focus on training and development of standardised courses to allow for continuous training to address the high levels of staff turnover in government ministries and amongst negotiators.
- Introduce a specific focus on food crops agro-processing (as opposed to the current focus on primarily cash-crops) to respond to food security of citizens.
- A focus on addressing regional dynamics such as the common external tariff that could be used to promote trade, agro-processing, food security and linkages with climate change at the regional level.
- Develop a knowledge management strategy and platform to include knowledge produced by all partner organisations, members of NRGs, etc.
- Develop a resource mobilisation strategy to identify other Cooperating Partners that might be willing to contribute to specific areas if not the entire project.
- Focus on institutionalisation of knowledge and learning to mitigate high levels of staff turnover within Ministries and partners such as the EAC Secretariat.
- Develop a focused sustainability plan focused particularly on sustainability of results and benefits.

If Sida sees merit in such an approach, it is also recommended that a proper design process is begun during the final year of the current project to allow for these and other issues to be more fully investigated and incorporated into the future phase.

³⁸ J. LeRoy Ward, author of *Dictionary of Project Management Terms*, quoted on <http://pmtips.net/blog-new/difference-projects-programmes>.

An example of a long-term, Sida-supported programme that continues to deliver

A good example of a programme that has been supported by Sida over many years and that continues to be a one-of-a-kind programme in the region that continues to produce excellent results (and that faces similar challenges to the PACT EAC 2 in terms of staff turnover and the need for continuous capacity building to be conducted) is the AFROSAI-E programme that provides capacity building to Auditors-General in English-speaking African countries and has been running for close to 20 years.

Annex A - Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference for the Mid Term Review (MTR) of the project “Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade linkages in the East African Community 2 (PACT EAC 2)” implemented by CUTS International

Date: 15 May 2018

1. Evaluation purpose

The purpose or intended use of the evaluation is to provide evidence-based input to allow for a strategic discussion between Sweden (Sida HQ and the Embassy in Addis Ababa) and CUTS on the ongoing support, and beyond, with a specific focus on: help to assess progress of the on-going project to learn from what works well and less well and inform decisions on how project implementation may be adjusted and improved to fulfil the main objectives and poverty focus; considering possible synergies with Sida’s bilateral support in the EAC region. The primary intended users of the evaluation are inter alia: the project management team both in Geneva and Nairobi and its national partners the project management team at Sida’s Africa Department in Stockholm and the Swedish Embassy in Addis Abeba. The evaluation is to be designed, conducted and reported to meet the needs of the intended users and tenderers shall elaborate on how this will be ensured during the evaluation process. During the inception phase, the evaluator and the users will agree on who will be responsible for keeping the various stakeholders informed about the evaluation.

2. Evaluation object and scope

The evaluation object is a mid-term review of the project PACT EAC, phase II, 1 October 2015 until 31 September 2019.

Sida has been supporting CUTS International and its implementation of PACT EAC first phase (2011-2015) that contributed to create knowledge and capacity of relevant EAC stakeholders on the linkages between trade, climate change and food security policies.

Key achievements of PACT EAC includes better policy coherence between trade and climate at the national level, enhanced participation at the WTO, coordinated stakeholder responses, increased stakeholder knowledge and capacity. An external final evaluation was made of the first phase of PACT EAC and is attached to this ToR (Annex D).

PACT EAC2 builds on the previous project with a continued focus on the linkages between climate change, food security and trade but in the context of agro-processing as a result of demand from stakeholders as well as the EAC industrialisation strategy (2012-2032) that notes that agro-processing industry has the greatest growth potential in the region. Through a holistic approach to agro-value-addition which is climate-friendly, trade-oriented and promotes food security will contribute to poverty reduction. The total budget is 32 000 SEK and Sida is the sole donor to this project.

There are three specific objectives of PACT EAC2: 1) increased knowledge and capacity of national and regional stakeholders on agro-value addition vis-à-vis climate change, food security and trade to contribute to holistic policies and their implementation; 2) increased knowledge and capacity to negotiate in the WTO and UNFCCC on issues related to agro-value addition in a coherent manner and 3) improved communication and coordination between and across stakeholders at national, regional and multilateral levels for holistic approaches and regular information flow between and across stakeholders.

CUTS International Geneva is implementing the project together with other partners such as CUTS International Nairobi (national activities in Kenya, coordinate regional activities in EAC and facilitate for other national partners), EAC secretariat as regional partner and national country partners include Burundi: Action, Développement et Intégration Régionale (ADIR), Rwanda: ACORD Rwanda, Tanzania: Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF), Uganda: Southern and Eastern African Trade, Information and Negotiations Institute (SEATINI). On top of that CUTS has MoU with Sida-supported Trapca that is performing some of the training and has collaboration with several international organisations.

3. Evaluation objective and questions

The objective of this evaluation is to make a mid-term evaluation mainly to assess the effectiveness and impact of the implementation of PACT EAC2 and formulate recommendations to CUTS and Sida on appropriate revisions of programme design, methodology in order to achieve set goals;

The evaluation questions are:

Effectiveness

To which extent have the project contributed to intended outcomes? If so, why? If not, why not?

Sustainability

Is it likely that the benefits of the project are sustainable?

Questions are expected to be developed in the tender by the tenderer and further developed during the inception phase of the evaluation.

The evaluation shall also make an assessment of the following mainstreaming questions:

Has the project contributed to poverty reduction? How?

Has the project had any positive effects on gender equality? Could gender mainstreaming have been improved in planning, implementation or follow up?

For further information, the project proposal is attached. The scope of the evaluation and the theory of change of the project/programme shall be further elaborated by the evaluator in the inception report.

4. Evaluation approach and methods for data collection and analysis

It is expected that the evaluator describes and justifies an appropriate evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection in the tender. The evaluation design, methodology and methods for data collection and analysis are expected to be fully presented in the inception report. A clear distinction is to be made between evaluation approach/methodology and methods.

Sida's approach to evaluation is utilization-focused which means the evaluator should facilitate the entire evaluation process with careful consideration of how everything that is done will affect the use of the evaluation. It is therefore expected that the evaluators, in their tender, present i) how intended users are to participate in and contribute to the evaluation process and ii) methodology and methods for data collection that create space for reflection, discussion and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

Evaluators should take into consideration appropriate measures for collecting data in cases where sensitive or confidential issues are addressed, and avoid presenting information that may be harmful to some stakeholder groups.

5. Organisation of evaluation management

This Mid-term review is commissioned by the Swedish Embassy in Addis Abeba. The intended users are Sida staff at both HQ and the Embassy in Addis as well as CUTS International and its partners. The intended users of the evaluation form a steering group, including relevant staff at Sida HQ and the Embassy in Addis as well as CUTS Geneva and Nairobi, which has contributed to and agreed on the ToR for this evaluation. The role of the steering group is to discuss the inception report and the final report of the evaluation. The steering group will be participating in the start-up meeting of the evaluation as well as in debriefing workshop where preliminary findings and conclusions are discussed (draft report). However, it is the responsibility of Sida/the Embassy to evaluate the proposals and award the best suitable consultant for the assignment as well as approving the final report.

6. Evaluation quality

All Sida's evaluations shall conform to OECD/DAC's Quality Standards for Development Evaluation¹. The evaluators shall use the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation². The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the evaluation process.

7. Time schedule and deliverables

It is expected that a time and work plan is presented in the tender and further detailed in the inception report. The evaluation shall be carried out starting from May 2018.

The timing of any field visits, surveys and interviews need to be settled by the evaluator in dialogue with the main stakeholders during the inception phase.

The table below lists key deliverables with tentative time-frames, for the evaluation process.

Time-plan

The table below lists key deliverables with tentative dates, for the evaluation process.

Deliverables	Participants	Deadlines
Start-up virtual meeting (to discuss the proposal and time plan)	Consultants, steering group	One week after the appointment of the consultant
Draft inception report	Consultant develop the method and work plan for the MTR process	One week after the Start-up meeting
Comments on inception report	Consultants and Steering Group	One week after delivery of the draft report
Final inception report	Consultants to developed based on the discussion in the Inception meeting	One weeks after the comments by the Steering group
Field work	Consultants with coordination and facilitation by Steering Group	Starting from the Final inception report
Draft evaluation report	Consultants, Steering group	After finalisation of the field work
Comments from Steering group during a debriefing work shop (virtual meeting)	Steering group	Within one week of the receipt of the draft evaluation report
Final evaluation report	Consultants	Within one week of the receipt of the comments by the intended users on the draft evaluation report. Final report at the latest by 31 of August 2018.

¹ DAC Quality Standards for development Evaluation, OECD 2010

² Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Sida in cooperation with OECD/DAC, 2014

The inception report will form the basis for the continued evaluation process and shall be approved by Sida before the evaluation proceeds to implementation. The inception report should be written in English and cover evaluability issues and interpretations of evaluation questions, present the methodology, methods for data collection and analysis as well as the full evaluation design. A clear distinction between evaluation methodology and methods for data collection shall be made. A specific time and work plan for the remainder of the evaluation should be presented which also cater for the need to create space for reflection and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

The final report shall be written in English and be professionally proof read. The final report should have clear structure and follow the report format in the Sida Decentralised Evaluation Report Template for decentralised evaluations (Annex C). The methodology and methods for data collection and analysis shall be clearly described and explained in detail and a clear distinction between the two shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. Findings shall flow logically from the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings and analysis. Recommendations and lessons learned shall flow logically from conclusions. Recommendations should be specific, directed to relevant stakeholders and categorised as a short-term, medium-term and long-term. The report should be no more than max 35 pages excluding annexes (including Terms of Reference and Inception Report). In addition, it shall contain an executive summary of maximum 5 pages. The evaluator shall adhere to the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation³.

The evaluator shall, upon approval of the final report, insert the report into the Sida Decentralised Evaluation Report for decentralised evaluations and submit it to Nordic Morning (in pdf-format) for publication and release in the Sida publication data base. The order is placed by sending the approved report to sida@nordicmorning.com, always with a copy to the Sida Programme Officer as well as Sida's evaluation unit (evaluation@sida.se). Write "Sida decentralised evaluations" in the email subject field and include the name of the consulting company as well as the full evaluation title in the email. For invoicing purposes, the evaluator needs to include the invoice reference "ZZ610601S," type of allocation "sakanslag" and type of order "digital publicering/publikationsdatabas.

1. Evaluation Team Qualification

The evaluation team must have relevant academic background and expertise within the area of international trade policy and English language skills. The team should desirably have specific experience of work within the field of trade and agriculture and trade and climate change/environment.

A CV should be included in the call-off response for each team member and contain a full description of the evaluators' qualifications and professional work experience.

It is important that the competencies of the individual team members are complimentary and it is highly recommended that local consultants are included in the team.

The evaluators must be independent from the evaluation object and evaluated activities, and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

2. Resources

The maximum budget amount available for the evaluation is SEK 500 000. The Program Officer/contact person at the Swedish Embassy in Addis Ababa is Mr. Ulf Ekdahl, ulf.ekdahl@gov.se. The contact person should be consulted if any problems arise during the evaluation process.

Relevant PACT EAC documentation will be provided by the CUTS contact person Executive Director Mr. Rashid Kaukab, rsk@cuts.org. Relevant Sida documentation will be provided by Programme Officer at Sida HQ Rebecca Ygberg Amayra, rebecca.ygbergamayra@sida.se.

Contact details to intended users (cooperation partners, Swedish Embassies, other donors etc.) will be provided by the CUTS and the embassy.

The consultant will be required to arrange the logistics with assistance from CUTS regarding booking of interviews, preparation of visits etc.

Annex A: List of key documentation

All relevant strategy documents, program documents and reports will be distributed by the Embassy contact person and CUTS, including *inter alia* CUTS proposal 2015-2019, CUTS previous program PACT EAC1 including MTR and final evaluation, CUTS strategic reports, annual reports, annual work plans and budgets, financial reports, Sida regional strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa 2016-2021 including Sida Plan for Operationalisation of the strategy.

Annex B: Data sheet on the evaluation object

Information on the evaluation object (i.e. intervention, strategy, policy etc.)	
Title of the evaluation object	Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade linkages in the East African Community 2 (PACT EAC 2)
ID no. in PLANIt	51050099
Dox no./Archive case no.	
Activity period (if applicable)	October 2015- 30 September 2019
Agreed budget (if applicable)	32 000 000 SEK
Main sector	Market development
Name and type of implementing organisation	CUTS International
Aid type	Project support/Grant Agreement
Swedish strategy	Strategy for Sweden's regional development cooperation in Sub-Saharan Africa 2016-2021

Information on the evaluation assignment	
Commissioning unit/Swedish Embassy	Swedish Embassy in Addis Ababa
Contact person at unit/Swedish Embassy	Ulf Ekdahl

Timing of evaluation (mid-term review, end-of-programme, ex-post or other)	Mid-term review
ID no. in PLANIt (if other than above).	Xxxxxxxx

Annex C: Decentralised evaluation report template Annex D: Project documents

³ Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Sida in cooperation with OECD/DAC, 2014

Annex B – Documents

1. CUTS International: SIDA Grant Agreement (October 21, 2015)
2. CUTS International: Strategic Business Plan (2014-2018)
3. CUTS International: Organisational Chart
4. CUTS Kenya: Organisational Chart
5. CUTS International: PACT EAC2 – The Nexus of Climate Change, Food Security & Trade: Case of East Africa – Presentation at UNEA Conference (20160922)
6. CUTS International: Climate, Food, Trade: Where is The Policy Nexus? Lessons from the East African Community (2013)
7. PACT EAC2: Second Revised Project Proposal (8 July 2015)
8. PACT EAC2: Results Framework
9. PACT EAC 2: Developing Coherent Policies & Programmes in the East African Community – Regional Training Manual (2014)
10. PACT EAC2: Planned Activities (October 2016-March 2017)
11. PACT EAC2: Work Plan – Year 2 (April 2016-March 2017)
12. PACT EAC2: Work Plan – Year 3 (April 2017-March 2018)
13. PACT EAC2: Work Plan – Year 4 (April 2018-March 2019)
14. PACT EAC2: Results Progress Report 1 (October 2015-March 2016)
15. PACT EAC2: Results Progress Report 2 (April 2016-March 2017)
16. PACT EAC2: Results Progress Report 3 (April 2017-March 2018)
17. PACT EAC2: Minutes of Annual Review Meeting 1 – CUTS & SIDA (August 9, 2016)
18. PACT EAC2: Minutes of Annual Review Meeting 2 – CUTS & SIDA (September 5, 2017)
19. CUTS International: PACT EAC2 - Independent Auditors Report – Mazars (October 1, 2015-March 31, 2016)
20. CUTS International: PACT EAC2 - Independent Auditors Report – Mazars (April 1, 2016-March 31, 2017)
21. PACT EAC2: Financial Report (April 1, 2017-March 31, 2018)
22. CUTS International: Action Alerts [10] – Selection/Samples
23. CUTS International: Briefing Papers [8] – Selection/Samples
24. CUTS International: Country Update Notes [4] – Selection/Samples
25. CUTS International: Rapid Response Notes [4] – Selection/Samples
26. CUTS International: Research Studies [2] – Selection/Samples
27. CUTS International: website - http://www.cuts-geneva.org/pacteac2/index.php /publications
28. UN FAO: The State of Food & Agriculture – Climate Change, Agriculture & Food Security (2016)
29. UN FAO: Paper Preview - Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture: Summary of Submissions (2018)
30. UN FAO & UNIDO: Brochure on the ‘Accelerator for Agriculture & Agro-Industry Development & Innovation- Partnering for the Sustainable Development Goals’ (3ADI+)
31. Discussion Paper: Cross-Cutting Climate Change: How to Integrate Climate Change into the Post-2015 Framework (Phillips, Fischler, Fuller et. Al, 2013)
32. Advanced Review: Adapting to Climate Change to Sustain Food Security (Xiervogel & Erickson; Wiley, 2010)

Annex C – People consulted

Organisation	Name	Gender	Position	Phone	Email
SWITZERLAND					
CUTS International	Rashid S. Kaukab	M	Executive Director	+41 22 734 60 80	rsk@cuts.org
CUTS International	Julian Mukiibi	M	Assistant Director	+41 22 734 60 80	jm@cuts.org
CUTS International	Julien Grollier	M	Programme Officer	+41 22 734 60 80	jg@cuts.org
CUTS International	Leslie Debornes	F	Assistant Programme Officer	+41 22 734 60 80	ldb@cuts.org
CUTS International	Josiane Rufener	F	Administrative Officer	+41 22 734 60 80	geneva@cuts.org
WTO	Anoush der Boghossian	F	WTO Trade and Gender Focal Point, Economic Affairs Officer, Aid for Trade Unit, Development Division	+41 22 739 50 75	anoush.der-boghossian@wto.org
WTO	Shishir Priyadarshi	M	Director, Development Division	+41 22 739 60 68	shishir.priyadarshi@wto.org
WTO	Wase Musonge-Ediage	F	Legal/Economic Affairs Officer	+41 22 739 60 29	wase.musonge@wto.org
UNCTAD	David Vivas Eugui	M	Legal Officer / Trade, Environment, Climate Change and Sustainable Development Branch, Division on International Trade in Goods and Services and Commodities	+41 22 917 56 42	david.vivaseugui@unctad.org
UN Environment, Economy Division	Asad Naqvi	M	Acting Head, Secretariat of the Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE) and Green Economy Advisory Unit	+41 22 917 86 20	asad.naqvi@un.org
UNCTAD	Daniel Owoko	M	Chief of Staff a.i., Office of the Secretary-General	+41 22 917 50 25 / +41 76 691 01 60	Daniel.Owoko@unctad.org
UNCTAD	Elisabeth Tuerk	F	Chief International Investment Agreements Section, Division on Investment and Enterprise	+41 79 797 7927	Elisabeth.tuerk@un.org
Kenya Mission to the UN, Geneva	Rabson Wanjala KISUYA	M	Counsellor, Trade	+41 77 926 9383	rabsonwk@gmail.com
Permanent Mission of the United Republic of Tanzania to UN	Elia Nelson Mtweve	M	Minister Counsellor / Ag. Head of Chancery	+41 77 512 8154	emtweve1977@yahoo.co.uk
Burundi Mission to Geneva	Thérèse Manirambona	F	Counsellor	+41 22 734 7705	manithreza@gmail.com
ITALY					
FAO, Rome	Jamie Morrison	M	Director and Strategic Programme Leader, Food Systems Programme	+39 0657056251	Jamie.Morrison@fao.org
BURUNDI					
ADIR	Godefroid Manirankunda	M	Director	+257 76717888 / +257 75997582	gmanirankunda@gmail.com

ANNEX C – PEOPLE CONSULTED

Organisation	Name	Gender	Position	Phone	Email
Institut Géographique du Burundi (IGEBU), Bujumbura	Renilde Ndayishimiye	F	General Director and National Climate Focal Point		renilidend@gmail.com
University of Burundi	Lambert CIZA	M	Lecturer	+257 79700321	cilam007@gmail.com
Ministry of Trade and Industry	Serges BIRI-ZANYE	M	Direction of Industrial Promotion	+257 79 92 30 92	sergebiri-zanye@yahoo.fr
KENYA					
CUTS Nairobi	Clement Onyango	M	Director	+254 733 990	cvo@cuts.org
CUTS Nairobi	Jackline Wanja	F	Young Professional	+254 20 38 62 150	jwa@cuts.org
CUTS Nairobi	Daniel Asher	M	Programme Officer	+254 20 38 62 150	doa@cuts.org
CUTS Nairobi	Collins Oweqi	M	Assistant Programme Officer	+254 20 38 62 150	coi@cuts.org
CUTS Nairobi	Kinya Idah	F	Project Assistant	+254 20 38 62 150	Kinyai-dahg@gmail.com
CUTS Nairobi	Prof. Jasper Okello	M	Chair of the Board	+254 722330983	jasper-okello@gmail.com
Climate Change Directorate	Michael Okumu	M	Senior Assistant Director	+254 733 789 825	ochiengokumu@gmail.com
Meteorology Department, Murang'a County	Paul Murage	M	Meteorology Department, Murang'a County	+254 723560802	murage@meteo.go.ke
Embassy of Sweden	Duncan Marigi	M	Programme Manager / Agriculture and Rural Development Embassy of Sweden, United Nations Crescent, Gigiri??	+254 734 626 391	duncan.marigi@gov.se
NRG Kenya	Booker Owuor	M	Research Consultant/Rural Economist – Sower Solutions Limited	+254 724 046 732	booker-was@gmail.com
NRG Kenya	Mediatix Tuju	F	Research Co-Ordinator – Collaborative Centre for Gender & Development	+254 717 541869	t.mediatix@ccgdcntr.org
NRG Kenya	Cecelia Mueni Kikoko	F	Consultant – Human Capital Resource Centre	+254 722 550138	ces@humancapital.co.ke
NRG Kenya	Doris Asembo	F	SEATINI Kenya	+254 721 525 265	N/A
RWANDA					
ACORD	Francois Muyentwari	M	Country Director	+250 788502420	fmuyentwari@gmail.com
ACORD	Vedaste Mwenende	M	In charge of Monitoring Activities	+250 788411390	mwenendev@yahoo.fr
ACORD	Prudence Mushonganana	F	Administration and Finance Officer	+250 788312874	pmushonganana@yahoo.fr
Agence Rwandaise d'Information	André Gakwaya	M	Managing Director	+250 788770270	andre.gakwaya@gmail.com
Bureau d'Appui aux Initiatives Rurales (BAIR)	Anselme Nzabonimpa	M	Executive Secretary	+250 788523126	nzabonimpaanselme@yahoo.fr
Reseau des femmes rurales	Crescence Mukantabana	F		+250 788513975	muk-acresce@gmail.com
Centrale des syndicats des travailleurs du	Jeremie Nsengiyumva	M	Executive Secretary	+250 788420647	staverorg@yahoo.fr

ANNEX C – PEOPLE CONSULTED

Organisation	Name	Gender	Position	Phone	Email
Rwanda (CES-TRAR)					
Trade and Links Ltd	John Bosco Kanyangoga	M	Expert in Trade and Regional Integration	+250 788763163	jkanyangs@yahoo.com
Independent Consultant	Protails Hakizimana	M	Consultant / Pro-poor approaches Specialist, Agriculture Policy	+250 788430733	hakiprotails@yahoo.com
RWAMREC	Venant Nzabonimana	M	Vice Chairman	+250 788523126	vioven@yahoo.fr
TANZANIA					
TRAPCA	Peter Kiuluku	M	Executive Director	+255 754 468672	peter.kiuluku@trapca.org
EAC Secretariat, Arusha	Jennifer Gache	F	Senior Industrial Engineer, Productive and Social Sectors	+254 720 344662	
Embassy of Sweden	Brasio Msugu	M	Private Sector Development	+255 686 144776 / +255 22 2196543	brasio.msugu@gov.se
Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF)	Prof. Fortunata Makenep	F	Head	+255 673 658770	fmakene@esrf.or.tz
Ministry of Industry, Trade and Investments	Dr. Primi Mmasi	F	Principle Trade Officer, Department of Policy and Planning	+255 715 060 908	nangawe@hotmail.com
East African Community, Directorate of Productive Sectors, Arusha	Eng. Ladislaus K. Leonidas	M	Principal Environment and Natural Resources Officer	+255 757 450226	kleonidas@eachq.org
Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF)	John Shilinde	M	Research Fellow; Focal Person PACT EAC	+255 786 082 655	jshilinde@esrf.or.tz
Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF)	Hosana Mpango	F	Assistant Researcher; PACT EAC Coordinator at the Strategic Research and Publications Department	+255 769 185 698	hmpango@esrf.or.tz
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	Natai Atukwatse Sheilla	F	Head of the Environment Management Unit	+255 754 893346	ai-kairuwa@gmail.com
UGANDA					
Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries, Kampala	Stephen Muwaya	M	Senior Range Ecologist, Directorate of Animal Resources	+256 77 6642536 / +256 752642536	smuwaya@yahoo.com
SEATINI-Uganda (Southern and Eastern Africa Trade Information and Negotiations Institute)	Jane S. Nalunga	F	Country Director	+256 77 2581849	jnalunga59@gmail.com
SEATINI-Uganda	Kiiza Africa	M	Program Officer	+256 71 8513760	akiiza@seatini-uganda.org
SEATINI-Uganda	Lumonya Faith	F	Program Officer	+256 75 1314826	flumonya@seatini-uganda.org
SEATINI-Uganda	Ndagire Immaculate	F	Program Support Officer	+256 75 6102430	indagire@seatini-uganda.org

ANNEX C – PEOPLE CONSULTED

Organisation	Name	Gender	Position	Phone	Email
Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives	Connie Nabutebi	F	Senior Commercial Officer	+256 77 2632463	connita2010@yahoo.com
ACTADE	Allen Lunkuse	F	Not provided	+256 70 1007065	alun-kuse@actade.org
MORIE Ltd	Tunesiime Orator M. K. Kaddio	F	CEO	+256 77 2960824	moriehoney@gmail.com
Wobulenzi Farmers's District Association, Nakaseko Maize Platform	Kirabira George	M	Not provided	+256 77 2585988	kirabi-rageorge@gmail.com
SIVU	Odony Chandes	M	Not provided	+256 77 6068773	odonychandes@gmail.com
VWONET	Sarah Ogvang	F	Not provided	+256 75 1849615	sarah@newnet.org
Emlil	Christine Mbatuusa	F	Fellow (Womens' Group)	+256 70 5532516	mbatuusachristine@gmail.com
D&M Group Int. Ltd	Dorothy Kimuli	F	Managing Partner	+256 77 2586073	dkimuli@yahoo.com
Ecclesiastes	Santa Joyce Laker	F	MD	+256 77 2498650	refeal2014@gmail.com
Youth Plus Policy Network	Miriam Talwisa	F	Programs & Partnerships Manager	+256 78 1591814	mtalwisa@yahoo.com
SEATINI-Uganda // Lily Dawes Wg. Ltd	Joseph Bukenya	M	Programme Officer	+256 77 3384052	bukenyaj87@gmail.com

Annex D – Research conducted by PACT EAC 2

ACTION ALERTS			
N°	Date	Type	Title
1	Jun. 2018	Action Alert	MSME International Day: What Sustainable Way Forward For EAC Agro-Food MSMEs?
2	May. 2018	Action Alert	Tanzania Sustainable Industrial Development Policy: Call to Include Climate Change, Food Security, and Trade Concerns
3	Mar. 2018	Action Alert	Taking Forward Gender in Trade Agreements: Any Role for the WTO?
4	Jan. 2018	Action Alert	Review of Uganda's National Industrial Policy: Case for Synergies with Climate Change, Food Security, Gender and Trade
5	Nov. 2017	Action Alert	Agriculture Breakthrough at COP23: How to Build on this Progress?
6	Nov. 2017	Action Alert	Safeguarding Regional Trade Integration in The Buy Kenya, Build Kenya Strategy
7	Oct. 2017	Action Alert	Supporting Agriculture in the Face of Climate Change: Any Role for UNFCCC?
8	Aug. 2017	Action Alert	Implementing Agro-Industry Policy: Case for a National Agro-Processing Forum under IDEC
9	Aug. 2017	Action Alert	Supporting Climate Adaptation: Any Role for the WTO?
10	Jul. 2017	Action Alert	Embodying the Brussels Forum on Women and Trade
11	Jul. 2017	Action Alert	How Can the Buy Kenya, Build Kenya Strategy Boost Agro-Processing?
12	Jun. 2017	Action Alert	Tackle Climate Challenges of Agriculture: Leveraging Technology Transfer at UNFCCC
13	Mar. 2017	Action Alert	A Climate-Smart Policy Framework For Tanzania's Agro-Industry
14	Mar. 2017	Action Alert	New Climate Bill Could Help Uplift Agro-processing, If...
15	Feb. 2017	Action Alert	Politique Industrielle: S'adapter Au Climat, Profiter Du Commerce
16	Jan. 2017	Action Alert	Why Rwanda Needs an Agro-Industry Policy
17	Jan. 2017	Action Alert	5 Ways Kenya's New Trade Policy Should Help Green Agro-Industry
18	Nov. 2016	Action Alert	Why WTO Negotiators Should Keep an Eye on COP22
19	Aug. 2016	Action Alert	5 Policy Actions Young "Agripreneurs" Need
20	Jul. 2016	Action Alert	Fisheries: When Will the WTO Contribute to SDG 14?
21	Jan. 2016	Action Alert	COP21: The Springboard for a Green Development Path in Africa?
22	Dec. 2015	Action Alert	WTO: After Export Subsidies, Time to Tackle Domestic Support
23	Nov. 2015	Action Alert	COP 21: Call to Ensure Sustainable African Development
BRIEFING PAPERS			
N°	Date	Type	Title
1	Mar. 2018	Briefing Paper	Time for a New Sustainable Industrial Development Policy in Tanzania
2	Mar. 2018	Briefing Paper	Taking forward the UNFCCC Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture
3	Feb. 2018	Briefing Paper	Buy Kenya, Build Kenya: Preserving EAC Regional Integration
4	Feb. 2018	Briefing Paper	How can Trade Help Agro-Processing Development in East Africa?

5	Jan. 2018	Briefing Paper	Leveraging Climate, Trade, and Industrial Policies to Upgrade EAC Agro-industries in Regional and Global Value Chains
6	Oct. 2017	Briefing Paper	Review of the Uganda National Industrial Policy: Synopsis of Incorporating Climate Change for Agro-processing
7	Oct. 2017	Briefing Paper	Industrial Policy: Proposed Features of a National Agro-Processing Forum under the IDEC
8	Jul. 2017	Briefing Paper	Making Buy Kenya, Build Kenya Strategy Work for Local Agro-processors
9	Mar. 2017	Briefing Paper	Addressing Fisheries Subsidies: A Quest for Sustainable Fisheries Production
10	Jan. 2017	Briefing Paper	Making Climate Adaptation Finance Work for Developing Countries
11	Jan. 2017	Briefing Paper	Greening Kenya's Trade Policy: Suggested Provisions
12	Nov. 2016	Briefing Paper	Tackling Adaptation Challenges: Critical Step towards Sustainable Energy Sectors in the EAC
13	Aug. 2016	Briefing Paper	Work Programme on Electronic Commerce: A Brief overview of its Evolution in the WTO
14	Aug. 2016	Briefing Paper	Trade as a Tool for the Economic Empowerment of Women
15	Aug. 2016	Briefing Paper	Women Agro-Processors in East Africa: Success Stories and Ways Forward
16	Jul. 2016	Briefing Paper	The Continental Free Trade Area: Enhancing Economic Development in Africa
17	May. 2016	Briefing Paper	What the Paris Climate Agreement Means to EAC Stakeholders: Reactions
18	Apr. 2016	Briefing Paper	Gendering Agro-Processing in the EAC Region

TECHNICAL NOTES

N°	Date	Type	Title
1	Jun. 2018	Note	Implementing Adaptation Strategies to Climate Change: State of Play and Stakeholders "Involvement"
2	May. 2018	Note	Public Stockholding for Food Security Programmes: State of Play in the East African Community
3	Mar. 2018	Note	Beyond the 11th WTO Ministerial Conference: Issues and Interests of the East African Community Members
4	Mar. 2018	Note	Socio-economic Impacts of Climate Change on EAC Agriculture: Can UNFCCC Negotiators Support Farmers and Agro-processors?
5	Feb. 2018	Note	An Overview of the WTO Work Programme on Electronic Commerce
6	Dec. 2017	Note	Towards MC11: A Synopsis of Small Developing Countries and LDCs Interests
7	Nov. 2017	Note	How can Africa Agenda 2063 Leverage Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMs)?
8	Nov. 2017	Note	What are the Possible Features of EAC Adaptation Communication?
9	Sep. 2017	Note	Fishery sector in the WTO and UNFCCC: Outlining a Synergetic Approach
10	Jul. 2017	Note	The WTO Negotiations on Fisheries Subsidies: Interests of the East African Community
11	May. 2017	Note	Domestic Support in Agriculture: Challenges and Opportunities for East Africa at the WTO
12	May. 2017	Note	Agriculture-related Actions of EAC NDCs: Technology as a Means of Implementation
13	Mar. 2017	Note	Negotiating Trade and Investment in the WTO: A Historical Review of Multilateral Negotiations to Regulate Foreign Investment

14	Mar. 2017	Note	Technology Mechanism After Marrakesh: Enhancing Climate Technology Development and Transfer to Developing Countries
15	Jan. 2017	Note	Liberalising Government Procurement in the Multilateral Trading System
16	Dec. 2016	Note	Integrating Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises in International Trade
17	Nov. 2016	Note	Climate Finance: Where are UNFCCC Parties at, Where Should They be Headed?
18	Sep. 2016	Note	Work Programme on Electronic Commerce: A brief overview of its evolution in the WTO
19	Aug. 2016	Note	Trade and Climate: Are their Interlinkages Taken into Account in the WTO and UNFCCC Systems?
20	Aug. 2016	Note	Effective Participation of Developing Countries and LDCs in Global Value Chains
21	May. 2016	Note	Effective implementation of Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs): critical role of the Ad-hoc working group on the Paris Agreement (APA) and relevant actions to be taken by members
22	May. 2016	Note	Cotton, Textile and Apparel Sector in the EAC: Value Chain Analysis and Trade Concerns
23	Mar. 2016	Note	Following the UNFCCC Paris Agreement: Next Steps for 2016
24	Mar. 2016	Note	Competition Policy at the WTO: A Snapshot
25	Jan. 2016	Note	The WTO Nairobi Ministerial Outcome: Reflections for East African Countries

RESEARCH STUDIES

N°	Date	Type	Title
1	Feb. 2017	Research Study	Développer l'Agro-industrie: Aspects Climatiques et Commerciaux Vers la Sécurité Alimentaire au Burundi
2	Feb. 2017	Research Study	Agro-industrial Development Policies: What Nexus to Climate, Food Security, and Trade? - Kenya
3	Feb. 2017	Research Study	Agro-industrial Development Policies: What Nexus to Climate, Food Security, and Trade? - Rwanda
4	Feb. 2017	Research Study	Agro-industrial Development Policies: What Nexus to Climate, Food Security, and Trade? - Tanzania
5	Feb. 2017	Research Study	Agro-industrial Development Policies: What Nexus to Climate, Food Security, and Trade? - Uganda

RAPID-RESPONSE NOTES

N°	Date	Type	Title
1	Mar. 2018	Research Study	Agriculture Negotiations at the UNFCCC: What to be pursued for East African Community Member States' interests?
2	Feb. 2017	Research Study	The Impact of Second Hand Clothes and Shoes in East Africa
3	Sep. 2016	Note	Taking Stock of INDCs: Potential Trade Impacts for East Africa
4	Sep. 2016	Research Study	Accounting Guidance for Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs)
5	Jul. 2016	Note	The Impacts of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and E-commerce on Bilateral Trade Flows

EVENTS

N°	Date	Type	Title
1	Jun. 2018	Event	Implementing Adaptation Strategies to Climate Change
2	May. 2018	Event	Public Stockholding for Food Security Programmes

3	May. 2018	Event	Taking Forward Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture: Implications for Africa
4	Mar. 2018	Event	Beyond the 11th Ministerial Conference: Issues and Interests of the East African Community Members
5	Mar. 2018	Event	Pre-SBSTA/SBI48 Strategy Meeting on Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture: EAC Climate Change Negotiators' Workshop
6	Mar. 2018	Event	Leveraging UNFCCC Agriculture Support Mechanisms to Tackle Climate Change
7	Mar. 2018	Event	Burundi Climate Workshop: Developing a UNFCCC Submission on Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture
8	Mar. 2018	Event	East Africa: Five Countries, Five Policy Pathways to Sustainable Agro-Processing
9	Feb. 2018	Event	Post-MC11 WTO Work Programme of E-Commerce
10	Dec. 2017	Event	Ensuring Sustainability through a Nexus Approach: Climate Change, Trade and Food Security
11	Dec. 2017	Event	East Africa's Stakes at the WTO 11th Ministerial
12	Nov. 2017	Event	Leveraging the WTO Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMs) Agreement to Spur Industrialization
13	Nov. 2017	Event	Implementing Adaptation Strategies to Climate Change
14	Sep. 2017	Event	Interlinkages of Climate Change and Fisheries
15	Sep. 2017	Training	Advancing EAC Interests in Climate Change Negotiations: Linkages with Agriculture and Trade
16	Sep. 2017	Event	Time for Climate-aware, Trade-driven and Food Security-enhancing Agro-industry policies
17	Aug. 2017	Event	Climate, Food, Trade Nexus with Agro-processing
18	Jul. 2017	Event	WTO Fisheries Subsidies Negotiations: Main Issues and Interests of the East African Community
19	May. 2017	Event	Addressing Domestic Support Measures in the WTO: What is at Stake for East Africa?
20	May. 2017	Event	Leveraging Technology Development and Transfer to Tackle Climate Change
21	Mar. 2017	Event	Trade and Investment in the Multilateral Trading System
22	Mar. 2017	Event	From Research to Policies: Advocacy for Climate-aware, Trade-driven and Food security-enhancing Agro-Processing
23	Mar. 2017	Event	Leveraging Technology Development and Transfer to Tackle Climate Change
24	Jan. 2017	Event	Assessing the Potential Impacts of Liberalizing Government Procurement
25	Dec. 2016	Event	Participation of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in International Trade
26	Nov. 2016	Event	Review of International Climate Support Mechanisms
27	Sep. 2016	Event	Work Programme on E-Commerce
28	Sep. 2016	Event	Where does Agro-processing Meet Trade, Climate Change and Food Security?
29	Aug. 2016	Event	Sectors for the Future: Can Agro-Processing and Trade Feed East Africa Despite Climate Change?
30	Aug. 2016	Event	Potential Trade Impacts of the Paris Agreement
31	Aug. 2016	Event	Integrating East African Priority Sectors in Global Value Chains
32	May. 2016	Event	Dealing with Agricultural issues after the Paris Agreement: views on the EAC INDCs and the way forward
33	May. 2016	Event	Integrating the EAC Cotton, Textile and Apparel Sector in Global Value Chains
34	Apr. 2016	Event	Agro-Processing: What Relations with Climate, Food and Trade?
35	Mar. 2016	Event	Paris Climate Agreement: What do East African Stakeholders Think?
36	Mar. 2016	Event	Competition Policy: One of the WTO's "New issues"?



Mid-Term Review of the Project 'Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade Linkages in the East African Community 2 (PACT EAC 2)'

This report, which has been commissioned from NIRAS Sweden by Sida Headquarters in Stockholm, presents a mid-term review of the Project 'Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade Linkages in the East African Community 2 (PACT EAC 2)'. The project and activities are adjudged as highly relevant at the start of implementation in late 2015 have remained relevant in the period under review. The project has made good progress with implementation of activities and has been very effective and efficiently implemented. There are good examples of positive outcomes and impact, but sustainability is low and the project will not be able to continue beyond its current phase (ending September 2019 without additional donor support).

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

