

Independent Evaluation

EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY

**Trade Capacity Building in agro-industry products for
the establishment and proof of compliance with
international market requirements in EAC**



UNITED NATIONS
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

UNIDO EVALUATION GROUP

Independent Evaluation

EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY

Trade Capacity Building in agro-industry products for the establishment and proof of compliance with international market requirements in EAC

UNIDO project: TE/RAF/06/014

Funded by the
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION
Vienna, 2011

Distr. GENERAL

ODG/EVA/11/R.54

December 2011

Original: English

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

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

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

This document has not been formally edited.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	V
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	IX
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. PROJECT SUMMARY.....	2
2. EAC AND PROJECT CONTEXT	5
2.1. EAC AND PROJECT CONTEXT AT THE START OF THE PROJECT.....	5
2.2. CHANGES IN EAC CONTEXT SINCE PROJECT INCEPTION.....	9
2.3. OTHER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS.....	14
3. PROJECT PLANNING	21
3.1. STRENGTHS OF THE ORIGINAL DESIGN.....	21
3.2. WEAKNESSES OF THE ORIGINAL DESIGN.....	22
3.3. DESIGN CHANGES IN MID-TERM REVIEW.....	23
3.4. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK.....	24
3.5. ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS.....	25
4. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	27
4.1. INTRODUCTION.....	27
4.2. MANAGEMENT.....	28
4.3. USE OF INPUTS AND OUTPUTS.....	30
4.4. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.....	31
4.5. MONITORING AND EVALUATION.....	33
5. ASSESSMENT	35
5.1. RELEVANCE.....	35
5.2. OWNERSHIP.....	38
5.3. EFFICIENCY.....	39
5.4. EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT.....	42
5.5. SUSTAINABILITY.....	61
6. RECOMMENDATIONS	69
7. LESSONS LEARNED	73
ANNEX 1 LIST OF PERSON CONSULTED DURING EVALUATION MISSION PROCESS	74
ANNEX 2 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	78
ANNEX 3 TERMS OF REFERENCE INDEPENDENT EVALUATION	86

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team acknowledges with appreciation the cooperation of the TCB project management at UNIDO Headquarters (HQ) in Vienna and in the East African Community (EAC) partner states. The team also acknowledges with appreciation the cooperation and comments of the EAC secretariat, the intermediary and direct beneficiaries, other stakeholders and donors consulted during the evaluation process.

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACP	Africa, Caribbean and Pacific
AfDB	Africa Development Bank
AFIPEK	Kenya Fish Processors and Exporters Association
AU	African Union
BBN	Burundi Bureau of Standards and Quality Control
BRC	British Retail Consortium
CCIA	Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture, Tanzania
CODEX	Codex Alimentarius Commission
COMESA	Common Market of Eastern and Southern Africa
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
CU	Customs Union
CU FTA	Customs Union Free Trade Area
COPE	Centre of Phytosanitary Excellence
DANIDA	Danish Development Agency
DVS	Department of Veterinary Services
DPP	Department of Plant Protection
DFID	UK Department of Development Aid
EABC	EAC Business Council
EAC	East African Community
EAC-DS	East African Community Development Strategy
EC	European Community
EDF	European Development Fund
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
ESA	East and Southern Africa
ET	Evaluation Team
EU	European Union
FACAGRO	Faculté de Sciences Agronomiques
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
FPEAK	Fresh Produce Exporters Association of Kenya
FTA	Free Trade Area
FSMS	Food Safety Management System
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit - the Federal German Development Agency
GMP	Good Manufacturing Practice
GHP	Good Hygiene Practice
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points
HCDA	Horticultural Crops Development Authority
HQ	Headquarters
IBAR	Inter-African Bureau of Animal Resources
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
ISO	International Organization for Standardization

KEBS	Kenya Bureau of Standards
KEPHIS	Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate
LDC	Least developing countries
MAFC	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Cooperatives
MAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Uganda
MoAL	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, Burundi
MFD	Ministry of Fisheries Development, Kenya
MHSW	Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, Tanzania
MIHRS	Ministry of Health for Food Safety, Rwanda
MINICOM	Ministry of Trade and Industry, Rwanda
MITM	Ministry of Industry, Trade and Marketing, Tanzania
MLD	Ministry of Livestock Development, Kenya
MLDF	Ministry of Livestock Development and Fisheries
Mol	Ministry of Industrialization, Kenya
MoT	Ministry of Trade, Kenya
MoTU	Ministry of Tourism, Uganda
MRL	Minimum residue limit
MTIC	Ministry of Trade Industry and Cooperatives, Uganda
MTIPT	Ministry of Trade, Industry, Posts and Tourism, Burundi
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NBSs	National Standardization Bodies
NDA	National Drug Authority, Uganda
NEP	National Enquiry Point
NIPH	National Institute of Public Health
NLFC	National Laboratory of Food Chemistry
NNA	National Notification Authority
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NQS	National Quality System
NSC	National Steering Committee
NTBs	Non-tariff Barriers
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OIE	Organization for Animal Health- Office International des Epizooties
PTB	Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt – German Metrology Institute
RARDA	Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, Rwanda
RBS	Rwanda Bureau of Standards
REC	Regional Economic Cooperation
RPC	Regional Project Coordinator
RPSC	Regional Project Steering Committee
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SADCAS	Southern Africa Development Community Accreditation Services
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary
SQMT	Standards, Quality, Metrology and Testing
STDF	Standards and Trade Development Facility

TA	Technical assistance
TBS	Tanzania Bureau of Standards
TBT	Technical Barriers to Trade
TCB	Trade Capacity Building
TFDA	Tanzania Food and Drug Authority
TFTA	Tripartite Free Trade Agreement
TMEA	Trade Mark East Africa
TOR	Terms of Reference
UoN	University of Nairobi
UMA	Uganda Manufacturers Association
UNBS	Uganda National Bureau of Standards
UNCCI	Uganda National Chamber of Commerce and Industry
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Executive summary

The project under evaluation was launched initially in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda in December 2006 with an expected completion date of 30 August 2009. It was extended to Burundi and Rwanda in May 2008 and the completion date was extended twice to 30 August 2011 and to 15 December 2011. The total operational project budget of Euro 3,181,939 has been funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) with some contribution from UNIDO.

This independent evaluation was conducted by an independent Evaluation Team (ET) contracted by the UNIDO Evaluation Group. The ET began its work in August 2011 with review of project documentation and a debriefing at UNIDO HQ. This was followed by a field mission to the EAC Partner states in September/October after which the ET gave a debriefing to the EAC Secretariat and subsequently to the Project Managers (PMs) at UNIDO HQ on October 20 2011.

The ET estimates that to date the EAC project has completed about 90 per cent of its planned activities in the revised log frame following the Mid Term Review (MTR). It is expected that most of the remaining activities will be completed before the project ends. Most planned outputs should be delivered with the exception of those in relation to the World Trade Organization (WTO) Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) National Notification Authorities (NNA) and WTO National Enquiry Points (NEPs).

At regional level the SPS Protocol has been drafted with project support and is expected to be ratified by EAC Partner states within the next 6 to 12 months. Harmonized trade related SPS measures have been prepared covering animal and plant health and form annexes to the SPS Protocol. Harmonized trade related food safety standards have also been prepared as an annex. Similarly the project has supported the drafting of at least 3 harmonized food measures. The SPS Protocol will, when ratified, put in place the regional infrastructure that will enhance the efforts of the EAC Secretariat to promote regional harmonization of SPS measures and food safety standards in accordance with EAC's regional integration goals to promote intra EAC trade. As the SPS measures and food safety standards are also harmonized with international standards it will also facilitate EAC trade within the WTO multilateral trading system.

The EAC Business Council (EABC) has been assisted in developing public private sector dialogue on SPS issues and food safety standards with a view to raising awareness and removing non-tariff barriers (NTBs) in intra EAC trade. Food safety weeks held in all EAC countries have contributed to raising

awareness among stakeholders in the national food chain from 'farm to fork'. These are likely to become annual events in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and possibly Rwanda and will have a synergistic effect in raising awareness at regional level.

At national level, the national food safety institutions were supported to effectively harmonize SPS measures at the same time as drafting the SPS protocol. They were also assisted in beginning the process of developing national food safety policies aligned with international best practice and in putting the institutional structures and administrative procedures in place to carry out official food safety controls. While this process is on-going and not yet completed, the combined effect of the various activities of the project has raised awareness of the importance of this issue.

Testing laboratories in all EAC countries have been provided with equipment to strengthen their capacity to provide conformity assessment services to exporters in line with international standards. The new equipment allows them to carry out tests to assess if food products meet microbiological criteria and chemical maximum residue limits (MRLs) and they are expected to proceed to ISO 17025 accreditation for various product tests. Although the laboratories will not be accredited within the time frame of the project, the ET is confident that this objective will be achieved in 2012. The ET is also confident that the intervention will be sustainable as the laboratories appear to have good governance and funding in place for maintenance of the equipment and reference materials.

At least five food enterprises in Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda supported by the project for certification to ISO22000 have either achieved this objective or will do so within 2012. In Burundi it is also expected that four enterprises will implement the hazard analysis critical control point (HACCP) food safety management system. The project was the catalyst for the enterprises to seek to improve their food safety management systems (FSMS) which suggest that the intervention is also sustainable at company level.

The outputs of the project were complementary to TA of other donors in the same area of intervention. The project also cooperated extensively with other donors in implementing activities at regional and national level.

The EAC project can be considered a success in terms of the achievements noted above. However, the slow start of the project led to serious delays of 15 to 18 months. These delays were caused by a number of factors including difficulties in communication with the EAC Secretariat; difficulties in coordinating implementation at regional and national level; slowness in putting a regional and national management structure in place; slowness in selecting the laboratories, and implementing the capacity needs assessment and procurement process;

slowness in selecting the enterprises to support for certification to ISO 22000 and management of the process; logistic errors in shipping the laboratory equipment to Kenya and Tanzania; and the inclusion of Rwanda and Burundi which necessitated design changes. Weaknesses in project design also necessitated redesign and contribute to the difficulties in coordinating implementation at regional and national level and to the management inefficiencies noted above. These delays represent a significant opportunity cost to the intermediary and direct beneficiaries of the project.

The design weaknesses stemming from insufficient problem and stakeholder needs analyses missed to identify the complexity of the issues at stake and resulted in invalid assumptions and inadequate project targets, time frame and resources.

The initial design weaknesses were addressed towards the end of 2009 with a change of project management at UNIDO HQ and the appointment of a new Regional Project Coordinator (RPC) and Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) who conducted a Mid-Term Review (MTR), revised the log frame and reduced the scope of outputs and activities taking into account the remaining project time frame and budget. The RPC and CTA improved communication and strengthened regional and national stakeholder participation. These changes ensured the ultimate success of the project.

While ownership was weak during the early years, by the time of the evaluation ownership by the intermediary beneficiaries and the direct beneficiary was clearly high. This is attributable to the revised log frame and new activity design which required a more proactive participation by the beneficiaries. The EAC Secretariat had a high sense of ownership following on the successful drafting of the SPS Protocol which was an EAC strategic goal.

While it is expected that Outcome 2 will be fully achieved, Outcome 1 will be achieved in regard to the SPS protocol but not in relation to the harmonization of conformity assessment procedures because the harmonized food standards do not include conformity assessment procedures. Full achievement of Outcome 1 would require harmonization of conformity requirements and procedures between EAC Partners states.

Overall the project will contribute to the achievement of the Project objective and the Project development goal. However neither can be fully achieved until the SPS Protocol is ratified and implemented in each EAC Partner state.

It is recommended that UNIDO continues to support the EAC Secretariat for ratification and subsequent implementation of the SPS Protocol by EAC Partner states. It is also recommended that UNIDO should develop separate national

interventions to assist EAC Partners harmonize the regulatory framework with the SPS protocol. This should include harmonization of the legislative framework, the institutional structure and the administrative procedures of the national food safety management systems with best international standards and practice.

Recommendations

- It is recommended that UNIDO and NORAD continue to support the EAC Secretariat for ratification and subsequent implementation of the SPS Protocol by EAC Partner states.
- It is also recommended that UNIDO and NORAD should develop separate national interventions to assist EAC Partners harmonize the regulatory framework with the SPS protocol.

At a general level, this evaluation confirmed the recommendations of the recent Thematic Evaluation of UNIDO SMTQ interventions:

- For increased flexibility and efficiency, regional interventions should be implemented at regional level and national interventions at national level.
- SMTQ projects are not only relevant for TCB but also for national food safety and consumer protection and should be planned accordingly by a comprehensive approach.
- All project formulations should include comprehensive problem and stakeholder analyses.

1. Introduction

This independent evaluation of the UNIDO project *'Trade Capacity Building project in agro-industry products for the establishment and proof of compliance with international market requirements in EAC'* was by carried out by an independent Evaluation Team (ET) consisting of Mr Colm Mr Halloran, Team Leader, Mr Sam Kuloba Watasa, Evaluation Expert, and Ms Michaela Fleischer, Junior Evaluation Expert.

The objective of the evaluation as per the terms of reference (TOR) is to assess:

- Project relevance with regard to the priorities and policies of the EAC Secretariat and its Partner states, NORAD and UNIDO;
- Project effectiveness in terms of the outputs produced and outcomes achieved as compared to those planned;
- Efficiency of implementation: quantity, quality, cost and timeliness of UNIDO and counterpart inputs and activities;
- Prospects for development impact; and
- Long-term sustainability of the results and benefits.

A copy of the TOR may be seen in annex 3.

The ET commenced their task in early August 2011 with a review of available project documents, EAC policy documents, and reports of other donors. A web based survey among the companies who benefited from Output 2.5 was also carried out this time and the ET prepared sample questions to guide the interview process during the field mission. The full list of documents consulted may be seen in Annex 2.

The ET was briefed at UNIDO Headquarters (HQ) in Vienna by the UNIDO Project Managers (PMs), Ms Muge Dolun and Mr Dejene Tezera. The CTA, Mr Rene Frechet participated via a conference call. The Junior Evaluation Expert also joined these discussions.

Between September 20st 2011 and October 19th 2011 the ET conducted the field mission covering Nairobi (Kenya), Kampala (Uganda), Bujumbura (Burundi), Kigali (Rwanda) and Dar es Salaam (Tanzania). The field mission was finalized in consultation with the EAC Secretariat in Arusha Tanzania on 17th -18th October 2011. A list of persons consulted may be seen in Annex 1.

The ET drew up preliminary findings and presented them at a debriefing session for the EAC Secretariat on 18th October 2011. This was attended by Dr. Flora Musonda, Director for Trade, Customs and Trade Directorate, EAC, Mr Willy Musinguzi, Principal Standards Officer, Customs and Trade Directorate, EAC and Mr Timothy E.O. Wesonga, Principal Livestock and Fisheries Officer, Customs and Trade Directorate, EAC, Dr. Ananias Bagumire, UNIDO RPC and the CTA.

The Team Leader gave a further debriefing at UNIDO HQ in Vienna on October 22nd 2011 to Mr Peter Loewe, Senior Evaluation Officer, and Project Managers Ms. Muge Dolun and Mr. Dejene Tezera.

The ET then finalized the draft final report taking into account the contributions and comments of all stakeholders interviewed as well as the comments received at the debriefing meeting. The scope and methodology of the evaluation and the structure of the report are in accordance with the template in Annex 1 of the evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR).

1.1. Project Summary¹

Project number: TE/RAF/06/014
Title of Project: Trade Capacity Building in agro-industry products for the establishment and proof of compliance with international market requirements
Start date: December 2006 (Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania)/ May 2008 (Rwanda and Burundi)
Completion date as per original project document: 30 August 2009.
Completion date from September 2008: 30 August 2011(after the inclusion of Burundi and Rwanda).
Current completion date: 15 December 2011 (after approval of project extension)
Counterpart: EAC Secretariat in Arusha.
Executing agency: UNIDO.

Project Budget:

	Euro
Total project cost (excluding support cost) 3,077,600	3,077,600
UNIDO Programmable Funds (already approved)	261,725
Total project cost (incl. support cost/excluding UNIDO contribution)	3,181,939

¹ The summary is based on the TCB Project document and the revised log frame following the Mid Term Review.

Project objective

To establish a mutually supportive national and regional mechanism to facilitate both inter and intra-regional trade in selected strategic food products such as fruits and vegetables, coffee and tea (especially for Rwanda and Burundi) as well as fish.

Development goal/impact

To enhance inter-regional and global export performance of selected agro-products from the five EAC Partner states by establishing a mutually supportive national and regional framework for SPS compliance.

The expected outcome at the regional level is:

Outcome 1: *At the regional level, SPS Protocol is adopted, and standards and conformity assessment procedures for selected agro-products are harmonized.*

The expected outputs at the regional level are:

Output 1.1: Support the EAC Secretariat in the development and implementation of SPS protocol and harmonized SPS measures for trade

Output 1.2: Regional Awareness is raised on food safety/standards/quality issues for local consumer safety and compliance with international market requirements

The expected outcome at the national level (in each of the five countries) is:

Outcome 2: *At national level, selected conformity assessment bodies are able to provide support to agro-based enterprises and the enterprises to be able to increase export trade.*

The expected outputs at the national level (in each of the five countries) are:

Output 2.1: Technical and logistic support to National Institutions to participate effectively in regional harmonization of SPS measures;

Output 2.2: TBT and SPS Enquiry and Notification Points are provided with Technical and IT support to improve service delivery to Private sector;

Output 2.3: Selected national Chemical testing laboratory is upgraded based on needs identified and assisted to accreditation in selected scopes,

Output 2.4: Selected national Microbiology laboratory is upgraded based on needs identified and assisted to accreditation in selected scopes, and

Output 2.5: Upgrading of enterprises for selected products by applying food safety management systems.

The project focused on SPS and food products. Initially, specific emphasis was given to five food products: coffee, tea, fruits and vegetables, fish and honey. During the course of the project, dairy products, cereal grains and some other food products were included.

2. EAC and Project Context

2.1. EAC and project context at the start of the project

The EAC was established by Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda under the Treaty for the Establishment of the East African Community on the 30th November 1999. Burundi and Rwanda acceded to EAC on the 1st July, 2007.

The broad goal of the EAC is to widen and deepen cooperation among the Partner States in economic, social, and political fields although much of its activity to-date has been in the economic arena. The EAC established a Customs Union (CU) in 2005 with the goal of creating a Common Market in 2010 and Monetary Union in 2012.

Following the establishment of the CU the 'Third EAC Development Strategy' (EAC-DS) 2006-2010 was developed to facilitate the creation of the EAC Common Market in 2010. This included strategies targeted at improving agriculture products' competitiveness and food security in EAC Partner states through regional harmonization of SPS measures, food safety standards, and food safety policies. The TCB project objective, development goal and overall project design is in line with the goals and strategies of the EAC DS.

Article 38 of the CU Protocol on the Establishing of EAC CU, commits the EAC Partner states to cooperation on:

- a) Environment and natural resources management;
- b) Standardization, quality assurance, metrology and testing;
- c) Sanitary and phytosanitary measures;
- d) Intellectual property rights; and
- e) Standards and technical regulations on trade.

In particular the CU Protocol dictates that the Partner States shall conclude protocols in these areas which spell out the objectives, scope of cooperation and establish institutional mechanisms for co-operation.

EAC Partner States are committed to accept EAC protocols, policies laws etc, and are obliged by the EAC Treaty to accept them since the Treaty requires the regional legislation to supersede national ones

As the EAC Secretariat is under resourced it must rely on donor assistance to initiate and manage the process for developing the protocols. The first stage in

the process has been the development of common Protocol on standardization, quality, metrology and testing (SQMT) with the support of Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt – German Metrology Institute (PTB). This was subsequently enacted as the SQMT Act, 2006 for goods and services produced and traded within the EAC. The SQMT Act commits the EAC Partner States to apply a common SQMT policy and lays down the principles for cooperation and defined Partner States obligations in relation to the four areas of standardization. Under this Act Partner States also recognize, under a mutual recognition agreement (MRA), product certification marks issued by national standards bodies (NSBs) in other EAC Partner States as equal to their own. However EAC Partner states have been slow at implementing the SQMT Act and this process is still on-going.

In 2006 the EAC Partner States also approved 'the Approximation of Weights and Measures Acts'. This sets up the parameters and requirements for regional harmonization of legal metrology framework legislation. The EAC Sub Committee on Metrology also initiated the process of developing harmonized trade metrology technical regulations for the sale of goods. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) for the establishment of a regional accreditation system was also agreed.

A total of 494 EAC standards were harmonized by September 2007. Most of the standards are in effect 'specifications' of various products with few harmonized standards covering testing, sampling methods and labelling. 160 standards are related to food, plant or animal products. The EAC harmonized standards are generally based on international standards set by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CODEX), the International Standards Organization (ISO) and the World Organization for Animal Health- Office International des Epizooties (OIE).

However the SQMT Act does not cover SPS measures and food safety standards. It is necessary to develop a similar SPS Protocol to cover these areas to facilitate regional integration and intra EAC trade in agricultural products. It is also necessary for the same reasons to continue the process of harmonizing food quality same standards and remove non-tariff barriers (NTBs) associated with their implementation and the implementation of SPS measures and food safety standards for the same reasons.

2.1.1 EAC Partner states national institutional environments and policies

At the national level, the institutional environment and policies related to SMTQ and particularly in food safety are characterized by significant overlap of mandates and responsibilities powers and out-dated legislations that do not fall in line with international best practice. However all EAC Partner states are committed to accept EAC protocols, laws and legislations to supersede the national ones. There is also a an increasing recognition in EAC countries of the need to harmonize SPS measures, food safety standards and food standards to

operationalise the CU and Common Market and enable exporters in each country take advantage of the trade opportunities created through regional integration. The main challenge for the EAC is then to make sure that there is enough political commitment from all Partner States to develop and implement the process and ensure that the different level of current national capacities does not hamper the regional harmonization effort.

Challenges to trade in agro-food products

Harmonization of laws and regulations, including implementation of international standards in the SPS area are an essential pre-requisite for regional and international trade liberalization in food products.

Food safety and quality policy, risk analysis and the food chain approach

The existing resources in the overall food safety regulatory framework and the quality infrastructure are scarce and cooperation and coordination among the many ministries, agencies and other stakeholders involved is limited. This leads to conflicts of interests and uncertainty among agricultural enterprises as to the regulatory requirements and conformity assessment procedures for imports and exports.

The capacity of the regulatory authorities in all EAC Partners states to carry out official controls in accordance with CODEX standards, IPPC standards and OIE standards is limited and needs strengthening particularly in Rwanda and Burundi. The authorities have also few resources to promote public awareness on food safety issues and there is a low awareness of these issues not only among consumers but also among all food business enterprises and the stakeholders in the food chain from 'farm to fork'.

Conformity assessment structure

The quality infrastructure for agricultural products is underdeveloped in all EAC countries. Few testing laboratories are accredited to ISO 17025 for microbiological or chemical testing of food products. Most have funding constraints and lack capacity in equipment and personnel. These tests are necessary to support compliance of potential export commodities (coffee, tea, cashew nuts, honey, fruits and vegetables, fish and animal products, etc.) to regulatory requirements in export markets. In particular the quality infrastructure in Burundi is in its infancy.

Supply side capacity

The private sector in the agro-business sector needs support to raise awareness of the importance of international standards to meet food safety requirement in exporter markets. It also needs assistance to adopt these standards in order to improve their competitiveness and increase competitive access to regional and

global markets. This need is particularly acute as SPS measures, food safety and private sector standards in export markets are becoming increasingly stringent.

2.1.2. EAC cooperation with other Regional Economic Communities (RECs)

In 2001, the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) and Southern African Development Community (SADC) established a joint task force at Secretariat level to agree on interregional harmonization of their SQMT support programs. In 2005, this task force was expanded into a 'Tripartite Initiative' to include the EAC. Both SADC and COMESA have members in the EAC and cross membership of several Member States in each of their own organizations. The Tripartite Joint Task Force was established to develop a roadmap for closer cooperation. Regional integration is a key objective of all regional economic communities (RECs) and similar strategies have adopted by the RECs to achieve this objective. COMESA launched a CU in 2008. SADC launched a free trade area (FTA) in August 2008 with the objective of establishing to launch a CU by 2010².

UNIDO Positioning

UNIDO is the specialized UN agency supporting the industrial development of developing countries and economies in transition. UNIDO has over 40 years of global experience on issues related to industrial upgrading as well as in developing infrastructure for SMTQ and in supporting agro-industries in developing countries. UNIDO's TCB programmes are recognized as a good model for the implementation of the Aid for Trade initiative since 1997 UNIDO has provided a range of technical assistance (TA) to support developing and strengthening national quality infrastructure in developing countries. This included the joint UNIDO and ISO project 'Standard on Food Safety Management Systems in EAC countries' which provided preparatory assistance for training of trainers and awareness courses on ISO 22000 in five EAC Partner states. In Tanzania, UNIDO projects funded supported the strengthening the metrology laboratory at the Tanzanian Bureau of Standards (TBS) as part of an upgrade of the national quality infrastructure. This also included internal auditor training for Food Safety Management Systems (FSMSs) to assist nine participating companies to implement quality management systems necessary to meet the requirements of ISO 22000. In Uganda the UNIDO project 'Integrated Programmed Support to agro-processing industries' supported a co-ordinated approach to developing national food safety policy including preparing a National Food Safety bill and the National Food Safety Strategic Plan. It provided assistance to Chemiphar, a private laboratory and to the Ugandan Bureau of Standards (UNBS) microbiological and chemical laboratories for accreditation to ISO 17025 for

²The UK's Department for International Development (DFID) provide support for the Tripartite Task Force Secretariat's operations

microbiological and chemical analyses. It also assisted more than 60 food processing enterprises with introducing Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP), Good Hygiene Practice (GHP) and hazard analysis critical control points (HACCP) food safety management systems.

Through a coordinated effort at regional level the UNIDO EAC project seeks to enhance the capacity of the five EAC Partner states to participate in international trade, mainly through (1) the enhancement of enterprises' capacity to produce according to international market requirements and through (2) the strengthening of export-oriented support services, mainly relating to conformity assessment. In particular, the project will enhance the institutional capacity and services of the participating countries to implement the WTO agreements on TBT and SPS. Such regional trade capacity building and harmonization will lead not only to better access to industrialized markets, but will also facilitate intra an extra EAC trade. More specifically, the project will assess the regional and national challenges affecting the key export products, assist in establishing regional coordination mechanisms, develop a regional harmonized food safety framework and develop as well as regionally harmonized conformity assessment infrastructure.

2.2. Changes in EAC context since project inception

The accession of Burundi and Rwanda to the EAC in July 2007 was the principle change in EAC context since the initial launch of the project in 2006 and re-launch in 2008. Since then change has been limited. Progress towards deepening the EAC integration process under the CU has continued. Zero internal tariffs on intra EAC trade were introduced in January 2010. However the actualization of the CU remains incomplete as incidents of the application of NTBs as well as non-uniform application of the common external tariff continue to work against the smooth operations of the CU. It is expected that it will take at least until 2015 to fully establish a CU FTA with all NTBs eliminated.

A Common Market Protocol was signed in November 2010 and the EAC Common Market formally came into existence on July 1st 2011. The Common Market aims to build on achievements of the CU to enable the free movement of people, capital and services and abolish import duties. The EAC is also continuing to pursue its objective to establish a common currency by 2012 although at this stage given the current difficulties in the international financial it seems unlikely this can be achieved by then.

Regional harmonization of the SPS and food safety regulatory framework both in terms of the national legislative framework, the institutional and administrative procedures necessary to implement and the elimination of related NTBs are necessary if the CU and the Common Market are to operate effectively. This is critical to deepening the integration process and to creating an enabling

environment to allow exporters to compete on a level playing field in the EAC as the same time strengthen their capacity to compete effectively on global markets.

The strengthening of the national quality infrastructure in the area of STMQ is also necessary to provide internationally recognized conformity assessment and certification services to exporters and regulatory authorities responsible for ensuring compliance. This is to create an enabling environment for exporters to take advantage of trade opportunities from increased integration, to demonstrate compliance with national and international SPS regulatory requirements and compete effectively in intra and extra EAC trade. It is also necessary to enable the regulatory authorities to implement official controls on a farm to fork basis and carry out market surveillance on domestic and imported goods to ensure that food products placed on the market are fit for human consumption. Market surveillance in particular assumes a critical importance as the elimination of border controls under the CU and Common Market progresses.

EAC Partner states are committed to developing and implementing a common policy in this area. The EAC DS targeted the harmonization of regional SPS and food safety policies, SPS measures and food safety and food standards and some progress has been made in this area with the support of the TCB project. A SPS protocol to facilitate regional harmonization has been developed and is expected to be ratified by the EAC Partner states within the next 6-12 months.

EAC Partner states have also continued to implement the SQMT Act which was enacted in 2006 with the support of PTB. An additional 596 EAC regional standards have been developed since September 2007 bringing the current total to 1080 of which 187 are related to food, plant or animal products.

2.2.1 Changes in context at national level

At national level, in the areas of intervention of the Project, there appears to have been an increase in the political commitment of EAC Partner states level to develop a regional EAC mechanism to handle regional harmonization of SPS measures and food safety standards and to harmonize food standards and eliminate NTBs as is evidenced by the completion of the draft SPS Protocol, the SPS and food safety annexes to the protocol and the harmonized food standards. However it is not clear if this extends to implementing regional EAC decisions in each Partner state as PTB reports slow progress in implementing the STMQ Act by Partner States.

Additional changes in context at national level since the start of the project are the recognition in each EAC country of the need to develop national SPS and food safety policies, strengthen the regulatory framework in line with regional EAC and international standards and the need to develop an efficient

coordination mechanism for the various regulatory authorities involved in official SPS and food safety controls to avoid overlap, duplication of resources and inspections. The Project's intervention in conjunction other donor interventions in the same period have contributed the increased awareness.

However, given the numerous stakeholders involved, progress beyond recognition towards a resolution of these issues has been slow. Changes in institutional structures have contributed to the delay in all countries. Changes in government in Kenya have also slowed decision making in relation to international agreements such as approval of the EAC SPS protocol. The situation in Rwanda and Burundi is exacerbated by the limited resources in personnel, equipment and competences available to the relevant institutions compared with the other Partner states although this is less true of Rwanda where the government has provided considerable resources for institutional development and in particular for development of the Rwandan Bureau of Standards (RBS).

Quality Infrastructure

All EAC Partner states continue to push ahead with support from their governments and donors to upgrade their metrology and testing laboratories in line with international standards. However Burundi continues to be the weakest in this area and needs a major intervention in this area to bring their capacity to the level pertaining in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.

PTB has continued to support the development of product certification capacity in all EAC Partner states primarily through strengthening the NSBs in this area. However there continues to be a shortage of quality management system certification capacity in public or private sector (outside of Kenya).

2.2.2 Continued cooperation with other RECs

Progress continues towards the establishment of a FTA with other RECs. The Tripartite Task Force, headed by the Secretary Generals of COMESA and the EAC, and the Executive Secretary of SADC, has met at least twice per year. The main focus of deliberations has been the strengthening and deepening economic integration through various initiatives aimed at harmonizing policies and programs of the three RECs in the areas of trade, customs and infrastructure development, and implementing these in a coordinated manner, and wherever possible jointly.

A Tripartite Summit of Heads of State was held in Kampala, Uganda in October 2008 and a decision was made to develop a Tripartite Free Trade Agreement (TFTA) Roadmap and to roll out it out. Subsequently the Tripartite Task Force, led by the Trade Sub-Committee, has prepared a draft TFTA Roadmap and a draft agreement establishing the TFTA, including annexes on non-tariff barriers,

rules of origin, customs co-operation, transit trade and transit facilities, trade remedies, competition policy and law, standards, SPS measures, movement of business persons, Intellectual Property Rights, services negotiations, dispute settlement and institutional arrangements.

In November 2009 the Tripartite Task Force cleared the draft TFTA documents for transmission to the Partner States for consideration in preparing for the next meeting of the Tripartite Summit. The REC Partner States are in the process of reviewing the documents and proposing improvements. The main TFTA document is in the form of the draft Agreement for establishing the TFTA. It has 14 Annexes covering various complementary areas necessary for effective functioning of a regional market.

The main proposal is to establish a FTA on a tariff-free, quota-free, exemption-free basis by simply combining the existing FTAs of COMESA, EAC and SADC. It is expected that by 2012, all these FTAs will not have any exemptions or sensitive lists.

However at the 2nd Tripartite Summit held in June 2011, the Heads of State adopted a developmental approach to the tripartite integration process that will be anchored on three pillars namely:

- Market integration,
- Infrastructure Development and
- Industrial development.

The tripartite integration process is now expected to proceed in two key phases: the first phase will be for negotiations on trade in goods and movement of persons and the second phase will cover built-in agenda in services and trade-related areas.

The 3 RECs comprise 26 countries with a combined population of 527 million people, a combined Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of US\$ 624 billion, and a GDP per capita averaging US\$1,184. The 26 countries make up half of the African Union (AU) in terms of membership and just over 58% in terms contribution to GDP and 57% of the total population of the African Union.

2.2.3 EAC - EU Economic Partnership Agreement

In 2007, the EAC Partner states initialled an interim framework Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) with the European Community (EC). The framework EPA contains market access offers made by both the EAC and EC to each other. The EC market access offer consists of duty free and quota free access to imports from the EAC Partner States except for rice and sugar for which a transitional arrangement has been put in place. Exports of rice will

continue to attract a tariff until January 1st 2010 at which point it will become duty free while exports of sugar will continue to attract a tariff until 1st October 2009. Between 2008 and 2009, the EAC Partner States will be granted a quota of 15,000 tons of white sugar which is additional to the current quotas under the Sugar Protocol. A modality for continuing negotiations beyond the original deadline of 31st December 2007 was also agreed. A new timetable for negotiations was agreed – to end by July 2009. Negotiations will cover: (i) Customs and Trade Facilitation; (ii) Outstanding trade and market access issues including Rules of Origin, Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) and SPS measures; (iii) Trade in Services; (iv) Trade Related Issues namely: Competition Policy; Investment and Private Sector Development; Trade, Environment and Sustainable Development; Intellectual Property Rights; and Transparency in Public Procurement; (v) Agriculture; (vi) Dispute Settlement Mechanism and Institutional Arrangements; (vii) Economic and Development Co-operation; and (viii) Any other areas that the parties find necessary.

The Chapters on SPS and TBT are almost complete. In the area of SPS, the parties agreed to cooperate with the aim of safeguarding human, animal and plant health or life, ensuring transparency in application of SPS measures to trade, promoting technology transfer and more fundamentally establish and enhance the EAC Partner states' capacity to implement and monitor SPS standards in accordance with international best practice. In this regard, the EAC and EC agree to cooperate in helping and facilitating the compliance of EAC products with formal standards of the EU and other markets. This will include support for harmonization of SPS standards, promoting capacity in both public and private sector for sanitary control through development and implementation of quality programs, TA, harmonizing appropriate regulatory frameworks and policies between and within the parties, training and information exchange. The EAC and EC have agreed to identify and prioritize the necessary technical infrastructure, but the issue of providing such infrastructure is still subject to further negotiations.

As regards TBT, the EAC and EC agreed to cooperate in the areas of standards, technical regulations and conformity assessment, promotion of greater use of international standards in technical regulations and conformity assessments, including sector specific measures, in the Parties' territories. In addition, the EC will support EAC capacity building initiatives in the fields of standardization, conformity assessment and metrology, quality management and assurance in selected sectors of importance to the EAC.

Although both sides initially set a deadline of July 2009 for finalization of the EPA talks are still continuing. It is not clear when these will be completed.

2.3. Other technical assistance projects

A number of donors operate regional TA programs to support regional integration and have provided complementary TA in the areas of intervention of the Project since the start of the project. The principle ones are:

2.3.1 Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt

The project “Establishment of a Regional Quality Infrastructure in the East African Community” is being implemented by the EAC Secretariat and PTB. A fully functional quality infrastructure is essential for the free movement of goods within the region as well as for trade with international partners. The project is being implemented in 3 phases. The first ran from 2004 – 2006. In this phase the EAC, with the support of PTB, developed a new regional a WTO-compatible legal framework for the regional quality infrastructure with the establishment of technical subcommittees on Standardization, Quality Assurance & Accreditation, Metrology and Testing and the position of Standards Officer at the EAC Secretariat.

PTB also supported the development of the SQMT Act that was enacted by EAC in 2006 to operationalise the SQMT protocol which had been agreed by the EAC Partner states in 2001..This act makes provision for the harmonization of standards, the mutual acceptance of conformity assessments and quality marks, the establishment of competent testing and metrology laboratories, the coordination of accreditation activities and the implementation of technical regulations. This project has also supported regional harmonization of standards including food standards and capacity building for the national metrology laboratories in terms of equipment and training.

The 2nd phase has focused on supporting EAC Partner states implement the STMQ Act, it also provided TA to the metrology laboratories in EAC Partner states including Burundi and Rwanda during this phase. In Burundi, PTB assisted in setting up the legal metrology laboratory in the Burundi Bureau of Standards and Quality Control (BBN), and undertook some ISO 17025 sensitization workshops including assistance to BBN for organizational development. In Rwanda, PTB assisted RBS through the Kenya Bureau of Standards (KEBS), specifically in preparing the microbiology and chemistry laboratories for accreditation.

However progress in implementing the STMQ Act has been slow and the project were extended in 2010 with a third phase to 2013. In this phase project is continuing to support building regional capacity to implement the provisions of the act, through interventions at strategic and policy decision levels, and by giving advice to the EAC Secretariat and the top management of quality infrastructure institutions.

According to PTB, the project achieved a high level of ownership by the EAC Secretariat, and cooperated closely with other development projects including the UNIDO project. All national stakeholders and in particular the national quality infrastructure institutions have been involved in the process.

Despite the success achieved, PTB believe there remains limited awareness at the national level of the trade-related benefits that the regional quality infrastructure can offer. This has acted as a constraint on implementation of the STMQ Act.

2.3.2 Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF)

The Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) has over the past few years undertaken a series of 10 analytical studies in EAC Partner states to establish the status of SPS policies, institutional capacity and on-going technical and development assistance in all the five EAC countries. These studies assessed the need for TA with a focus on surmounting market access challenges. The studies identified gaps and requirements for national SPS interventions and form a good basis for future development assistance planning and project formulation to promote synergies and complementarities. Research was carried out in parallel on good practice in TA provided on SPS issues in the EAC in collaboration with Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)³. The STDF held regional workshops as part of this process under its Aid for Trade Initiative to synthesize the results of SPS capacity evaluations develop an inventory of technical assistance and identify “gaps” still not being addressed. Synthesizing the findings of these studies, discussing the conclusions with national stakeholders and tabulating the results provided an important opportunity for government agencies and development partners to agree on outstanding priorities.

The STDF also provides technical advice to the EAC via its cooperation with the project *‘Participation of African Nations in Sanitary and Phyto-sanitary Standard-setting Organizations’* funded by the European Commission and implemented by the African Union/Inter-African Bureau of Animal Resources (AU-IBAR). This has included, in close collaboration with the WTO, Codex, OIE and IPPC Secretariats, "training-of-trainers" workshops targeted at English- and French-speaking officials of the EAC, COMESA and SADC as well as a core selected group of African SPS experts in SPS issues.

³The STDF is a joint initiative of the FAO, OIE, World Bank, WHO and WTO in capacity building and technical cooperation aimed at raising awareness on the importance of sanitary and phyto-sanitary (SPS) issues, increasing coordination in the provision of SPS-related assistance, and mobilizing resources to assist developing countries enhance their capacity to meet SPS standards. The STDF is multi-donor funded.

The STDF assisted in setting up a regional Centre of Phyto-sanitary Excellence (COPE) in Nairobi, Kenya. The COPE was developed through a regional partnership involving leading experts from Kenya's Plant Health Inspectorate Services (KEPHIS), the University of Nairobi (UoN), the Centre for Agricultural Development. The STDF has also carried a scoping study on the establishment and functioning of EAC regional and national SPS coordination mechanisms.

The STDF project "Rwanda Horticulture Export Standards Initiative 2007-09 has supported strengthening phyto-sanitary capacity to meet export regulatory requirements for fruits, vegetables and cut- flowers.

The STDF has a policy of cooperation closely with other donors and has noted its close cooperation with UNIDO and the EAC project in its press releases.

2.3.3 Trademark East Africa (TMEA)

Trade Mark East Africa (TMEA) is a new regional initiative to strengthen trade capacity in the EAC. TMEA plans to work across the EAC to fund new businesses, develop essential infrastructure to speed up transport links, and standardize regulation across the region. It has already established offices in all EAC Partner states. It was launched in Nairobi on February 2nd 2011 by the UK Department of Development Aid (DFID) Minister Stephen O'Brien alongside the President of Burundi, Hon. Pierre Nkurunziza, and Kenya's Prime Minister, Hon. Raila Odinga.

According to DFID, TMEA's priority areas for intervention are:

- Trade policy reform
- Trade-related infrastructure
- Regional investment climate harmonization
- Export development
- Trade facilitation

Intervention will be at regional level to implement cross border projects, and at national level to support national institutional capacity for policy making and implementation and development necessary to support trade. TMEA will work EAC institutions, national governments and institutions, business and civil society organizations.

TMEA objectives are to:

- Reduce transport costs by 15%. Currently drivers are hampered by long and slow border crossings and wait days to cross borders. New projects will develop better roads and 'One stop border posts', between Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi. These new posts will use efficient

computer systems which will reduce transit times by 50%, and make trading across the region faster and easier;

- Link up tax regulations and systems, where ports and border posts across the region will be more effective at collecting customs and excise duties;
- Enable access to finance through the private sector for two key transport corridors that link Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi to Dar es Salaam and Mombasa;
- Work more effectively with East African institutions, national governments, business and civil society organizations in each country to improve the business framework across the region; and
- 60% reduction in non-tariff barriers (fees, border taxes and complex regulations) to make it easier and cheaper to do business between countries.

TMEA pilot projects have already been successful in the region. In Burundi, the Office Burundais de Recettes (OBR), who collects tax on behalf of the government, already piloted a TMEA project. Since 2009, the OBR has been reorganized and in 2010 tax revenue increased by over 25%. Motivated and skilled staff was recruited with the support of the TMEA to focus on collecting tax and reforming the country's confusing tax laws, which have now been brought in line with other East African countries.

The TMEA is still in the process of formulating its regional and national programs. It is not clear as yet the extent to which support may be provided in the areas of intervention of the UNIDO Project. However it does appear that the TMEA will support to the Burundi Bureau of Standards (BNN) to strengthen its capacity to the level of the national standards bodies (NSBs) in the other EAC Partner states⁴.

The UK government has committed funding of €100 Million between 2011 and 2015 to TMEA. This is part of the UK government's wider strategy around wealth creation, reducing barriers to market entry, and opening up cross-border trade across Africa.

TMEA has also received signed contribution agreements from other donors including Belgium, Sweden, Netherlands and Denmark. To date about €400 million has been pledged although some donors have restricted use of their funds to specific countries. In addition, a number of other investors have already signalled their interest in investing in TMEA as it will be the only vehicle available

⁴Mr. Nestor Bikorimana, Burundi NPC, notes in comments to the report that even if TMEA have agreed to fund the BBN it does not mean that support provided will be sufficient on its own to will bring the BBN to the same level as the standard institutes in the other EAC Partner states. He expects that additional office and state of the art laboratory equipment will be needed.

with the scope of engagement and impacts envisaged under the region's Aid for Trade agenda. TMEA will bring on-board additional potential donors, including new actors such as China, India and Brazil, especially as part of the transport corridor work.

2.3.4 European Union

The EU has continued to provide TA to the EAC region through its Eastern and Southern African (ESA) support programs under the 10th European Development Fund Program which is the main instrument for providing Community development aid in the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries.

At a regional level several programs support economic integration and trade, transport and communications, participation of the region in the Partnership Agreements. The main programs are as follows:

- Regional Integration Support Program (€30M)
- Regional Information and Communication Technologies Support (€21M)
- Infrastructure projects (€63.3M)
- Regional Integration Support Mechanism (€78M)

The EU has provided assistance to EAC Members under other ACP regional programs⁵. These

- The Analytical and the Capacity Building Components under Trade Com has provided TA to all the EAC Partner states in varying degrees to identify their needs, strengthen local research capacity and implement pilot projects including the area of SPS requirements:
- The "Hubs & Spokes" programme under TradeCom is a major general capacity strengthening measure which has supported Rwanda and Uganda with trade advisors to support trade policy development including SPS policy.
- Pesticides Initiative Program has assisted companies and professional organizations in Kenya and Uganda in the specific area of complying with EU rules on pesticides residues.
- Strengthening fisheries products health conditions program has provided specific support to improve sanitary conditions of fish exports. Kenya and Uganda have benefited greatly from this program to upgrade their testing laboratory infrastructure and fishery inspection procedures.
- Strengthening Food Safety Systems through SPS Measures in ACP countries has provided TA to EAC Partner states in varying degrees

⁵ SPS and quality infrastructure are not key focal points for EU intervention at nation level in EAC Member states.

towards building risk-based food and feed safety systems for exports products in line with regional, international and EU SPS requirements.

- BIZ CLIM (ACP Business Climate) initiative has supported Burundi and Uganda in this area.

The EU also provides support on SPS issues to EAC countries via the AU under their Participation in Sanitary and Phyto-sanitary Standard-setting Organizations PAN-SPSO program.

2.3.5 Other donor Initiatives

In Kenya, the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) has provided TA on SPS measures, and has supported establishing a small laboratory specifically designed for phyto-sanitary activities. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has also supported training in FSMs. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) has organized a workshop for capacity building in the plant health for the horticultural sector.

In Rwanda, the Belgium government has supported the Ministry of Agriculture to develop seeds export certification. The World Bank (WB) has provided support to the RBS for standards harmonization activities and for the purchase of laboratory equipment for testing and metrology laboratories.

3. Project Planning

To assess the initial planning, the ET had to rely on the original EAC project document and interviews with intermediary beneficiaries and stakeholders, as there are no other project scoping or formulation documents available for this period. The second TCB progress report indicates that a formulation mission was undertaken in 2004 and a report prepared but this report is unavailable. The discussions with the EAC Secretariat and government ministries and agencies in the EAC Members states suggest that an extensive consultative process with stakeholders and other donors was undertaken before launching the project in 2006 and again in 2008, albeit to a lesser extent. However the depth of analysis is not clear. Within these limitations the ET reaches the following conclusions on the strengths and weaknesses of the project planning process.

3.1. Strengths of the original design

a) Problem identification was sufficient

The Project document correctly identified and prioritized the following areas for intervention to facilitate intra and extra EAC Trade:

- a) Regional harmonization of food safety policy, SPS measures, food safety regulatory framework, and food standards necessary to eliminate regulatory NTBs;
- b) Upgrade of conformity assessment quality infrastructure to enable exporters take competitive advantage of opportunities in intra and extra EAC trade; and
- c) Upgrade food safety operating standards of local food processing enterprises to the level of HACCP implementation and certification to ISO 22000.

b) Activity design necessitated a high level of stakeholder participation

The activities were designed to require a high level of stakeholder participation in order to achieve the outputs, e.g. drafting the SPS Protocol, or implementing the prerequisite programs for HACCP and ISO 22000 could only be carried out by the proactive engagement of intermediary and direct beneficiaries. This design ensured the EAC Project acted as a facilitator rather than originator of the outputs. This contributed to the beneficiaries' sense of ownership. The eventual success of the project was to a large extent due to the active involvement and participation of the intermediary beneficiaries and direct beneficiaries.

3.2. Weaknesses of the original design

a) Problem analysis at regional and national level lacked depth

The problem analysis was insufficient particularly in relation to the complexity of the national food safety regulatory frameworks and in terms of both the legislative framework and the institutional structure and administrative procedures necessary to implement official controls. The development and implementation by all EAC Members of a regionally harmonized 'Food Law' could not of itself harmonize the regulatory framework. This requires further extensive development of food safety legislation and strengthening of the institutions that form part of the national food safety management system⁶. Arguably if the problem was analysed in greater depth the original target for Output 1.1 'A harmonized regional food safety legal framework and cooperation on SPS matters' would not have been proposed as it is not possible to achieve within the time frame and resources available to the project.

Similarly an in-depth analysis of the legal requirements for traceability or the design of traceability systems is likely to have concluded that this is more efficiently addressed at national and enterprise level rather than regional level, that the original Output 2.6 'Pilot regional traceability system established on a strategic export product with links to each national traceability system' was not feasible and that it is in any case addressed as part of ISO 22000 implementation under out 2.5.

b) Inadequate stakeholder analysis at regional & national level

There is no evidence that a comprehensive stakeholder analysis was carried out during project design or later. The institutions and agencies involved in the National Food Safety Management Systems are not clearly identified in the project document. The regional and national quality infrastructures were not mapped and a capacity and needs assessment of the intermediary beneficiaries was not carried out. Similarly, stakeholder analysis at EAC level in terms of its institutional structure and administrative procedures and resources is limited.

A more complete stakeholder analysis could have identified regional and national constraints and institutional weaknesses and contributed more effectively to project design and implementation. Such an analysis could also have identified

⁶ For example the European Union (EU) food safety legislative framework comprises over 300 horizontal and vertical legislation with additional implementing legislation at the national level of each Member State. The EU 'General food Law' i.e. Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of The European Parliament and of The Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety is a horizontal food safety legislation or 'umbrella' legislation with which all existing and subsequent food safety legislation must comply.

and selected the testing laboratories to be supported. It could also have noted the potential resistance encountered among intermediary stakeholders to developing regional centres of excellence targeted in the original Output 1.3 'Regional centre of excellence on food safety management and food technology are strengthened with special emphasis on priority export'. It could then have resulted in a more focused and viable project design excluding Output 1.3 and avoided the need for identifying and selecting laboratories, which contributed to delays in implementation. See also chapter 5.2

c) Design solution at regional and national level too ambitious

The ET believes that the weak problem analysis and stakeholder analysis resulted in a design solution that was inadequate given the project's resources and time frame. The EAC project counterpart and intermediary beneficiaries noted in discussions with the ET that the number of outputs and scope of activities at the start of the project was too ambitious given the limited resources and time frame of the project. They complained about a lack of focus and difficulty in understanding what the primary project purpose was or how it could be achieved. They believed that the project should have had a narrow focus and should recognize that it can only contribute in part to resolving the identified problems. The targeted goals, noted in (a) above were in some cases unrealistic. The targeted completion dates in 2009 were also unrealistic although this view is clearly the result of hindsight.

d) Management resources not adequate at regional and national level

The EAC Secretariat noted in discussions with the ET that the Regional Project Coordinator (RPC) did not appear to be adequately compensated relative to similar positions in Arusha. The National Project Coordinators (NPCs) and the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) also advised the ET that the budget for internal travel to meet intermediaries and stakeholders was insufficient. The ET got the impression that this resulted in fewer meetings than optimal for efficient project implementation. The ET concluded that adequate funds should have been included in the proposed budget in the design stage of the Project.

3.3. Design changes in Mid-Term Review

The changes in project design adopted following the MTR addressed the design weaknesses by redefining outcomes, eliminating unrealistic outputs and reducing the scope of activities to match the available resources. The clearer project focus and reduced number of outputs and activities also helped improve communication with the intermediary and direct beneficiaries and strengthened stakeholder participation. This was critical to the successful implementation of all outputs with the exception of Output 2.2.

Output 2.2 was changed from 'WTO SPS and TBT enquiry points are able to provide effective services' to 'TBT and SPS Enquiry and Notification Points are provided with technical and IT support to improve service delivery to private sector'. It is not clear why this change was made but in the redesign the primary function of the WTOSPS NNA and SPSNEPs and seems to have been lost i.e. notify other WTO Members of the products to be covered by new legislation or amendments to existing legislation, when an international standard, guideline or recommendation does not exist or the content of a proposed SPS measure is not substantially the same as the content of an international standard, guideline or recommendation, of if the regulation may have a significant effect on trade of other WTO Members. The activity design for this revised output was weak in that it did not address this key operational requirement. Specifically it does not apply best practice by including the use of the WTO 'Procedural Step-by-step Manual for SPS National Notification Authorities & SPS National Enquiry Points' which is advocated by the WTO Secretariat⁷. SPS NEPs are dependent of receiving notifications from other EAC members in order to provide an effective service to the private sector in their country. If the NNAs are not operational then the system is ineffective. The ET found that SPS NAAs in all countries were not fully operational with few if any notifications sent to the WTO Secretariat.

3.4. Logical Framework

The original log frame in the project document summarizes the design and key features of the project. The ET believes that the log frame and overall intervention logic is appropriate to the project design but targeted outputs, 1.1 and 1.3 in particular were too ambitious to be achieved with the activities proposed, the resources available and timeframe of the project. Output 2.6 as noted in chapter 4.2 was not a realistic goal at regional level. Otherwise the intervention logic is adequate as is the intervention logic in the realized log frame following the MTR. The activities result in outputs which result in outcomes. These in turn contribute to the achievement of the Project Objective and the Development Goal.

However the immediate relevance of the second part of Outcome 1 to the EAC is questionable. While Outcome 1 will be achieved in regard to the SPS protocol, it will not be achieved in relation to the 'conformity assessment procedures for selected agro-products are harmonized' in the time frame of the project as the harmonized food standards do not include conformity assessment procedures. This will require harmonization of conformity requirements and procedures between EAC Partners states. There are no activities or outputs included in this

⁷A revised version prepared by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF) Biosecurity New Zealand with contributions by Department of Agriculture and Forestry Biosecurity Australia was released by the WTO Secretariat in 2011.

area. While it will most likely be achieved as part of the implementation of the SPS protocol, it may be many years before it is realized.

Objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs)

Best practice in project design requires objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs) to be 'SMART' i.e. specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. The OVIs set out in the original and revised log frame Output 1.1 and 1.2, and Output 2.5 meet the criteria in respect to specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant and while specifically not time bound are implicitly so in terms of the time frame of the project. The OVIs in both log frames for Outputs 2.3 and 2.4 'Number of test results issued increased over baseline, time required to issue certificates reduced' are only partly relevant as the key determinant of the success of the intervention is more appropriately accreditation to ISO 17025 for a number of test parameters by an internationally recognized accreditation body (AB) rather than the 'number of test results issued increased over baseline'.

3.5. Assumptions and risks

3.5.1. Assumptions

Three assumptions were made in the original logframe. Two of these were relevant but proved incorrect. These are:

- a) Willingness of EAC members to accept and adopt as national legislation the model food safety law and restructure the overlapping responsibilities in the SPS administration and;
- b) The countries are willing to use the services of a centre in another country and are willing to cooperate.

The ET believes that that a more detailed problem analysis and stakeholder analysis might have concluded that these assumptions were incorrect particularly given the limited resources of the project.

The assumptions included in the revised log frame are judged appropriate and valid.

3.5.2. Risks

The risks identified in the original log frame were appropriate and valid. However, the risk 'Governments are not ready to approve a revised food safety law at the regional level' inexplicably contradicts the assumption noted in a) in chapter 4.5.1 above.

Although identified as a risk, the proposed mitigation strategy 'Mobilization of Ministries of Industry and Trade, Health and Agriculture through awareness raising events' was clearly insufficient. However, the goal of creating a model

food safety law at regional level for adoption by EAC Partner states was over ambitious given the time frame and resources of the project.

4. Project Implementation

4.1. Introduction

The project was initially launched in Arusha, Tanzania on 12 December 2006 by the Secretary General of the EAC in the presence of national counterparts and the UNIDO Project Manager. The EAC project was initially expected to run until August 2009. However, progress in setting up operations was slow due to difficulties in coordinating implementation at regional and national level. By October 2007, only Uganda had a NPC in place. NPCs in Kenya and Tanzania still had not been appointed. The RPC and the CTA were also not appointed at this stage. At the same time, the PMs learned that many planned activities were redundant as they had been completed with the support of other donors between the preparation of the original project formulation documents in 2004 and the start of the project. This necessitated a redesign of the Project which further delayed implementation.

The NPCs for Kenya and Tanzania were recruited by the end of 2007 and the RPC was in place at the beginning of 2008. The inclusion of Rwanda and Burundi in the project following their accession to the EAC in November 2007 further complicated the project design. A new TCB project document was prepared and the project was re-launched in May 2008. The expected completion date was extended to 30 August 2011 and NPCs in Rwanda and Burundi were also appointed at this stage.

The Project continued to encounter delays in implementing its program over the next 12 months due to on-going difficulties in coordinating implementation at regional and national level and communication difficulties with the EAC Secretariat, which also negatively impacted the working relationships with national counterparts. The RPC was dismissed as of beginning of 2009. Project Progress report Nr 5 dated 5 March 2009 states that this was the result of 'several problems regarding coordination with the EAC Secretariat and the RPC - due to difficulties to EAC structure'.

Other issues contributing to the implementation delays during this period were:

- The absence of the CTA. According to the Project Progress Nr 4 dated September 2008, the CTA had not been appointed at that stage due to

'lack of resources'. UNIDO subsequently renegotiated with NORAD to secure the necessary funds for this appointment⁸.

- Progress in identifying and selecting testing laboratories to be supported under Outputs 2.3 and 2.4 and in selection food processing enterprises to support under Output 2.5 was very slow; and
- Lack of proactive engagement by intermediary beneficiaries in implementing activities under Outputs 1.3, 2.6 and the parts of Output 2.1 relating to the development of a regional food safety law to be adopted by all EAC Partner states.

These constraints continued until the appointment of a CTA and replacement of the RPC in October 2009, the completion of the MTR by the CTA in cooperation with the RPC in December 2009 and the redesign of the project in line with the recommendations of the MTR in early 2010. The new RPC and the input of the CTA at regional and national level greatly improved communication and relations with the EAC Secretariat, national counterparts, intermediary beneficiaries and direct beneficiaries. This enhanced their ownership and effectively enabled the subsequent successful implementation of the project.

The redesign of the project following the MTR narrowed the focus of the project under Output 2.1, eliminated Output 1.3 and 2.6 and enabled a more efficient implementation at regional and national level.

Despite further delays of outputs 2.3 and 2.4 resulting from delayed capacity assessments and errors in the shipment of equipment to Kenya and Tanzania, the about 90 percent of the planned activities were implemented and it is expected that most of the remaining activities will be completed before the projects end. The ET also concluded that most of the planned benefits will be delivered with the exception of Output 2.2⁹. Although overall project implementation has been successful, the project outputs could have been achieved 12-18 months earlier, had the initial delays in implementation not occurred. These delays caused significant opportunity cost to the beneficiaries. See chapter 5.2.

4.2. Management

Project management was inefficient at the outset of the Project in appointing the RPC, NPCs and in particular the CTA. It took nearly a year to have all the NPCs and RPC in place. In October 2009, nearly 14 months after the re-launch of the project in 2008 and 32 months after the initial launch in December 2006, the CTA

⁸ The CTA noted in comments on the draft report that the CTA was hired on a part time basis: three months from October to December 2009, ten months in 2010 and eight months in 2011.

⁹ See chapter for an assessment of the effectiveness of the achievement of Output 2.2 in all EAC countries.

was still not appointed. These delays made it extremely difficult to implement a centralized project management structure as originally intended and contributed to the communication problems with the EAC Secretariat and the initial coordination problems at regional and national level. It also required more frequent field visit by PMs from HQ than originally envisaged. The reasons for the delay in putting the management in place on the ground are not clear. A contributing factor were the unexpected difficulties in coordinating a regional project at EAC and national level, the structure of the EAC Secretariat and the Secretariat's limited resources. As noted in chapter 4.3,a more detailed stakeholder analysis at the project formulation stage may have identified these constraints and enabled the project managers to develop an implementation strategy to address them. See also chapter 7.1.

The time lag of over 6 months between the launch of the project and the realization that many of the planned outputs were redundant was also inefficient. The ET believes that a mandatory inception report could have contributed to identifying and addressing many of these issues at an earlier stage.

Implementation of the activities under Outputs 2, 3, 2.4 and 2.5 could have been more efficient. There was no sense of urgency in identifying the laboratories that the project would support and subsequently initiating the gap analyses and procurement process. According to the NPCs, it appears to have taken over 3 months to get the report back from the international experts who carried out the capacity needs assessment of the laboratories. As a result, the laboratories are unlikely to achieve ISO 17025 accreditation before project end.

Similarly the process of selecting the enterprises to support under Output 2.5 appears to have been implemented at a very slow pace. The project was also slow in implementing the TA program following the selection. This is one of the reasons why most enterprises supported will achieve ISO 22000 certification only after the end of the project. However, the PMs can be commended for their decisions to have a MTR carried out by the new RPC and CTA and for rapidly implementing the recommendations for changes in project design which narrowed the scope of the project and refocused it within the remaining project time frame and resources. This decision and its implementation have been critical to the successful project implementation in accordance with the revised log frame.

The ET believes the lack of a formalized reporting structure between the CTA, RPC and NPCs contributed to the difficulties of the PMs in trying to create a decentralized management structure. It probably also resulted in a less than optimal cooperation and partnership between all parties and contributed to the confusion some of the national counterparts complained about to the ET i.e. confusion over the scope and extent of the project activities. However the

complaints were mainly from counterparts who were not direct beneficiaries or who were not directly involved in project activities. The intermediary beneficiaries and direct beneficiaries of the various outputs praised the quality of the TA provided and benefits received.

The ET found that project implementation at regional level by the current RPC and at national level by the NPCs was carried out with reasonable efficiency and effectiveness. The CTA provided expert assistance to the RPC and NPCs in planning their activities and in preparing and submitting activity and budget approval request to UNIDO HQ. When problems arose as in customs clearance hold ups in Kenya and Tanzania, the NPCs were proactive in trying to resolve these issues. Similarly, the operational challenges created by the high staff turnover in Tanzania have been addressed in an efficient and effective manner by the current NPC.

Project management in Kenya was particularly efficient. Public sector stakeholders expressed positive opinions about the efficiency of project management. However, the CTA, RPC and NPCs all complained about the lack of support personnel in carrying out their functions. The CTA, RPC and NPCs do not have secretarial assistance and only a very limited budget for transport¹⁰. The ET suspects that this constrained the amount of time spent visiting the intermediary beneficiaries and other stakeholders and may have contributed to the difficulties in communication with counterparts. Progress report 1 dated 31st March 2007 noted that 'Support personnel to national coordinators is a must'. This does not appear to have been acted upon. The budget for support personnel was under spent by about EUROS 23,000 at the time of this evaluation. The provision of support personnel to the CTA, RPC and NPCs could have increased the efficiency of their performance.

4.3. Use of inputs and outputs

Inputs included technical training, reviews and assessments by international experts, local experts and UNIDO HQ staff. It also included the provision of office equipment, laboratory equipment and support for travel to meetings, consultations and dialogue, at national and regional level. The intermediary and direct beneficiaries and the other stakeholders interviewed by the ET expressed their satisfaction with the quality of the TA provided and the benefits provided by the outputs except for the delays in implementing activities under Outputs 2.3 and 2.4.

¹⁰ The CTA noted in comments to the draft report that UNIDO offices in EAC countries are not supportive enough for project activities implementation; transport to project missions, secretarial support, etc.

However, as noted in chapter 4.3, it is unlikely that the benefits planned under Output 2.2 will be realized as the key primary function of the SPS NNAs was not adequately addressed through the intervention.

4.4. Financial management

The ET had only access to the project account summary included in the Progress Reports, listing budgeted and actual expenditure by budget line in accordance with UNIDO accounting procedures. The ET concluded from a review of these accounts and discussions with the PMs, CTA, RPC and NPCs that the project was managed in an efficient way with overall budget management largely consistent with forecasts and clearly managed within the overall budget. See Table 1 below.

For most activities, costs appear to have been broadly in line with budget and UNIDO guidelines were adhered to. The NPCs planned activities and prepared requests with detailed costs for approval of the activity by the PMs at UNIDO HQ. The CTA reviewed the requests and budgets and then submitted the request to PMs. The PMs reviewed the requests and, where necessary, requested clarifications or changes to bring the requests in line with UNIDO guidelines before approving them. The activity only took place after approval was received.

Table 1 Budget and Expenditure as of 31 August 2011

BL	Details	Total budget approved	PAD Aggregate Instalments*	U**	Total Expenditure	Balance Euro
		Euros	Euros	Euros	Euros	Euros
11-00	International Experts, CTA	474,000	557,281	0	536,025	21,255
13-00	Support personnel	36,000	13,626	0	13,594	32
17-00	National Expert	550,000	611,942	0	555,969	55,973
15-00	Travel	50,000	47,250	0	35,201	12,049
16-00	Other personnel	48,000	86,954	0	66,563	20,391
21-00	Subcontracts	230,000	144,380	0	32,629	111,751
32-00	Study tours, UNDP meeting	295,000	97,418	0	101,620	-4,202
33-00	In-service training	391,000	329,197	0	292,835	36,362
35-00	Non-UNDP meetings	232,000	350,295	0	305,239	45,056
45-00	Equipment	700,000	728,355	0	712,236	16,119
51-00	Sundries	71,600	140,049	0	107,083	32,966
82-00	Evaluation		48,000	0	46,389	1,611
Total (ex. support costs)		3,077,600	3,154,746	0	2,805,382	349,364

*includes Euros 166,381 for the 3.5 month extension of the Project to 15th December 2011 also includes UNIDO contribution exc. support costs, **Unapproved expenditure

According to the RPC and NPCs, UNIDO requirements for the approval of activities and disbursement of funds contributed to delays in the implementation. However, the ET concluded that these delays were not significant overall. The ET also cannot see how this can be avoided without changing UNIDO's operational guidelines.

The EAC Secretariat and intermediary beneficiaries expressed concern over the centralization of budget management at UNIDO HQ and suggested a need for joint accountability. The ET concluded that, while this was a valid concern, it should have been agreed at the formulation stage of the project. The ET agreed to use a proposal in this regard in their recommendations¹¹.

¹¹ The CTA in comments on the draft report noted that unless UNIDO changes its administrative procedures for project implementation, decentralized management and accounting is not feasible.

4.5. Monitoring and Evaluation

The original project document envisaged project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) would be carried by:

- a) A National Steering Committee (NSC)
- b) A Regional Steering Committee (RSC) and
- c) A donor representative in the EAC region will monitor the project at the local level and participate in the steering committee.

a) National Steering Committees

The NSCs consisted of representatives of the institutions directly involved in the implementation of various project components in each country. The main functions of the NSCs are mentioned in the project document:

- Overall monitoring of the national component activities and their integration with those of other countries;
- Review of progress reports to be submitted to the RSC meetings;
- Review of project work plans and budget updates to be submitted to the RSC for consideration and approval; and
- Recommendations and advice on the global.

The NSCs were established in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda by the middle of 2007 and in Burundi and Rwanda by early 2008. They did not have a regular meeting schedule and were supposed to meet when requested to do so by the NPC. With the possible exception of Burundi, NPCs performed largely as expected, although meetings were very infrequent and absenteeism was high.

b) Regional Steering Committee

The RSC is comprised of the focal points in each partner state, the RPC, UNIDO PMs, and a representative of NORAD. It is scheduled to meet every 8 months. It held its first meeting in early June 2007 in Arusha. Subsequent meetings rotated between countries. Originally, a representative of the EAC Secretariat was expected to chair the meetings but as it was an official meeting of EAC, it had to be conducted in accordance with set EAC meeting procedures and the chair between countries. The RSC appears to have carried out its role effectively.

c) A donor representative in the EAC region will monitor the project at the local level and participate in the steering committee.

This mechanism was not put in place.

In addition to the monitoring carried out by the RSC, the CTA on his appointment in October 2009 also assumed a monitoring role as part of his responsibilities. He appears to have been effective in this role. One of his first tasks was to carry out the MTR in partnership with the RPC.

The RPC also carried out monitoring of issues that required more attention at national level as part of his regional management function.

In addition to the above, the EAC, RPC, and NPCs carried out a joint monitoring between January and March 2010. The RPC believes this helped clarify issues to high profile officials in the governments of partner states and contributed to subsequent cooperation and collaboration of stakeholders.

Mid Term Review

The PMs initiated a MTR in the last quarter of 2009 in response to the slow progress made by that date in project implementation. The MTR recommended reducing the scope of the project through the elimination of a number of outputs and activities and a narrowing of the focus of others. The recommendations were subsequently implemented. This decision was critical to the subsequent successful achievement of the revised outputs.

Progress reports

Progress reports were prepared every 6 months initially by the PMs and then by the CTA when he was appointed. These were also used by the project management at UNIDO HQ and in the field and by the RPC to monitor project implementation. In addition from early 2010 the NPCs prepared monthly reports for the PMs, RPC and NSCs.

The ET found that the M&E system was sufficient, despite the non-performance of the NSCs. A web enabled results M&E system could have been more efficient and provide faster feed back to the PMs and management in the field. This should improve the reaction time for problem identification and resolution.

Final Evaluation

This final evaluation is carried out as part of the M&E process.

5. Assessment

5.1 Relevance

5.1.1. Consistency with EAC Policy

The project objective is consistent with the broad goal of the EAC to widen and deepen integration and cooperation between EAC Partner States, the establishment of a Customs Union (CU) in 2005 and the creation of a Common Market in 2010.

Articles 105 to 110 of the EAC Treaty provide for Partner States to cooperate in Agriculture and Food Security, while Article 108 (c) of the Treaty and Article 38 of the Protocol on the Establishment of the East African Community Customs Union provide for the Partner States to harmonize sanitary and phytosanitary measures in order to facilitate trade within the community and other trading partners.

The project objective, development goal and overall project design is accordance with the goals and strategies of the EAC DS. See also chapter 3.1.

At national level, EAC countries need support in regionally harmonizing standards and conformity assessment procedures that apply to regional trade to get ready for the economic and political integration foreseen by the EAC treaty. The regulatory frameworks in each country, i.e. the legislative framework and the institutional structure and administrative procedures, need to be strengthened in conjunction with a strengthening of the regional and national quality infrastructure in order to provide conformity assessment services to an international standard to exporters at competitive prices. This is necessary to create an enabling environment for exporters to take advantage of intra and extra EAC trade opportunities that are expected to result from the CU and Common market. At the same time private sector needs support to raise awareness of international standards and to adopt these standards in order to improve their competitiveness and access to regional and global markets. This need is particularly acute in the agriculture sector where SPS measures, food safety and private sector standards in export markets are becoming increasingly stringent.

5.1.2 Consistency with UNIDO and NORAD Policy

The objectives, activities, outputs and outcomes of the project are consistent with the UNIDO policy of Trade Capacity Building in developing countries through

strengthening the National Quality Infrastructure to provide internationally recognized conformity assessment services to regulatory authorities, producers and exporters. This policy includes provision of TA to NSBs, laboratories for product testing and calibration of measurement equipment, inspection, market surveillance services, accreditation and certification bodies, traceability schemes and quality promotions.

The project design and implementation is also consistent with the PTC division's strategy of helping countries to help themselves, opening doors to food producers and exporters to new opportunities, enabling producers and exporters to prepare themselves for entry into world markets and of helping them find own solutions to the challenges they face. It draws from trade capacity building experience on the development of competitive export supply in low-income sectors with high employment impact such as fisheries and horticulture as well as further development of essential compliance infrastructure and services, such as for SPS management, inspection, product testing for key export sectors and accreditation.

It is also consistent with the UNIDO mandate to support industrial development of least developed countries (LDCs) and the policy of seeking to integrate a regional dimension into trade. Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda are classified as LDCs. The project complements the services and expertise offered by other development partners of the EAC, such as the WTO, the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) in the WTO, PTB, and the EU. See also chapters 3.2 and 3.4.

The project objective and development goal are also in line with Norway's overall development cooperation objectives which include support to developing countries to achieve sustainable economic development and create an enabling business environment for the purpose. It is also in accordance with NORAD's policy of channelling funding through multilateral organizations with project management experience like UNIDO to achieve these objectives. NORAD and UNIDO have a long history of cooperation in this area.

Key beneficiaries, stakeholder & target groups

The EAC Secretariat is the project counterpart at regional level. It is the key administrative institution in the EAC. Its responsibilities include:

- The strategic planning, management and monitoring of programs for the development of the EAC,
- The co-ordination and harmonization of the policies and strategies relating to the development of the EAC,
- The general promotion and dissemination of information on the EAC to the stakeholders, the general public and the international community; and
- The implementation of the decisions of the Summit and the Council of the EAC.

The EABC is a direct beneficiary at regional level. The EABC facilitates public private sector dialogue on the integration process of the EAC. It works closely with the EAC Secretariat, the East African Legislative Assembly, governments, regional economic communities, multilateral groups and the business community to improve the region's trade and investment climate. The project supported the EABC to establish public private sector dialogue on removing NTBs in regard to certification requirements for SPS measures and food safety standards.

At national level, the key intermediaries are the ministries responsible for regional integration, the ministries and agencies with responsibilities in agriculture and agribusiness and the ministries and agencies that form part of the national quality infrastructure providing conformity assessment services to exporters. This includes ministries of industry, trade and commerce or equivalent, ministries of agriculture and health and equivalent as well as the NSBs. The large number of intermediaries was necessary given the scope of the project and the targeted outputs. The development and preparation of the SPS protocol required the participation of the ministries of agriculture and health or equivalent as they have policy and regulatory responsibility in these areas in all EAC countries. The testing laboratories of the NSBs and some ministries are direct beneficiaries. The ministries of trade and industry or equivalent are also direct beneficiaries from the support to the WTO TBT NEPs and are in Uganda and Tanzania counterparts for UNIDO¹².

Direct beneficiaries and target groups include the enterprises selected for support under Output 2.5. These appear to have been selected by the NPCs in consultation with the NSCs. The selected enterprises included large enterprises that could have funded the cost of certification to ISO 22000 by themselves. The ET discussed this point with the RPC, NPCs and CTA, the enterprises visited, as well as with a number of other donors including the EU, the Danish Development Agency (DANIDA), and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). The ET concluded from these discussions that the decision to include them as direct beneficiaries for certification to ISO 22000 was correct, as it is likely to encourage other smaller enterprises to follow suit. This is expected to result in an overall substantial improvement in the national quality environment in the export food sector which will benefit national competitiveness and increase intra and extra EAC trade. It is also likely to improve the business climate for inward investment.

5.1.3. Coherence with other donor on-going initiatives in this area

The ET concluded from the review of the EAC project documents, donor reports and from interviews with a number of donors that the project was complementary

¹² A list of the beneficiaries in each country is included in Chapter 6.

to their work in the area of intervention of the project and does not overlap. The project has established very good working relationships with PTB, STDF, FAO, World Health Organization (WHO) and EU projects in the EAC Partner states as well as with other UNIDO and UN projects. The ET notes that many activities were conducted in collaboration with other donor organizations including GIZ, International Institute for Tropical Agriculture, Trade Africa Network (TAN), PTB, “Aid to Trade”, Belgium, USAID, French Development Agency, EU projects, FAO, WHO and the WB.

5.2 Ownership

5.2.1. Regional

The ET raised the issue of ownership in the interviews with the EAC Secretariat, intermediary beneficiaries, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders. The ET concluded that the EAC Secretariat perceived limited ownership during the first two years of the project. This situation changed following the appointment of the CTA and the replacement of the first RPC. The new RPC and the CTA worked hard to establish a close working relationship with the EAC Secretariat. The momentum created by this and the successful implementation of the project outputs in the revised log frame strengthened the sense of ownership of the EAC Secretariat at regional and national level. This contributed to the successful achievement of the regional outputs including the development of the SPS Protocol and will support sustainability of the project outputs and outcomes.

The EABC expressed their satisfaction with the project outputs and the support provided in initiating public sector dialogue with the private sector on SPS issues. The ET concluded that the EABC has a high of ownership of the project aspects they participated in.

5.2.2. National

The ET found that the intermediary beneficiaries and direct beneficiaries of the project have a high sense of ownership. While this sense of ownership was apparent at the time the evaluation, it may not have been as apparent in the early stages of the project. The delays in project implementation clearly frustrated the beneficiaries and there was also some annoyance in regard to the non-payment of per diems for attendance at meetings. However, the ET does not think this lessened the sense of ownership among the intermediary beneficiaries and direct beneficiaries. As the activities began to be implemented, the sense of ownership increased¹³.

¹³ The CTA in comments to the draft report noted that clear MOUs should be signed with the stakeholders of the project to ensure proper participation and ownership of the activities from the beginning of the project, including the sensitive issue of per diem and transport allowance which should be arranged with the national institutions involved.

The unrealistic ambition of the original project design may have generated expectations that could not be realised, given the limited resources of the project. This may also have created confusion and lack of ownership among stakeholders who were not direct beneficiaries. However, given the high level of ownership among the intermediary and direct beneficiaries, it is unlikely that this will impact negatively on the sustainability of the project results.

5.3 Efficiency

5.3.1. Management

The ET found that management of the project was affected by a number of issues:

a) Initial difficulties in coordination and communication at regional and national level

The project was launched in December 2006 but immediately encountered difficulties in setting a management structure on the ground and coordinating implementation at regional and national level. The ET found it was difficult to determine the main reasons for this but surmises that it may in part have been the results of poor communication and misunderstandings between the PMs, the EAC Secretariat and the national counterparts. At regional level, there appears to have been confusion over the role of the EAC Secretariat, while at national level the counterparts were confused as to the scope of the project. The realization mid-way through 2007 that many of the proposed activities were redundant and the project needed redesign added to this confusion. The problems continued right throughout 2008 and early 2009 and appear to have contributed to the departure of the RPC at end of 2008.

The ET believes that if a more in depth problem analysis and stakeholder analysis has been carried out at the formulation stage these issues could have been identified and an implementation strategy put in place to address them. A requirement to prepare an inception report at the outset might also have enabled the PMs to address these issues in a more efficient manner.

b) Accession of Burundi and Rwanda

The need to resign the project to facilitate inclusion of Rwanda and Burundi in 2007 contributed to the delay in project implementation. This, in conjunction with the project redesign to address proposed activities that were now redundant meant that the project implementation was effectively in hiatus between September 2007 and May 2008 when the project was re-launched.

c) Delays in appointing RPC, NPCs and CTA and weaknesses in management structure

There were significant delays in appointing the RPC, NPCs and CTA. The reasons are not fully clear. They appear to be relation to the difficulties noted in a) above. Only one NPC were in place by October 2007. The RPC and other NPC s were only recruited towards the last quarter and end of 2007. The CTA was not appointed until October 2009. See also chapter 4.

The project management remained centralized in Vienna despite attempts to decentralize to RPC, CTA and NPCs. There were also no clear lines of authority in place at regional level. The NPCs did not report to the RPC and the CTA had no line authority except to review activity budgets prepared by the NPCs and request approval from Vienna. This created communication issues and frustration with intermediaries and stakeholders. It arguably contributed to implementation delays.

d) Delays in implementing activities under output 2.3 and 2.4

The project was slow to initiate activities under these outputs and, when initiated, management of them was inefficient. E.g. it appears to have taken nearly three months to receive reports back from the international expert recruited to carry out the gap analysis of the laboratories. The project design also contributed to delays. The ET believes that the selection of the laboratories could have been completed as part of the formulation stage of the project and this would have enabled much more efficient implementation. Given that procurement is a protracted and difficult process project management should also have prioritized the procurement activities at the start of the project.

e) Delays in implementing activities under output 2.5

The EAC project was also slow to initiate activities under Output 2.5. The design also contributed to the delay in implementation. The ET believes that the selection of the enterprises could have been completed as part of the formulation stage of the project and this would have enabled much more efficient implementation.

f) Logistic problems in shipping to Kenya and Tanzania

Errors were made in recoding consignee details on documents for laboratory equipment sent to KEBS in Kenya and the Tanzania Food and Drug Authority (TFDA) in Tanzania. The shipments should have been consigned to the project but instead were consigned to the beneficiary. These errors seem to have been made by the shipper. In Kenya, this resulted in the consignment been held up in customs incurring demurrage charges of USD 77,000. At the time of the evaluation the shipment has been held up 6 weeks and not yet released from

customs. KEBS were however confident that the government would drop the demurrage charges as the goods formed part of TA from UNIDO¹⁴. In Tanzania the TFDA inadvertently paid demurrage charges of \$8,000 to release the goods. These charges have since been refunded.

The NPCs noted delays in implementing project activities as a result of slowness in UNIDO HQ approving activities and disbursing funds. However, given the importance of the planning related delays mentioned above, the ET does not think this contributed significantly to overall delays in project implementation.

The ET discussed with stakeholders at regional and national level the effects, if any, on the delivery of the planned benefits from delay in project implementation. From these discussions, the ET concluded that delays in implementation of activities between the start of the project between 2008 and the Mid Term Review resulted in the benefits being delivered later than planned. This represents a potential opportunity cost to the beneficiaries' access to all outputs. However the ET was not in position to quantify these costs. The ET also concluded that any negative effect of delays in project implementation between 2006 and 2007 are arguably offset by the positive effect created at regional level by the inclusion of Rwanda and Burundi in the program.

The ET concludes that, since the decision to initiate the MTR and to review the design, the project has been efficient with a possible exception in procurement under Outputs 2.3 and 2.4. It is estimated that about 90% of the targeted outputs will be achieved.

However, without the delays occurred during the first two years of the project, the outputs of the revised log frame following the MTR could have been achieved at least 18 months earlier. The ET concluded that the following factors contributed to the delays in project implementation:

- a) Initial difficulties in coordination and communication at regional and national level;
- b) Delays in appointing RPC, NPC and CTA and weaknesses in management structure;
- c) Accession of Burundi and Rwanda;
- d) Delays in implementing activities under output 2.4 & 2.5;
- e) Delays in implementing activities under output 2.5;
- f) Logistic problems in shipping to Kenya and Tanzania.

¹⁴Mr. Andrew Edewa, NPC Kenya, noted in his comments to the report that the laboratory shipment was finally delivered to KEBS on 30th December 2011. The amount relating to demurrage has reduced by 50%, although there are efforts by Ministry of Industrialization to seek complete waiver on demurrage charges. Other costs (e.g. those related to clearing agent, etc) will still be incurred

5.3.2. Financial Management: Costs versus benefits

Inputs included the provision of technical training and technical reviews and assessment by international experts, local experts, and UNIDO HQ staff. It also included the provision of office equipment, laboratory equipment and support for travel to meetings, consultations and dialogue, at national and regional level. The ET consulted with the RPC, NPCs and CTA on implementation costs to assess that project costs were in line with other donor projects and correct procedures were followed. The ET noted that UNIDO's operational guidelines are precisely followed. The CTA reviewed activity and budget approval requests prepared by the RPC and NPCs. These were further reviewed by the PMs before approval. The procurement of office equipment and laboratory equipment was carried out by UNIDO HQ in accordance with UNIDO procurement guidelines.

The intermediary and direct beneficiaries and the other stakeholders interviewed by the ET expressed their satisfaction with the quality of the TA provided. Overall, the ET concluded that the costs of the project have been justified by the benefits delivered with the exception of the benefits delivered under Output 2.2. See also chapter 5.3.

5.3.3. Reporting

The project reporting was in line with the requirements set out in the EAC project document. Progress reports were prepared on a six monthly basis. The RPCs and NPCs also reported to the PMs on a monthly basis since the middle of 2010. However, the quality of the reports could be improved with more precise referencing of the individual activities. The ET found it difficult to determine the progress and completion date of activities under the various outputs. See also chapter 5.5.

5.4 Effectiveness and Impact

5.4.1. Effectiveness: Outputs, Benefits

The achievement of outputs and delivery of planned benefits was assessed in terms of the revised log frame approved by the Regional Steering Committee, following the MTR. This is noted from the 7th Progress report onwards as *"1.1 EAC Secretariat supported in the development and implementation of SPS Protocol and harmonized SPS measures for trade"*. Omission of the last phrase in 'harmonized SPS measures for trade' in the TOR and MTR was assumed to be a typing error, therefore where relevant to this chapter changes to the outputs following the MTR are noted.

5.4.1.1. Regional

Output 1.1: EAC Secretariat supported in the development and implementation of SPS Protocol and harmonized SPS measures for trade.

The Project provided logistic support and TA to the EAC Secretariat in line with the targeted output. The draft SPS Protocol has been prepared and approved by the Sectoral Council on Agriculture and Food Security. It is currently with the Legal and Judicial council for legal drafting. After legal drafting, the Ministers' Multi-sectoral Council is expected to send it to national parliaments for ratification. This is expected to happen within the next 6 months. Harmonized measures for plant health, animal health and food safety have also been prepared and form annexes to the SPS Protocol. These are as follows:

- i. Harmonized SPS Standards, Measures and Procedures for Plants Vol. I (Phytosanitary);
- ii. Harmonized SPS Standards, Measures and Procedures for Mammals, Birds, and Bees. Vol. II (Sanitary); and
- iii. Harmonized SPS Standards, Measures and Procedures Vol. III (Fish and Fishery Products) and
- iv. Harmonized SPS Standards, Measures and Procedures Vol. IV (Food Safety)¹⁵.

For the SPS Protocol to be implemented it has to be ratified by national parliaments. It is not clear how long this will take or how long it will then take for EAC Partner states to implement the protocol. Judging from the PTB experience in relation with the SQMT Act (2006), this could take several years. A mid-term evaluation of the PTB project 'Establishment of a Regional Quality Infrastructure in the EAC 2004-2013' noted that *"despite the existence of regional legislation EAC Partner countries often delay or even reject the implementation of the SQMT Act at the national level, while the EAC Secretariat lacks a mechanism for sanctions"*¹⁶. It is likely that similar problems will be encountered with the implementation of the SPS Protocol.

The TCB project also provided direct support for the harmonization of 3 to 5 EAC food standards on fruit and vegetable and indirectly to the development of an additional 124 standards for fruit and vegetables which were drafted in 2009 and 2010 and published on the EAC website for public comment¹⁷. When adopted,

¹⁵Mr. Andrew Edewa, NPC Kenya noted in comments to the report "It is our understanding that the titles of the harmonised measures were simplified as follows: Harmonized SPS Measures (Volume 1: Phytosanitary Measures, Volume 2: Sanitary Measures for Mammals, Birds and Bees, Volume 3: Sanitary Measures for Fish and Fishery Products, and Volume 4: Food Safety Measures".

¹⁶Page 3, Summary of the report on the mid-term evaluation of the project "Establishment of a Regional Quality Infrastructure in the East African Community (EAC)", EAC Arusha Tanzania, September 2010

¹⁷ Intermediary stakeholders in each country commented that the capacity developed through participation in development of the SPS Protocol and annexes, which was

these standards will add to the existing 187 harmonized agriculture and food standards¹⁸. The development of fish and fish product standards was also supported.

It is worth noting that the support provided to the EAC Secretariat also contributed to the achievement of original Outcome 1: 'EAC Secretariat is able to enhance the regional harmonization and cooperation efforts and establish a regional infrastructure in the food safety area'. The ratification and eventual implementation of the SPS Protocol and Annexes will facilitate the creation of a 'regional infrastructure in the food safety area'. However, the implementation of the protocol will require harmonization of national legislation with the SPS protocol and consequent institutional restructuring and strengthening to implement it.

The activities completed at national level under output 2.1 also contributed to the achievement of Output 1.1 and strengthened the benefits delivered. The capacity of the national stakeholders participating in EAC meetings on the SPS Protocol was strengthened by the activities supported to develop national food safety and quality policy and strategy on coordination within the national food safety management systems.

The stakeholders in EAC Partner states interviewed by the ET expressed satisfaction and appreciation for support provided by UNIDO and noted that the development of the SPS protocol and its annexes would have been delayed without this support.

Output 1.2 Regional Awareness is raised on food safety/standards/quality issues for local consumer safety and compliance with international market requirements

The ET believes that this output has been achieved as planned. The targeted intermediaries organized parallel Food Safety Weeks with the support of the TCB project in Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda in 2009 and in Tanzania in 2011. Campaigns in each partner state lasted for a week. Activities included national workshops, seminars, symposia, radio and TV talk shows, commercials, street walks, newspaper articles, leaflets, visits and public talks conducted to schools and colleges. These activities are thought to have raised public understanding and awareness of food safety¹⁹.

facilitated by the EAC project enabled them to contribute effectively in the harmonization of food standards and also created the impetus to do so.

¹⁸Catalogue of East African Standards, 2010, Chapter 65, Agriculture and Chapter 67, Food Technology, EAC, Arusha Tanzania.

¹⁹This assessment is based on interviews with the stakeholders as no survey for changes in awareness among stakeholders has been carried out in the time frame of the project.

The food safety week is likely to become an annual event in Kenya and Uganda where it was already repeated in 2010 without funding from the project²⁰. The Tanzanian Food and Drug Authority (TFDA) in Tanzania advised the ET that it is their intention to organize this week as an annual event and funding will be included in the budget for the year 2012. A Food safety week was organized in Rwanda in 2009 and repeated again in 2011 (although not in 2010). It was organized by Ministry of Health (MINISANTE) with the support of the WHO, the project, UNICEF and the World Bank. There are no similar plans in Burundi where it appeared to have been a one-off event.

From the ET's interviews with the stakeholders it is clear that awareness has been raised among key stakeholders. However the degree to which it has been raised among consumers is difficult to assess without a survey. Parallel implementation among EAC Partner states, with the exception of Tanzania, has ensured a regional dimension to this output.

Most of the activities for this output were implemented at national level in conjunction with Output 2.1. The ET believes this creates a synergy which strengthened the achievement of the outputs 1.1 and 1.2. It helped raise awareness among intermediary stakeholders and contributed to the impetus at national level to formulate national policy in this area and at EAC level to finalizing the SPS Protocol.

Note 1: The Output 1.3 envisaged in the original log frame entitled '*Regional centres of excellence on food safety management and food technology are strengthened with special emphasis on priority export products*' was discontinued following the MTR. The resources available under this output were applied to support the EAC Business Council (EACB) with the objective of sensitizing and guiding their members on SPS issues. This was implemented as part of Output 1.1. An EAC business guide on SPS and TBT issues to guide the business community in complying with the requirements for trade within and out of the region was prepared and approved for publishing by the EAC and EACB. A website to disseminate relevant information on SPS trade issues was also completed and linked to the EACB website. This also supported the achievement of Output 1.2.

5.4.1.2. National

The targeted outputs are:

Output 2.1: Technical and logistical support provided to national institutions to participate effectively in regional harmonization of SPS measures

²⁰In Kenya the Food Safety Week was sponsored by the private sector in 2010 and 2011.

Output 2.2: TBT and SPS enquiry points and notification with technical and IT support to improve service delivery to the private sector

Output 2.3: Selected national Chemical testing lab is upgraded based on needs identified and assisted to accreditation in selected scopes,

Output 2.4: Selected national Microbiology lab is upgraded based on needs identified and assisted to accreditation in selected scopes, and

Output 2.5: Enterprises for selected products upgraded by applying food safety management systems

Burundi

The target groups, key intermediaries and direct beneficiaries are the Ministry of Trade, Industry, Posts and Tourism (MTIPT), Faculté de Sciences Agronomiques (FACAGRO), Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MoAL), National Institute of Public Health (NIPH), Ministry of Health (MoH), the Burundi Bureau of Standards and Quality Control (BBN), and selected food business enterprises. Indirect beneficiaries are the other food business enterprises in the food chain and consumers.

Output 2.1: This output was designed to support implementation of regional output 1.1 at national level. The TCB Project provided logistical support for national stakeholders to participate in EAC meetings to develop the SPS protocol, related harmonized SPS measures, food safety standards and elimination of NTBs. It also included logistical support for meetings of national stakeholders to discuss the formation of a national food safety committee and for high level meetings to develop national food safety policy. The support included technical inputs from UNIDO experts and a number of national workshops on related issues. Overall, the ET concluded benefits planned under this output to the national institutions.

Most of the activities in relation to policy support and institutional coordination were completed following the MTR. However, the activities completed prior to it also contributed to its achievement e.g. 2.1.1.4 '*Set up a working group in the image of CODEX Committee and organize meeting to discuss the harmonization of the above standards and regulations, and their dissemination to the industry*'. Activities to organize the food safety week under output 1.2 were implemented in parallel with this output. The ET believes the synergy created as a result strengthened the achievement of both outputs.

The ET concluded from their interviews with intermediaries that the support provided was effective in building capacity for SPS and food safety policy development in the relevant ministries and in the BBN (although the BBN has not

as yet formally introduced a food safety policy). However, as the NPC notes in his progress report to the EAC, while Burundi has made good progress in developing its national quality infrastructure and institutional capacity in recent years, it is still considerably weaker in these areas than other EAC countries including Rwanda. In these areas more targeted support to Burundi will be necessary for many years.

The key intermediaries expressed their satisfaction to the ET for the support provided by the TCB on policy development in this area.

In addition to support provided for policy development, this output also included 10 days of practical training for 20 phytosanitary staff from the Department of Plant Protection (DPP), MoAL on inspection procedures and IPPC standards. A set of inspection equipment was also provided to the DPP. The DPP advised the ET that this has been beneficial to them. However they believe and the ET concurs that significant additional support will be necessary in this area before they are in position to carry out their duties in accordance with international standards.

Output 2.2: This output will not be achieved. The TBT Enquiry Point and SPS NNA and SPS NEPs were nominally set up in 2009 with equipment and training provided by the EAC Project²¹. However, since then none are functional as neither the BNNS nor MoA has clarified the roles and responsibilities for the officials assigned to operate them or transferred officials have not been replaced. It was not clear to the ET whether this was due to limited absorption capacity or to a lack of commitment and ownership. The ET concluded that, to date, the only benefits delivered have been the equipment provided to the beneficiaries²².

The WTO TBT and SPS databases have no record of receiving any notifications from Burundi.

Outputs 2.3 and 2.4: These outputs included:

- a) Support to the National Laboratory of Food Chemistry (NLFC) in the BBN for initial set up of its testing laboratory equipment and training of technical staff in use of the equipment and

²¹ The TBT Enquiry Point was set up in the BBN. SPS NEPs were set up in the Department of Plant Protection and Department of Animal Health in the MoA and in the General Inspectorate of Health, MoH.

²² In his comments to the draft report the CTA noted that despite some achievements in the operation of NAA and NEPs, a stronger commitment from ministries involved is necessary to assign staff time for the respective tasks. Although success is very limited for this output, there is some hope especially in Uganda where the established web system is being used by the stakeholders.

- b) Supply of laboratory equipment to FACAGRO microbiological laboratory, installation of the equipment, technical training in its use and support in strengthening QMS capacity to meet the requirements for accreditation to ISO 17025 under this output will be completed as planned.

The activities under a) were completed in 2010. One month's intensive training was provided for 6 technicians from the NLFC and 14 from other institutions training on use of the laboratory equipment. This enabled the NLFC to carry out limited testing of some food products primarily salt and milk²³.

Since then it has carried out about 100 tests, a majority of which were on behalf of the BBN as the regulatory authority to assess compliance of imported salt with the Burundi national standards. A small number of about 20 UHT milk samples were also tested to assess protein content. The in-house capacity also allows the BBN to reduce the average turnaround time on tests for imports from 3-6 weeks to 1-2 weeks as previously the BBN had to outsource testing. The equipment for testing milk broke down over 3 months before the evaluation mission and had not been repaired due to delays from national procurement procedures. A small number of tests had been provided to exporters for quality control purposes.

A 2nd phase was recommended by the trainer to ensure sustainability but was not implemented due to a lack of resources.

Activities under b) will be completed by the end of the project extension period in December 2011. Although the procurement of equipment was delayed, delivery has been made and installation was due by the time of this evaluation. The project also intends to support the development of an operational plan for the laboratory. The ET believes the benefits to FACAGRO will be delivered as planned and that it will have a significant impact in the medium to long term²⁴.

Output 2.5: The TCB project initially targeted 10 enterprises for support to ISO 22000 certification. This was subsequently reduced following the gap analyses of the enterprises to 5 as the infrastructure changes required to meet the standards were too expensive for the others to implement in the timeframe of the project.

²³Mr. Nestor Bikorimana, NPC Burundi, notes in his comment to the draft report that in his view the activities under this heading have been partially met because the BBN received no equipment and only one-month training was performed on some equipment not on all equipment. If this training was performed on all equipment, BBN realize more analysis than it does today. The ET notes the views of the project management team that additional training could not be provided with the resources available to the project.

²⁴Mr. Nestor Bikorimana, NPC Burundi, notes in his comments the report that a national chemical testing laboratory has been identified in Burundi but has not been assisted as in other partner states. The ET notes that the prioritization of which laboratories to assist was made in consultation with the stakeholders and within the resources constraints of the project,

The objective of ISO 22000 was also reduced to implementation of the FSMSs such as GMP, GHP and HACCP for similar reasons. The TCB project also provided support for training and to a very limited extent financial support for infrastructure upgrades²⁵. 2 people received training as lead auditors for ISO 22000 certification and 10 people received training on internal auditing of HACCP.

The ET visited four enterprises that are expected to implement HACCP before the project ends or shortly after. The management of all four enterprises also confirmed their intention to seek ISO 22000 certification as their resources allow in the future. They expressed their appreciation for the support provided by the project and stated that the project was the catalyst for them to begin the process of improving their FSMS at this point in time. The ET concluded that this was a successful intervention given the apparent capacity constraints in the country.

Kenya

The target groups, key intermediaries and direct beneficiaries are the Ministry of Industrialization (MoI), Ministry of Trade (MoT), Kenyan Bureau of Standards (KEBS), Ministry of Public Health and Sanitation (MPHS), Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Services (KEPHIS) in the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), Horticultural Crops Development Authority (HCDA), Fresh Produce Exporters Association of Kenya (FPEAK), Ministry of Fisheries Development (MFD), Kenya Fish Processors and Exporters Association (AFIPEK); Department of Veterinary Services (DVS) in the Ministry of Livestock Development (MLD), and selected enterprises. Indirect beneficiaries are other food business enterprises in the food chain and consumers.

Output 2.1: In addition to support provided to stakeholders at national level to develop the SPS protocol, the EAC project supported the formation of the National Food Safety Coordination Committee, preparation and review of a draft National Food Safety Policy and high level meetings to discuss policy and coordination issues. This helped strengthen the coordination frameworks in the food safety area. The National Food Safety Coordination Committee is now an important intersectoral committee that performs food safety management functions in Kenya. The support included technical inputs from UNIDO experts and national workshops on related issues. Support was also given for the harmonization of regional food standards for fruit and vegetable and fish and the identification of NTBs in trade between Kenya and other EAC Members. Overall, the benefits planned under this output were delivered. An additional benefit was provided via logistic support to trace the sources of contamination in exports of vegetables and fruit exported to the EU under the EU's rapid alert system.

²⁵ The EAC Project allocated a maximum of USD 26,694 in Burundi to assist enterprises carry infrastructure upgrades required compliance with GHP.

Most of the activities were completed following the Mid Term Review. Activities completed before the change in design also contributed to the achievement of this output e.g. activities 2.2.1 '*Hold a National Symposium' (on food safety legislation) and the logistical support to the development of the SPS protocol*'. The activities under regional Output 1.2 were implemented in conjunction with the activities for this output. This strengthened the delivery of the benefits from both outputs.

An additional activity to this output supported the development of the following regulations and syllabus on food safety at the University of Nairobi in 2009:

- a) Certificate In Food Safety And Quality
- b) Postgraduate Diploma In Food Safety And Quality, and
- c) Degree Of Master Of Science In Food Safety And Quality

The initiative for this activity came from the NPC. The output was very favourably received by the intermediary stakeholders. One person advised the ET that he was studying for the relevant masters' degree and was very pleased with the curricula.

Stakeholders expressed satisfaction with the support given and benefits received. The ET concluded that this output delivered substantial benefits in the form of capacity strengthening in policy formulation and review.

Output 2.2: The ET concluded that most of the planned activities have been delivered with the exception of the development of a web based information platform which should enable the enquiry points operate more efficiently in delivery of services to the private sector. This is expected to be completed before the end of the project. Support in the form of equipment and training has been provided to for one TBT Enquiry and for three SPS NEPs and a contact point on Fisheries issues and the NNA in the Ministry of Trade.

The project supported the operationalization of the NNA. The notification system is working. A number of new regulations have been notified through the system on animal health. According to the NPC there have been no other regulations on SPS issues to notify during the timeframe of the project²⁶. Additional staff capacity building is still necessary. However the ET noted that there is currently a lack of coordination between the NEPS and the NNA with nobody apparently assigned responsibility for preparing notifications for transmission to the WTO Secretariat which is the primary function of the NNA and NEPs system. The focus

²⁶The WTO database shows only two WTO SPS notifications were sent since the start of the project

appears to be on services to the domestic private sector which is only a secondary or ancillary function of the NEPs.

A potential benefit to the private sector is advance warning of changes in regulatory requirements for a product. The TBT Enquiry Point has been issuing notifications since 2004. The WTO database records two TBT notifications from the TBT Enquiry Point in 2004 and ongoing notifications since 2007. The EAC project has supported updating the TBT databases and mailing lists, as well as strengthening the National TBT Consultative Committee

The ET was informed that the SPS NEPs had received a number of enquiries although it was not clear how many. These came from other countries enquiry points and requested information on Kenya SPS regulatory requirements for imports.

The project also assisted in setting up the National SPS Coordination Committee.

Output 2.4: The ET expects that the activities for this output will be completed and the benefits delivered as planned despite the delays in equipment procurement, delivery and installation. The equipment for the microbiological laboratory is expected to be delivered and installed in the next few months and KEBS expect that the laboratory will be accredited by UKAS within 12 months. It is also assumed that the project will provide TA for development of an operational plan for the microbiological laboratory as planned.

KEBS as the intermediary stakeholder expressed satisfaction with the support provided but criticized the time it took to procure the equipment as it delayed their objective of providing accredited *microbiological* testing services to exporters. (KEBS already provides accredited *chemical* laboratory testing services).

Output 2.5: Under this output, 14 companies are likely to be certified to ISO 22000 by the end of the project or shortly thereafter. This includes 10 fish processing companies, 3 fruit and vegetable exporters using the HCDA's packing house facilities and one independent fruit and vegetable exporter. two enterprises dropped out of the program but the target of five companies to be certified as set out in the indicator will still be reached.

65 internal auditors were trained in the horticultural and fisheries subsectors (50 for horticulture and 15 for fisheries) on FSMSs and further 16 are expected to receive training before the end of the project. An additional 15 internal auditors will be trained in the fish industry in Kisumu. Three lead auditors were trained on all aspects of ISO 22000 and a further 20 lead auditors in the fish industry are scheduled for training in October 2011.

The ET visited 4 enterprises participating in the ISO Certification program. This included 3 enterprises and the Horticultural Crops Development Authority (HCDA). The HCDA provides packing house services to 23 small enterprises of which 3 are expected to be certified to ISO 22000. The enterprises visited included two that will not proceed to certification. One of them serves the domestic market without intending to export in the foreseeable future and did thus not have a strategic market related reason for participating in the program. The company appears to have agreed to participate because the assistance was freely provided but withdrew. The other company was also annoyed because funding was not provided for upgrading, which they informed the ET was one of the main reasons they participated. However they remained in the program and also plan to implement ISO 22000 in the new plants they are currently constructing. The current plant of this company, which is rented, has been certified to the British Retail Consortium (BRC) Food Safety Management System (FMSS).

The MFD expressed satisfaction to the ET with the level of EAC project support towards building capacity in the ministry and in the private sector on HACCP and ISO 22000. They noted that this was aligned with GOK policy priority in targeting the fisheries sector for development. They also expressed their expectation that the TA provided under the project and the capacity developed would enhance the private sector's ability to compete more effectively in export markets by increasing their productivity. It is anticipated that improved private sector productivity would enable exporters to survive in the long term despite the depletion of fish stocks in Lake Victoria. They also noted that the increased capacity in the sector would assist the Ministry in its efforts to develop a viable SME based Aquaculture sector.

Rwanda

The target groups, key intermediaries and direct beneficiaries are the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MINICOM), Rwanda Bureau of Standards (RBS), Ministry of Health and Food Safety (MIHRS), Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, (RARDA), Rwanda Bureau of Standards (RBS) and selected enterprises. Indirect beneficiaries are the food business operators in the food chain and consumers.

Output 2.1: The support provided was similar to that provided in Kenya and Uganda. The EAC project supported Rwanda's active participation at EAC level in the development and review of the SPS protocol, harmonized food standards and elimination of NTBs. Support was also provided to high level discussions on food safety policy and legislation and the formation of a National Food Safety Committee. Similarly, the National Monitoring Committee on NTBs was assisted in the identification of NTBs.

Most of the activities following the MTR were completed. Activities completed before the MTR also contributed to the achievement of this output e.g. 2.1.1.3 *'Identify and keep an inventory of all food safety regulations and laws, Food Standards at RBS, EAC food Standards and CODEX Standards'* and 2.1.2.1. *'Discuss with Ministry of Health and Agriculture on development of Food safety policy and Strategy and formation of a National Food Safety Committee and establishment of National alert system'*.

The ET concluded that the support provided by the EAC project contributed significantly to the intermediaries' understanding of the key food safety issues in international trade and strengthened their capacity to develop and implement food safety policy.

Output 2.2: As planned, the EAC Project has supported setting up 3 SPS NEPs for food safety, plant and animal health through the provision of equipment and training including a study tour to Kenya. It had provided training to TBT NEP which already existed in the RBS. Most of the planned activities have been delivered. A web based SPS information exchanges platform has been completed and the NEP staff is currently learning to operate it. This will enable the NEPs operate more efficiently in delivery of services to the private sector. The ET was advised that the SPS NEPs had received 4 enquiries from other countries enquiry points or foreign enterprises for information on Rwanda's SPS regulatory requirements for imports. The TBT NEP had also received similar enquiries.

However the planned benefits cannot be fully realized until the SPS NNA is fully operational and sending notifications to the WTO Secretariat. The ET noted WTO TBT and SPS database has as yet no record of TBT or SPS notifications from Rwanda. See also chapter 4.4.

Output 2.4: The ET assumes that the benefits planned under this output will be delivered although the delays in project implementation and equipment procurement have changed the time frame for realization of the benefits. Equipment for the RBS microbiological laboratory has been delivered and is being installed. The EAC project is continuing to provide support for accreditation to ISO 17025. Staff members from the chemical laboratory were included in the training. This included training of laboratory staff in proficiency testing and as assessors. It is expected that the laboratory will be accredited by within 12-18 months. This assessment assumes that the EAC Project will provide TA for the development of an operational plan for the RBS microbiological and chemical laboratories as planned.

The RBS laboratory staff expressed satisfaction with the support provided but also criticized the length of time it took to procure the equipment.

Output 2.5: The EAC project provided support to initially 10 companies for certification to ISO 22000. Four and possibly five factories are expected to proceed to certification although it is unlikely to be accomplished within the project time frame. This includes two tea producing companies, one dairy, one fruit juice producer and possibly one tomato processor. The ET assumes the project will strengthen the quality environment in Rwanda delivering the benefits as planned.

The ET visited 5 enterprises. All enterprises cited market related objectives for their decision to seek certification to ISO 22000 such as meeting buyer requirements in existing export markets, or strengthening the product brand to enter export markets in EAC countries. They also noted that UNIDO had provided the motivation to implement FSMS and would proceed to seek certification after the project ended even without support from UNIDO. At the same time, they argued that the support provided was insufficient and appealed for additional support.

The ET concluded that output was successfully achieved.

The Permanent Secretary in MINICOM expressed satisfaction to the ET with the EAC project support towards building capacity in the public sector and in private sector on HACCP and ISO 22000.

Tanzania

The target groups, key intermediaries and direct beneficiaries are the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Marketing (MITM), Tanzania Bureau of Standards (TBS), the Tanzania Food and Drugs Authority (TFDA), Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MHSW), Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture (CCIA), Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Cooperatives (MAFC), Ministry of Livestock Development and Fisheries (MLDF) and selected enterprises. Indirect beneficiaries are the other food business enterprises in the food chain and consumers.

Output 2.1: The key intermediaries were supported to participate at EAC level in the development of the SPS protocol, associated SPS measures, and harmonized food standards and to support a regional and national dialogue on NTBs. Support was also provided to the Food Quality Committee which included the key intermediary institutions i.e. TBS, TFDA, Ministries, MHSW and MLDF to develop a food safety policy and review the Food and Drug Act. Activities for the achievement of output 1.2 were implemented in conjunction with this output, and despite the delay in organization of the Food Safety Week it appears to have had a synergistic effect towards strengthening the benefits delivered under both outputs. Awareness raised by the Food Safety week among key intermediaries and stakeholders is likely to create demand for more effective food safety policy

and regulatory framework to assist exporters meet market access requirements and strengthen consumer protection in the country.

Output 2.2: The project provided training and equipment to the WTO TBT NEP at the TBS and to nominally established SPS NEPs at the MAFC, MLDF and a SPS NNA at the MITM. The WTO TBT database has recorded 36 TBT notifications sent by the TBT NEP starting in 2009 although it was not clear to the ET whether this was a result of the EAC project intervention. The MITM advised the ET that WTO had complained they had received no SPS notifications since a trial notification was sent in 1999. The ET believes this is because SPS NEPS do not understand how NNA and NEPs operate rather than the absence of criteria for triggering SPS notifications. The planned benefits cannot be fully realized until the SPS NNA is fully operational.

Output 2.4: The benefits envisaged for this output will be delivered later than planned due to delays in project implementation, equipment procurement and customs clearance. The laboratory equipment had been delivered and was due for installation in the TFDA Chemistry laboratory. The TDFA informed the ET that they were very happy with the support provided and had already initiated training, some with the support of the project, to meet the requirements for accreditation to ISO 17025 by SADCAS. They expect to be accredited for testing parameters allowable by the equipment provided by the end of the year. The project will also provide TA for the development of an operational or business plan by the end of the project.

Output 2.5: The project provided initial support to 10 companies in the fish, tea, coffee and dairy sectors. 1 fish processing company and 1 tea company have already been certified and a further 3 companies are expected to be certified by the end of the project. Another 2 companies which the ET interviewed will not be certified this year for internal reasons but intend to proceed with certification next year.

The three enterprises visited by the ET expressed their appreciation and gratitude for the support provided under the EAC project but also complained that it was insufficient and requested for more. All the enterprises visited expressed their intention to proceed to ISO certification with or without further support from the project which indicates the effectiveness of the intervention. The enterprises also noted that the project was a catalyst for them to seek certification to ISO 22000. Their objective in doing so was to facilitate entry to export markets in EAC countries, meet buyer requirements in existing export markets or improve competitiveness in domestic and export markets.

The ET concluded that this intervention delivered benefits despite some complaints from beneficiaries.

Uganda

The target groups, key intermediaries and direct beneficiaries are the Ministry of Trade Industry and Cooperatives (MTIC), Ministry of Tourism (MoTU), Uganda National Bureau of Standards (UNBS), National Drug Authority (NDA), Private Sector Foundation, Department of Crop Protection in the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAIF), Uganda National Chamber of Commerce and Industry (UNCCI), Uganda Manufacturers Association (UMA) and selected enterprises. Indirect beneficiaries are the other food business enterprise in the food chain and consumers.

Output 2.1: Similar as in the other countries, the EAC Project provided support for national participation in the development and review of the SPS protocol and associated annexes. Support was also provided to the formation of a National Food Safety Advisory Committee and to set up a food safety desk in the National Drug Authority (NFDA). Assistance was also provided in identifying NTBs that need to be eliminated and to prioritizing food standards to be harmonized to facilitate intra EAC trade.

Most of the activities were completed following the MTR. Activities completed under this output before the change in design also contributed to the achievement of this output e.g. 2.1.1.3 *'Identify and keep an inventory of all food safety regulations and laws, Food Standards at UNBS, EAC food Standards and CODEX Standards'*

Output 2.2: The EAC Project provided training to the TBT NEP and SPS NNA already established in the UNBS. It also supported setting up 2 SPS NEPs for food safety, plant and animal health in the MoA, and MAAIF respectively through the provision of equipment and training and the development of a web based SPS information exchange mechanism. Most of the planned activities were delivered and will enable the enquiry points operate more efficiently in delivery of services to the private sector.

However, the planned benefits cannot be fully realized until the SPS NNA is fully operational and sending notifications to the WTO Secretariat. There are no SPS notifications from Uganda in the WTO SPS notification database which suggests that the SPS NNA is not yet carrying its primary function and suggest that the intervention in this regard is weak. However the ET understands a trial notification was sent recently. The TBT Enquiry Point has been actively sending notifications since 2007. See also chapter 4.4.

Output 2.4: Like in other countries this output will be achieved as expected despite the delays in procurement. The equipment had been delivered and was due for installation. Support was provided for training on proficiency testing to

meet the requirements for accreditation to ISO 17025. It is expected that the laboratory will be accredited by SANAS or another Accreditation Body (AB) within 12-18 months. This assessment assumes that the project will provide TA for development of an operational plan for the microbiological and chemical laboratories as planned. The UNBS laboratory staff expressed satisfaction with the support provided but also criticized the length of time it took to procure the equipment.

Output 2.5: Progress in implementing planned activities is similar to the other countries. One company has already been certified. Another three tea producing companies and 1 fruit juice producer are expected to proceed to certification. The two companies visited by the ET had clear market oriented objectives for participating and expressed their appreciation for the support provided.

However, it is not clear why only 5 companies of 10 originally selected for support will progress to certification. The ET surmises that in the case of coffee producers it may be because ISO certification is not required by buyers in the EU and export markets and it is therefore not clear what the economic benefit to the enterprises would be. Furthermore they are already exporting and are part of large conglomerates which can afford certification if required. None the less the ET judged achievement of this output as successful and believe it will have a potential positive impact on exports.

5.4.2. Outcomes and Impact

This section assesses the achievement of Outcomes 1 and 2. It also proposes some additional outcomes to capture the outputs achieved not captured under Outcomes 1 and 2. It is too early to assess the impacts from the outcomes before activities for outputs have been completed. The ET therefore estimates the potential impacts.

5.4.2.1. Regional Outcome

Outcome 1: *At the regional level, SPS Protocol is adopted, and standards and conformity assessment procedures for selected agro-products are harmonized.*

Outcome 1 is likely to be achieved as a direct result of Output 1.1 and 1.2 but this is not likely within the time frame of the project²⁷. Intermediaries and stakeholders interviewed by the ET believe that the ratification by national parliaments could take another 6-12 months. After ratification it must still be implemented by partner states. Once this is achieved, further action will be required to harmonize national conformity assessment procedures for food products required to demonstrate

²⁷ This analysis assumes that the Outcome 1 refers to national conformity assessment procedures necessary to demonstrate compliance with regional standards. It also assumes that regional standards must be adopted as national standards and implemented as mandatory where relevant.

compliance with the SPS measures and food safety standards. This is necessary as conformity assessment procedures are not addressed in the harmonized SPS measures or food standards²⁸. It is also necessary to ensure conformity assessment and compliance procedures do not form unnecessary NTBs to intra EAC trade.

The original targeted Outcome 1 *'EAC Secretariat is able to enhance the regional harmonization and cooperation efforts and establish a regional infrastructure in the food safety area'* will also be partly realized as a result of output 1.1 and 1.2. The ratification of the SPS Protocol and subsequent implementation in all partner states will in effect set the parameters for a regional food safety infrastructure; albeit one that is trade focused and does not necessarily address domestic food safety issues.

National stakeholders noted in their discussions with the ET that the capacity developed at EAC and national level in preparing the SPS protocol in conjunction with the heightened awareness of the role and importance of food safety in international trade (as a result of output 1.2) has enhanced the EAC Secretariat's ability to promote regional harmonization and cooperation,

Potential impact of outcome 1

The future potential impacts of this outcome would be;

1. Increase in trade and in particular in intra EAC trade -quantifiable from trade statistics using date of ratification of the SPS Protocol by all partner states baseline date;
2. Increase in use of regional standards by the private sector in intra EAC trade - quantifiable from statistics of NSBs using the date for the harmonized food standards are gazetted as the baseline date;
3. Increase in productivity of exporters in the agri-business sector (arising from use of harmonized standards) - quantifiable from survey of exporters correlated with the results of 2 and using the same baseline year as 2.

The magnitude of impacts above cannot be assessed because no baseline data exist.

Note: Neither the revised nor the original outcome 1 capture the potential impact of Output 2. These include:

²⁸ The PMS in comments to the draft report noted that It was indeed EAC project's recommendation to prioritize the conformity assessment standards as part of the UNIDO support but the EAC standards committee had their own list of priorities which they asked the EAC project to support

- a) Reduction in food borne disease incidence in the region - quantifiable from a household survey ideally using the baseline year as the date the first safety week was implemented (but as a survey was not carried out a baseline would have to be established in the first year of the survey),
- b) Increased public demand for strengthened consumer protection laws on food safety and food standards - quantifiable from a survey of stakeholders using the baseline year as the date the first safety week was implemented.

The result of this output can have an immediate impact in these areas. The ET concluded from interviews that awareness was raised among intermediaries and enterprises participating in the food safety week. It is likely to increase the impetus among regulatory stakeholders to strengthen food safety regulatory framework and food safety management. The inclusion of media advertisements using both radio, print media and in some countries TV will have reached consumers in rural and urban areas. However, it was not possible for the ET to assess changed awareness of consumers without a consumer survey. A more accurate quantitative assessment of intermediaries, stakeholders and beneficiaries would require an opinion survey to establish a baseline and assess future changes.

5.4.2.2. National Outcomes

Outcome 2: *At national level, selected conformity assessment bodies are able to provide support to agro-based and enterprises and the enterprises to be able to increase export trade.*

This outcome will be achieved with the support provided to the chemical and microbiological testing laboratories in each country under outputs 2.3 and 2.4. However, the outcome can only be realized once the outputs are achieved -the laboratory equipment has been installed and the laboratory staff trained.

Potential impact of outcome 2

The future potential impact would be:

1. Increase in demand for testing services from exporters and increase in services provided by the laboratories for quality control and conformity assessment for exports - quantifiable from laboratory data;
2. Increase in exports of enterprises using testing services - quantifiable from enterprise data;
3. Increase in number of companies exporting - quantifiable from national statistical data (if available);
4. Increase in investment in the food sector for exports for which testing services are provided - quantifiable from national statistical data (if available) using date of accreditation of the laboratory as the baseline; and

5. Increase in employment in the export food sector in enterprises using laboratory testing services- quantifiable from national statistical data.

The baseline year should be when the laboratories are accredited to ISO 17025 as the utility value to the exporter increases once the conformity assessment is carried out by an accredited laboratory²⁹.

The ET believes that outcome 2 does not capture the results of the outputs 2.1, 2.2 and 2.5 and uses instead the initial Outcome 3 for purposes of this analysis.

Outcome 3: *'In each country, the national capacity in SPS related issues at general and regulatory, institutional and enterprise levels, established and or upgraded'*

The potential impacts include:

1. Strengthening of the regulatory framework i.e. legislative framework, institutional structures and administrative procedures necessary to implement official controls - quantifiable from interviews with intermediaries on the institutional changes that have occurred and from the national gazette;
2. Increase in adoption of food safety standards by export food business enterprises - quantifiable from the national standards institutions' data using the end date of project as the baseline;
3. Increase in compliance with SPS measures and food safety standards by food export business enterprises - quantifiable from control or competent authorities' data;
4. Reduction in rejections of food products in export markets due to non-compliance - quantifiable from control or competent authorities' data;
5. Increase in trade of food products within the EAC and export to other markets- quantifiable from national statistical data;
6. Increase in awareness of food safety among all stakeholders in the food chain - quantifiable from opinion and consumer survey data; and
7. Increase in consumer confidence in safety of food produced by national and EAC food business operators - quantifiable from consumer survey data.

The end date of the project should be used as the baseline for measuring these impacts.³⁰.

²⁹Accreditation by an international accreditation body (AB) who is a member of the International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) and a signatory to its mutual recognition arrangement (MRA).

³⁰ It is assumed that there is an implementation lag between policy discussion and intermediaries which precludes using the project start date as the baseline date unless an institutional or legislative change can be directly attributed to policy formulation directly or indirectly facilitated by the EAC project.

The ET uses an additional outcome to capture the results of output 2.5:

Outcome 4: *Strengthened national quality environment for food production for export*

Impact: Outcome 4

The potential impacts include:

1. Increase in exports of companies which implemented HACCP and/or ISO 22000 under the EAC project - quantifiable from enterprise data using the date of implementation of HACCP or certification to ISO 22000 as the baseline;
2. Increase in employment in food business enterprises implementing HACCP or certified to ISO 22000 under the EAC project- quantifiable from enterprise data using the same baseline as 1;
3. Increase in the number of food producers implementing HACCP or ISO 22000 - quantifiable from enterprise survey data using the end date of the project as the baseline³¹;
4. Increase in companies implementing HACCP or ISO 22000 and in their exports-quantifiable from enterprise data using the same baseline date as 1.
5. Increase in buyer confidence in food safety of export food production - quantifiable from enterprise survey data using the same baseline date as 3.

5.5 Sustainability

5.5.1. Regional

The SPS Protocol is expected to be ratified by EAC Partner states within the next 6 -12 months. However it must then be implemented by each country and this likely to take considerably longer to achieve. Nonetheless Outcome 1 in this regard is clearly sustainable.

The intermediaries interviewed in each country agreed that the active participation of the EAC Secretariat in the process of developing the SPS Protocol ensured a high degree of ownership of the process. This has strengthened the capacity of the EAC Secretariat to manage harmonization in this area and is expected to drive the process for elimination of trade related NTBs, including where relevant SPS measures and food safety standards that are not allowable under WTO rules.

³¹ Assumes a lag period between awareness and implementation of FSMS

The active participation of national stakeholders in the development of the SPS Protocol and the SPS annexes and in the development of harmonized food standards has helped create policy support for implementation of the SPS protocol at national level once it is ratified.

A potential constraint on further harmonization of the SPS and food safety regulatory framework in EAC Member states is insufficient funding for the purpose at regional and national level. Progress achieved in relation to the SPS Protocol relied on logistical support from the EAC project. Progress would have been limited without this donor support to facilitate the meetings.

The increase in public awareness on food safety realized as a result of the food safety week is likely to be sustained in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania where it has been agreed as an annual event (since 2009) and appears to have been institutionalized within the relevant ministries. The situation is more problematic in Rwanda and Burundi. The food safety week was not marked in Rwanda in 2010 but is planned take place in 2011 with support from UNICEF, while the 2009 activity in Burundi appears to have been a one-off event, with neither commitment nor initiative from government stakeholders to make it an annual event.

5.5.2. National

Burundi

The training provided on phytosanitary inspection procedures under output 2.1 is likely to be sustainable as it will be applied in routine operations by the Department of Plant Health. However interviewees believe that the sustainability of the other benefits in SPS policy development and regulatory framework assessment will require additional medium term support from donors to ensure sustainability as they lag behind other EAC countries in terms of capacity and resources.

The output of 2.2 is not sustainable without further TA. See also chapter 8.1.2.

Outcomes from support given to FACAGRO is likely to be sustainable as one of their key objectives in strengthening their microbiological testing capacity for food products is to provide testing services to the exporters. They intend to seek accreditation to ISO 17025 for the testing services to be provided and will implement the operational/business plan to be developed with the support of the project. It is expected that the income from services provided to exporters will cover their costs.

However the training provided provide to the BNN Chemistry Laboratory is unlikely to be sustainable without further TA and it is not clear whether this will be provided under the TMEA program. All interviewees in the public and private sector agreed that support given to enterprises in the food sector to implement FSMS has improved the quality environment in Burundi and is likely to be sustainable as it is driven by export market requirements. For example IAB intend to implement HACCP as part of their plans to produce UHT milk for export. OTB plan to implement ISO 22000 to meet buyer requirements in their export markets and estimate to receive a premium return of between 10-20% on the commodity price once certified. The sustainability of the support given to OTB will be strengthened as Agence Française de Développement (AFD) is planning a new TA project to provide financial and technical support to assist OTB meet the QMS requirements for certification to ISO 22000. This is a 2 to 3 year project, with an estimated value of the TA at €1.1 Million, is expect to commence this year or early 2012.

Kenya

All interviewees agreed that the impetus created through the National Food Safety Committee in the process of developing the National Food Policy and coordinating mechanism for the various regulatory authorities involved in the National Food Safety Management System is likely to continue. This in addition to the active participation of relevant stakeholders in the process contributes to sustainability of Output 2.1.

The intermediary stakeholders indicated to the ET that the EU was planning to introduce a new TA program to strengthen the national food safety system in Kenya. This will be introduced as part of the 11thEDF for ACP countries states which will be implemented from 2013 to 2018. Although the program has not yet been formulated, the potential stakeholders advised the ET confirmed that it will take note of the outputs of the EAC project, particularly in relation to legislative harmonization (vis-a-vis the SPS Protocol and SPS Annexes) and the support given to the testing laboratories and the private sector.

Given the operational coordination problem between the SPS NNA and NEPs some additional TA may be required to address this issue and enable the NAA to carry out its primary function. See also chapter 8.1.2.

The ET believes that the TA to the KEBS Microbiological laboratory under output 2.4 is clearly sustainable and supported by KEBS policy to offer a full range of laboratory testing services for food products to exporters. KEBS Chemical laboratory is already accredited to ISO 17025 for water, fruit juices and fish products. The equipment provided will allow KEBS to offer microbiological testing services for these products. KEBS has already initiated a QMS to meet the requirements of ISO 17025 and expect to be accredited for the relevance

parameters within 12 months from the date of installation of the equipment. Although KEBS does not retain income generated from provision of testing services they expect the GOK will provide budget lines to maintain the laboratory and equipment for provision of services to exporters and to the KEBS for testing imports. The development of an operational/business plan which is to be supported by the project before the end of the project will also enhance planning for sustainability.

Similarly output 2.5 is considered sustainable for the same reasons as in Kenya. The implementation by companies proceeding to certification is market driven. HCDA informed the ET that three of the enterprises who were using their packing house facilities were applying for ISO Certification in order to enter export markets in the EU. The ET also learnt from the MFD that the fish producers in Mombasa and Kisumu are implementing ISO 22000 to ensure their competitiveness in the export markets in the EU and to increase their productivity in the face of declining fish stocks in Lake Victoria. WONI who withdrew from the program also informed the ET that, in addition to the British Retail Consortium (BRC) standard they currently implement, they intended to implement ISO 22000 in two new fruit and vegetable plants that were under construction on new sites.

The project was also implemented in Kenya in close collaboration with the MoL whose role in the process is to ensure that project outputs are built into future projects by donors. This contributes to sustainability of the outcomes.

Rwanda

The intermediary stakeholders interviewed concurred that the National Food Safety Committee which was formed with the support of the project will be maintained as an instrument for national food safety policy formulation and coordination, and for institution and administrative changes to strengthen the national food safety management system. The government is expected to provide financial support where necessary for these meetings. Stakeholders actively participated in the process which contributes to its sustainability. The FAO's Kigali field office is also planning to introduce an intermediate TA program to support the strengthening of the national food safety management system. The program is currently at the design stage and FAO has consulted the NPC as part of this process to ensure complementarities with the EAC project. This will enhance sustainability of Output 2.1.

The TBT NEP and SPS NNA and NEPS may need additional TA to ensure that they can carry out their primary function. See also chapter in 8.1.2.

The ET believes that the TA to the RBS Microbiological laboratory under output 2.4 is clearly sustainable for the same reasons as in Kenya. The equipment provided will allow RBS to offer microbiological testing services to exporters. The

laboratory is planning to seek accreditation ISO 17025 and expects to be accredited within 12 months from the date of installation of the equipment. The RBS expects to receive sufficient funds from budget appropriation towards maintenance of the laboratory and equipment to provide the necessary services to exporters and to the RBS for testing imports. The development of an operational/business plan which is to be supported by the EAC project before the end of the project will also enhance sustainability.

Output 2.5 is sustainable for the similar reasons as in Kenya. The implementation by the companies proceeding to certification is market driven. Rwanda Mountain Tea is implementing ISO 22000 in order to meet buyer requirements in the exports. Currently they are exporting their tea through the bulk auction market in Mombasa. The company plans direct export entry and has a target of 20% of total volumes for direct sales within the next 5 years. They also anticipate a quality price premium of 10-20%. Sina Gerald is implementing ISO 22000 to increase productivity and to increase their competitiveness in EAC and Middle East markets. The company is also assisted by a GIZ project technician to implement the changes necessary in the production line and standard procedures to apply the pre-requisite GHP and GMP programs necessary for ISO certification. Sorwatom, who had to withdraw from the program as a new owner had altered investment priorities for plant, nonetheless confirmed that the new investor was committed to making the necessary investments for certification to ISO certification in 2012. The objective is also to improve its competitive position and beginning exporting within EAC countries.

Tanzania

All interviewees agreed that the support provided to Food Quality Committee which included the key intermediary institutions i.e. TBS, TFDA, Ministries, MHSW and MLDF to develop a food safety policy and review the Food, Drugs and Cosmetics Act 2003 is sustainable as the Act is likely to be updated in line with changes in international standards and guidelines in the near future. This in addition to the active participation of relevant stakeholders in the process contributes to sustainability of Output 2.1.

The SPS NNA and NEPs may need additional TA to ensure that they can carry out their primary function. See also chapter in 8.1.2.

The ET believes that the TA to the TFDA Chemistry laboratory under output 2.4 is clearly sustainable and supported by TFA policy to offer a full range of laboratory services to meet the requirements for accreditation to ISO 17025 by SADC Accreditation Services (SADCAS). They expect to be accredited for testing parameters allowable by the equipment provided by the end of the year. The TFDA also intend to proceed with the development of a business plan for their

laboratories. Funding for equipment maintenance will be included in their budget. This will enhance sustainability of the output.

The ET believes that Output 2.5 is sustainable. 1 fish processing company and 1 tea company have already been certified and a further 3 companies are expected to be certified by the end of the project. Another 2 companies intend to proceed with certification next year. All the enterprises visited expressed their intention to proceed to ISO certification with or without further support from the EAC project which indicates the effectiveness of the intervention. While the project was a catalyst for them to seek certification to ISO 22000 their objective in doing so is to improve their competitiveness and meet buyer requirements in Tanzanian and other EAC markets.

Uganda

In Uganda the strengthening of the National Food Safety Committee with the support of the EAC project is likely to be maintained as an instrument for national food safety policy formulation and institutional coordination. It is expected that the draft food safety policy, standards policy, accreditation policy and metrology policy when passed by cabinet will further define coordination mechanisms and strengthen the national food safety management system.

The EU Delegation in Uganda also indicated that there were plans to support a new TA program towards strengthening the national food safety system in Uganda under the 11th EDF which will be implemented from 2013 to 2018. It was affirmed to the ET that the program formulation process build on the outputs of the UNIDO program to ensure its complementarity and sustainability of sector interventions.

The SPS NNA and NEPS may need addition TA to ensure that they can carry out their primary function. See Uganda in chapter in 8.1.2 above.

The ET believes that the TA to the UNBS Chemical laboratory under Output 2.4 is clearly sustainable for the same reasons as in Kenya and Rwanda. The equipment provided strengthens the capacity of UNBS to offer competitive chemical laboratory testing services to exporters. The laboratory will seek accreditation ISO 17025 and expect to be accredited within 12 months for the products covered. Testing turn-around time will be reduced from an average of 15 days to a low of 10 days. Interviewees also informed the ET that there is a shortage of chemical laboratory testing services in Uganda and this intervention while increasing that capacity will not compromise competitiveness of any laboratory. The UNBS, which is allowed by government to retain internally generated revenues, will provide funds in its budget to maintain the laboratory equipment to the standards required for accreditation. The development of an

operational/business plan which will be supported by the project before the end will facilitate planning for sustainability.

Output 2.5 is deemed sustainable in Uganda for the similar reasons. Implementation by the companies proceeding to certification is market driven. Igara Tea Growers advised the ET that their objective is to sell 50 % of their products directly to customers in the UK and other EU markets instead of selling 100 % through the Mombasa auctions market as current practice is. They also expect to get a price premium of between 10 to 20%.

One enterprise, Britannia, is already exporting within the EAC and Middle East and is implementing ISO 22000 to increase their competitiveness and maintain their reputation and consumer confidence in their products for high standards. When certified they plan seek export opportunities to the EU. Britannia also informed the ET that the project strengthened the overall quality environment and increased the propensity of food producers to implement FSMS in line with international standards.

Project objective and development goal

Overall the ET concluded the outputs and outcomes of TCB project will contribute to the achievement of the Project objective and the Project development goal. However neither can be fully achieved until the SPS Protocol is ratified and implemented in each EAC Partner state.

6. Recommendations

The Evaluation Team makes the following recommendations to the different project partners.

A. Recommendations to UNIDO

- 1. Further support should be provided to the EAC Secretariat for ratification of the SPS Protocol by EAC Partner states and subsequent implementation in each country. A comprehensive problem analysis and stakeholder analysis should be undertaken in partnership with the EAC Secretariat as part of a project formulation mission to design this intervention.**

While the current EAC project outputs will contribute to the project objective, it can be only fully achieved when the SPS Protocol is ratified and implemented by each EAC Partner State. Similarly the impact can also only be fully realized when this process is complete. The SPS protocol requires the establishment of support structures such as an SPS Office and SPS Committee at the regional level to assist and monitor its implementation at national level. The EAC Secretariat has limited resources and must rely on donor assistance to implement its integrations strategy.

The implementation of this recommendation is likely to require logistical support to the national institutions involved in implementing the SPS protocol at level participate in regional meetings designed to assist implementation. It will also require donor TA to (a) harmonize the legislative framework with the SPS Protocol and (b) harmonize the institutional structure and administrative procedures of the national food safety management system with best international practice. TA will also be required to develop MRAs to ensure harmonization of conformity assessment and compliance requirements and procedures.

However, given the experience of this project, national activities are more efficient and effective than stand-alone interventions particularly when a differentiated approach is required for different countries to ensure they reach a common benchmark which by definition is both a regional and

international standard³². Recommendation 2 below is made to address this.

- 2. UNIDO should initiate separate national interventions to assist EAC Partners harmonize the regulatory framework with the SPS protocol. This should support harmonization of institutional structure and administrative procedures of the national food safety management system with best international practice as well as the legislative framework. A comprehensive problem analysis and stakeholder analysis should be undertaken in each EAC Partner state as part of a project formulation mission to design this intervention.**

As noted above under recommendation 1, this intervention is needed to support implementation of the SPS protocol at the national level in each EAC Partner state. Each national intervention should be coordinated to common benchmarks to ensure parallel strengthening of the national food safety system in each country. However as noted under Recommendation 1 the ET believes each national intervention is more efficiently implemented as a separate intervention.³³

- 3. Support should be provided to the EAC Secretariat and EAC Partner states for harmonization of EAC food standards**

Further harmonization of EAC food standards is a very important prerequisite for EAC integration and intra EAC trade. It is currently not adequately supported or undertaken by existing EAC donor programmes. Substantial TA is necessary to make a significant progress on this. This issue was raised by many stakeholders and also highlighted in the last RSC meeting. Standards harmonisation should include harmonisation of related conformity assessments (testing, certification, inspection) and other compliance requirements and procedures.

- 4. Joint accountability with the EAC Secretariat should be considered for future projects to support ownership and capacity enhancement.**

³² The SPS Protocol and its SPS and food safety annexes have been drawn up in accordance with international standards guidelines as required by the WTO SPS agreement.

³³ The EAC Secretariat advised the ET during the debriefing that a regional intervention would require the inclusion of national components in order to get approval from the EAC Partner states for the intervention. This might be addressed by introducing a regional project and national projects as part of a regional program but with each national project designed and implemented as a stand-alone project.

In discussions with the ET the EAC Secretariat suggested that given the project objective and the project outputs are of strategic importance to the EAC Partner states, the EAC Secretariat should have a greater role in the management of the project. They propose this should include joint accountability whereby project activities and budgets jointly approved by the EAC Secretariat and UNIDO rather than simply by UNIDO. They believe that this will enhance their ownership of the project outputs and outcomes and will increase their sustainability.

- 5. A web-enabled results based quarterly monitoring system benchmarked against quarterly and SMART OVI's accessible to all stakeholders should be used in M&E of future follow-up interventions.**

A web-enabled result based monitoring system may identify potential implementation difficulties more quickly than the system in place. This may enable a more rapid response to addressing the issues and thus avoid problems similar to those experienced in the TCB project.

- 6. Field missions for evaluation of future UNIDO-EAC projects should start and end with consultations with the EAC Secretariat.**

As the main counterpart, the EAC Secretariat should be consulted before and after an independent evaluation mission.

B. Recommendation to the Government of Burundi

- 1. Under its TMEA program, the Government of Burundi should ensure that the staff of the BNN Chemistry Laboratory receives the training, which is necessary to make the achievements of the EAC project sustainable.**

C. Donor

- 1. The donor should consider funding UNIDO to implement the above recommendations.**

With the experience it has gained from this project, UNIDO has moved the learning curve on regional implementation. It can also now build on the successful outputs and outcomes of this project.

- 2. The donor should consider supporting development of QMS certification services by accredited public or private sector companies in each EAC country.**

One of the reasons that the ET concluded the outputs under 2.5 are sustainable is that the reasons given by the enterprise for proceeding to ISO 22000 certification are market driven e.g. a need to improve competitiveness in export markets, in many instances in other EAC markets. While the success of this project will promote other enterprises to follow suit the ET believe the uptake could be faster if more donor support was provided. This can act as a significant catalyst in increasing intra EAC trade.

D. EAC Secretariat

- 1. The EAC Secretariat should begin establishing the SPS structures required under the SPS Protocol, where possible e.g. by appointing a SPS Officer.**

The ET recognizes that given the limited resources of the EAC Secretariat this may require donor support. The appointment of an STMQ officer under the STMQ Protocol was successfully supported by PTB in earlier years.

7. Lessons learned

The key lessons learned from this evaluation are:

1. In line with the recommendations of the Thematic Evaluation of UNIDO SMTQ projects, this evaluation found that a more in-depth problem analysis and stakeholder analysis is necessary at the formulation stage of a project to ensure a correct identification of the complexity of the problems and a design appropriate to the time frame and the resources available.
2. When difficulties in implementation are protracted over a longer period of time and delaying project implementation, the project management should consider initiating an independent review of the overall project design. The decision to initiate a MTR and act on its recommendations was critical to the eventual successful implementation of the project. The MTR should be carried out by a fresh management team or an independent consulting team. In the case of the EAC project it was carried out by the newly appointed RPC and CTA who could assess the project design from a fresh perspective.
3. Procurement is at the heart of SMTQ projects. It is a protracted and difficult process that should be given high attention and priority from the project start. Project management should ensure close communication and cooperation with the UNIDO procurement branch to ensure timely decisions and minimize delays. The UNIDO procurement branch, project management and UNIDO Field Offices should establish close quality control mechanisms to avoid communication errors and possible mistakes in consignee details, which can entail considerable delays and demurrage charges. There seems to be room for improving UNIDO's internal procurement communication processes.

Annex 1 - List of persons consulted

EAC Secretariat

- Dr. Flora Musonda, Director for Trade, Customs and Trade Directorate, EAC
- Mr Willy Musinguzi, Principal Standards Officer, Customs and Trade Directorate, EAC
- Mr Timothy E.O. Wesonga, Principal Livestock and Fisheries Officer, Customs and Trade Directorate, EAC

East African Business Council (EABC)

- Agatha Nderitu, Executive Director, East African Business Council

UNDIO and Donors

- UNIDO Vienna, Ms Muge Dolun, TCB Project Manager
- UNIDO, Vienna, Mr Dejene Tezera, AGR Project Manager
- Dr. Ananias Bagumire, UNIDO RPC.
- Rene Frechet, Chief Technical Adviser to EAC Program
- Tobias Diergardt, Project Coordinator, PTB Project “Establishment of a Regional Quality Infrastructure in the East African Community (EAC)”
- Niels von Keyserlingk, Program Manager, GIZ Program, ‘Support to the EAC Integration Process’
- Florian Berhardt, Head of Centre for Economic Policy, GIZ Program, ‘Support to the EAC Integration Process’

Burundi

- Nestor Bikorimana, UNIDO National Project Coordinator, Burundi.
- Aloys Mbonihankuyem, Technical Director, Societe Sucriere Du Moso.
- Carine Bigira, Program Officer, Trade Mark East Africa - Burundi
- Liliane Nzibarega, Program Officer, Trade Mark East Africa -Burundi
- Claire Galante, Project Manager, Agence Francaise de Development-Burundi.
- Damien Nakobedetse , Director, BBN
- Eric Ruracenyeka, Head of Training and Technical Assistance Division, BBN,
- Gervais Nzinahora, TBT Enquiry Point, BBN,
- Christophe Mvutsebakana, Head Chemist, NALC, BBN
- Edouard Nzambimana, Chemist, NALC, BBN.

- Donavine Hakizimana, Director, NIPH,, MPH
- Albin Sinzotuma, Assistant Director, Directorate General of Industry, Mol
- Prosper Kiyuku, Laboratory Manger, Microbiology laboratory, FACAGRO
- Eliakim Sakayoya, Department of Plant Protection , MoA.
- Alexis Nzohabonimana, Director, OTB TeaAuthority, Burundi.
- Thomas Nkeshimama, Marketing Manager, OTB, Tea authority, Burundi,
- Habwawuhe Nethode, Factory Manager, OTB Rwagura, Burundi.
- Ruripniaye Bruit, General Manager, OTB Rwagure, Burundi.
- Pierre Claver Kiraroba, Production Manager, SODECO, Burundi.
- Nestor Sibomana, Production Manager, IAB
- Heimo Vicens, Managing Director, LIQUIDS

Kenya

- Mr Andrew Edewa, UNIDONPC, Kenya.
- Dr. Eng. Karanja Kibicho, Permanent Secretary, Mol
- George Makateto, UNIDO Desk Officer, Mol
- Pamela Dede, Deputy Director of Industries, Mol
- Ms Evah Oduor, Ag. Managing Director, KEBS
- Ms Lucy Ikonya. Manager, Trade and External Affairs, KEBS
- Clarkson Agembo, Manager Microbiology Laboratory, KEBS
- Ms Margaret Masaku, Assistant Director of Agriculture, MoA.
- Dedan Mungai, Assistant Director of Fisheries, MFD.
- Mr Kilinda Kilei, Health Specialists, National Food Safety and Quality Control, MPHS.
- Robert M. Kilonzo, Head of Division of Food Safety and Quality Control Secretariat, MPHS.,
- Ms Lucy Obungu, Assistant Director of Fisheries, MFD.
- Francis Wario. Technical Manager, FPEAK.
- Beth Wagude Chief Executive Officer, KFPA.
- Mr Philip Njoroge, Head, Trade & Standards, KEPHIS.
- Dr. Daniel Karugu Assistant Director of Veterinary Services. MALD.
- Lily Langat, Pack House Manager, HCDA
- Josephine N. Simiyu, Horticultural Officer & ISO 22000 Team Leader, HCDA.
- Mr David Mulwa, Managing Director, Kandia FPS.
- Mr Sundip Jethalal, General Manager, Fresh an Juici.
- Mr Thadeaus Mutiso, Director, Woni Vegfru Exporters and Importers
- Anne Kamau Chief Trade Officer. MoT.
- Brama Lito Kaleve Senior Trade Development Officer, MoT.
- Jose Maciel, Director, TMEA, Kenya.

Rwanda

- Andre Habimana, Head of UNIDO Operations, Rwanda
- Charles Rutagyengwa, UNIDO NPC, Rwanda
- Emmanuel Hategeka, Permanent Secretary, MINICOM
- Peace Basemera, Trade Officer, MINICOM
- Izabu Muhikira, Acting Head of Export and Manufacturing, Rwandan Development Board
- Mark Cyubahiro Bagabe, Director General, RBS.
- Philip Nzaire, Director of Quality Assurance Unit, RBS
- Liliane Kamanzi, Head of Information and Documentation, TBTNEP, RBS.
- Mukeshiyaremye Athanasie Head of Standards Development, RBS.
- Antione Mukunzi, Director Testing Laboratories, RBS.
- Patrice Ntiyamira, Deputy Director General, RBS.
- Leo Hakizimana, Head Plant Health and Plant Health NEP, RARDA
- Joseph Katarwa, Head of Environmental Health and Food Safety NEP,
- Isidore Gafarasi, Head of Animal Health and Animal Health NEP.
- Laurent Gashugi, Representative. Assistant, FAO, Rwanda
- Jean Pierre Ruhira, Environmental Health Officer,
- Florence Umurungi, Quality Control Manager, Inyange
- Deckers Ngamkiye, Technical Manager, Inyange
- Jean de Dieu Hakizimana, Quality Control Manager, SORWATOM
- Theodore Munama, Production Manager, SORWATOM
- Ephraim Twahirwa, Production, Rwanda Mountain Tea, Rubaya
- Imu Hatambmana, Production Manager, Caferwa
- Evelyne mculikiyijuku, Marketing Manager, Caferwa
- Jean Beaufort Tuyisenge, Sina Gerard Urwibutso
- Vicent Hafekimana, Laboratory Manager, Sine Gerald
- Sesuelien Ngabisulmije, Quality Control Manager, Sine Gerald
- Ralf Fave, GIZ Production Adviser, Sine Gerald
- Emmanuel Rusatira –Production Manager, RWACOF
- Jean Marie Vianney Hategekimana, Production Manager, CAFERWA
- Carine Bigira, Program Officer, Rwanda
- Liliane Nzibargea, Program Officer, Rwanda

Tanzania

- Emmanuel Kalenzi, UNIDO Representative, Tanzania,
- Ms Grace Bingeleki, UNIDO NPC. Tanzania
- Charles M. Ekelege, Director General, TBS.
- Theresia Hubert, Principal Standards Officer, TBS.
- Julitha Tibanyenda, Chief Quality Assurance Officer, TBT Enquiry Point, TBS
- Burhani A. Mlundi, MIT.

- Zavery David Mdemu, MIT.
- Magdalene Mkocho, Sector Development Officer, Tanzania Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture
- Sergei Mutajigo, Principal Agricultural Officer, MAF.
- Dr. Charys Nuhu Ugullum, Director Laboratory Services, Tanzania Food and Drug Authority
- Dr. Ngossi, Manager Food Risk Analysis, TFDA.
- Raymond Wigenge, Director of Food Safety,
- Joseph Mwangi, Mills Manager, Mikoani Traders Ltd/Azania Wheat Flour Mills
- Afsa, Abdallah, Quality Control Manager, Azania Wheat Flour Mills
- Mr S.K Sarma,Afri Tea and Coffee
- Helleu Raphael Tiengo, Accountant Assistant, Power Food Industries
- Eugenia Kibasa,Quality Control Officer, Power Food Industries
- Nyamizi Julius, Senior Marketing Manager, Power Food Industries
- Peter Joshua, Production Manager, Power Food Industries

Uganda

- Dr. Ananias Bagumire, UNIDO TCB Project RPC and NPC, Uganda
- Bruno Otto, Head Of UNIDO Operations in Uganda
- Samuel G. L. Balagadde, Manager Imports Inspection, UNBS.
- Arinaltwe Gilbert Mnbalinda, Acting Head System Certification, UNBS.
- Deus Mubangizi, Manager Testing Division, UNBS.
- David L. Kiragga, Quality Manager, Head of Certification, UNBS.
- Mukusta Aziz, Head of Chemistry Laboratory, UNBS.
- Dr. Ben Manyindo, Deputy Executive Director, UNBS.
- Silver Ojakol, Commissioner, External Trade, MTTI
- Moses Ogwal, Director Publicity and Advocacy Manager, PrivateSector Foundation, Uganda
- Eva Ekanya, Trade Policy Officer, Private Sector Foundation Uganda
- Komayombi Bulegeya Dept. of Crop Protection MAAIF
- Karyeija F. Robert, Agricultural Inspector, SPS NEP, MALF.
- Gilbert Sebutare, Agricultural Inspector, SPS NEP, MALF.
- N. Parthasarathy, General Manager Operation, Britannia Allied Industries Ltd
- Carolyn Night, Quality Control Manager, Britannia Allied Industries Ltd
- Robert Ejiku, Group Manager, Uganda Tea Development Agency
- Warwick Thomson, Program Coordinator, Private Sector Support and Development, DANIDA, Royal Danish Embassy.
- Alex Nakajjo, Program Task Manager, EU Delegation in Uganda

Annex 2 - List of documents reviewed

A. Project Documents

EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY

- East African Community Business Guide on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures and Standards Developed by East African Business Council March 2011
- Report Of The Meeting Of Experts To Improve Draft EAC Food Safety Measures And Develop Regional Codex Alimentarius Framework, Imperial Royale Hotel Ltd, Kampala, Uganda 2nd to 4th March, 2011.
- Draft EAC Sanitary And Phytosanitary (SPS) Protocol
- East African Community Harmonized Sanitary And Phytosanitary Measures, Volume 1 – Procedures for Plants Phytosanitary Measures EAC Secretariat, Arusha, Tanzania.
- East African Community Harmonized Sanitary And Phytosanitary Measures Volume II - Procedures for Mammals, Birds, and Bees EAC Secretariat, Arusha, Tanzania
- East African Community Harmonized Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, Volume III –Sanitary Measures for Fish and Fishery Products EAC Secretariat, Arusha, Tanzania.
- East African Community Harmonized Sanitary And Phytosanitary Measures , Volume IV – Food Safety Measures, EAC Secretariat, Arusha, Tanzania
- SQMT Understanding Of East African Community Legislation On Standardization, Quality Assurance, Metrology And Testing Act (SQMT) Brochure
- EAC WTO TBT-SPS Enquiry Points Training Workshop Presentation 1-4 on TBT Issues March 2009
- EAC WTO TBT-SPS Enquiry Points Training Workshop Presentation 5-10 on TBT Issues March 2009
- EAC WTO TBT-SPS Enquiry Points Training Workshop Presentation 11-15 on TBT Issues March 2009
- EAC WTO TBT-SPS Enquiry Points Training Workshop Speeches March 2009
- WTO SPS/TBT ENQUIRY POINTS TRAINING WORKSHOP 25th -26th March, 2009 Nairobi- Kenya
- UNIDO-EAC Project Document title: Trade Capacity Building in agro-industry products for the establishment and proof of compliance with international market requirements, Project number: TERAFO6014 hematic

area code: TCB; Starting date: December 2006 (Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania)/ May 2008 (Rwanda and Burundi Duration: 3 years (2008-2011). Project site: Arusha and Dar-es-Salaam (Tanzania), Nairobi (Kenya), Kampala (Uganda), Kigali (Rwanda) and Bujumbura (Burundi) 2008.

- Report Of the National Consultative Workshop on the EAC Draft Protocol On Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Measures. White Stone, Bujumbura, Burundi. 11th May 2009
- Minutes Of The Consultative Meeting On Terms Of Reference For The EAC Codex Forum And Codex SPS Committee Held On 13th May 2011
- Report Of The Meeting Of EAC Experts To Update/Edit EAC Harmonized Sanitary And Phytosanitary Standards (SPS), Measures And Procedures Documents, Imperial Royale Hotel, Kampala, Uganda 24th to 27th May, 2010
- Report Of The Meeting Of Experts On Development Of SPS Protocol Imperial Royale Hotel, Kampala, Uganda 27th to 28th, November, 2008

Burundi

- Awareness Workshop For Consumers And Media On Their Role In The Promotion Of Food Safety
- On the 23rd October, 2009, ABUCO (Burundian Association of Consumers), TCP Project.
- Mission Report*Report on Training 13th August to 13th September : Formation des Techniciens de Laboratoire en Chimie Analytique By Dr. R.S. Sangwan, Dr. A. Nguyen Van Nhien, UNIDO International Consultants, Backstopping Officer: Ms U. Müge Dolun , Trade Capacity Building Branch
- Rapport Final de mission d'assistance à la mise en place des BPH, HACCP et système de management de la sécurité des denrées alimentaires pour le compte de 5 entreprises Burundaises Janvier - avril 2011 Rédigé par Dr. Moez JRIDI
- Rapport Final de mission d'assistance à la mise en place des BPH, HACCP et système de management de la sécurité des denrées alimentaires pour le compte de 5 entreprises Burundaises Janvier - avril 2011 Rédigé par Dr. Moez JRIDI
- Rapport Final de mission d'assistance à la mise en place des BPH, HACCP et système de management de la sécurité des denrées alimentaires pour le compte de 5 entreprises Burundaises Mai 2011 Rédigé par Dr. Moez JRIDI
- Rapport Final de mission d'assistance à la mise en place des BPH, HACCP et système de management de la sécurité des denrées alimentaires pour le compte de 5 entreprises Burundaises par : Dr. Moez JRIDI (Expert international) JUIN

- Rapport De Diagnostic Sur Les Systemes De Gestion De La Sécurité Des Denrees Alimentaires Selon La Norme ISO 22000; Rapport Produit par : Louis MURANGO, Consultant En Qualité et Sécurité des Dentrées alimentaires , Novembre 2009
- Reunion De Haut Niveau Sur La Législation En Matiere De Sécurité Des Aliments Bujumbura, Centre De Conférences Et De Rencontres Scientifiques, Cecores 02 Novembre 2010
- Technical Report Capacity evaluation of the Microbiology and Chemical laboratories of Institut des Sciences Agronomiques du Burundi (ISABU), Faculté d'Agronomie de l'Université du Burundi (FACAGRO) and the Centre National de Technologies Alimentaires (CNTA) in Bujumbura, Burundi , Prepared by the Industrial Research Institute – Lebanon Based on the work of Amine Jbeily Chemical Expert, Hovig Kouyoumdjian Microbiology expert and Joseph Matta, team leader
- Main Findings of the Gap Analysis Conducted for ISO 22000:2005 Implementation in Burundi Enterprises –project document not dated.
- Report of the Food Safety Campaign. 02 To 07 November 2009
- Séminaire de formation sur les normes SPS et OTC, Bujumbura, CEPRODILIC, 25 – 28 Janvier 2011.
- Reunion De Haut Niveau Sur La Législation En Matiere De Sécurité Des Aliments, Bujumbura, Centre de Conférences et de Rencontres Scientifiques, CECORES 02 Novembre 2010

Kenya

- Terms Of Reference For The National Committee On SPS Kenya
- 002-2 Gap Analysis Report -Fresh An Juici 12-08-09
- 003-1 GAP Analysis Summary Report – Woni
- 004-1 Gap Analysis Summary Report - Kandia Fresh
- 004-2 Gap Analysis Report - KANDIA FRESH
- Project Name: 6thEURACHEM Workshop On Proficiency Testing In Analytical Chemistry, Microbiology And Laboratory Medicine Country Of Study Tour: Rome -Italy
- Study Tour Report 5th -8th October 2008
- Mobilizing Aid For Trade For SPS-Related Technical Cooperation In East Africa SPS Balance Sheet For Kenya Research work for the Standards and Trade Development Facility , by Dr. Mulat Abegaz 2008
- Fish Safety Performance Importing Countries from Kenya, 1993 –June 2010
- Regulations And Syllabus For Certificate In Food Safety And Quality - 2010
- Regulations And Syllabus For The Degree Of Master Of Science In Food Safety And Quality -2010
- Regulations And Syllabus For The Postgraduate Diploma In Food Safety And Quality-2010

- Speeches At The Opening Session Of The University Of Nairobi's Food Safety Curriculum And Launch Workshop Held On 20TH-21ST JULY 2009; Chairman: National Food safety Coordinating Committee, Dr. Wilson Songa
- Progress Report For Kandia Fresh Limited Iso 22000:2005 Food Safety Management System Implementation From December 2009 To 30th May 2010 by Ruth Nyagah Africert Limited
- Progress Report For FRESH 'N JUICI ISO 22000:2005 Food Safety Management System Implementation 21st May 2010 By: George Ogoti, MMCAFRICA
- Progress Report For HCDA ISO 22000:2005 Food Safety Management System Implementation 21st May 2010 By: George Ogoti, MMCAFRICA
- Technical Report: Capacity evaluation of the Microbiology and Chemical laboratories of KEBS, KEPHIS and NPHL in Nairobi, KENYA. Prepared by the Industrial Research Institute – Lebanon
- Based on the work of Christiane Chidiac-Jbeily Microbiology expert,
- Edgard Najjar Chemical Expert and Joseph Matta, Team leader
- Progress Report For Woni VegFru ISO 22000:2005 Food Safety Management System Implementation by Anne Chepkoech, contracted Food Safety consultant 03rd March 2010
- Report Of The National Food Safety Awareness Week In Kenya "Safe food for a Healthy & Wealthy Nation" Organized by The National Food Safety Coordination Committee (NFSC) in cooperation with the TCB project October 12th To 16th 2009
- Study Tour Report to India Prepared by: Ms Scholastica N. Musila, KEPHIS and Liza Okoth KEBS, Programme Manager: Mr. Ouseph Padickakudi, 07th to 9th April 2010.
- Activities Of The National Enquiry Point From July 2010 To February 2011
- The National Food Safety Policy, Republic of Kenya, Mol. Nairobi Kenya. 2010
- Woni-UNIDO Project – Iso 22000: 2005 Implementation Status Report March 2010
- Woni-UNIDO Project – Iso 22000: 2005 Implementation Status Report June 2010
- Kenya KEBS Laboratory Proposed Equipment List November 2009.
- Linking Policy Advice and Implementation: The Case of Kenyan Food Safety Control System by Andrew Edewa, August 2011.
- Activities Of The National Enquiry Point From July 2010 To February 2011

Rwanda

- Draft Cabinet Paper For Establishment Of National Codex And WTO TBT/SPS Committee, 10th August 2011
- The Report For Selection And Gap Analysis For Food Industries Under ISO 22000 Certification Program, Auditors: Eugenia Niwenkunda - Team Leader; Jean Paul Bajeneza - Team Member, Charles Rutegyengwa - Team Member, 15/10/2009
- ILAC/UNIDO/PTB Workshop On Accreditation Kigali, Rwanda 6th To 7th November 2008
- Rwanda Quality Policy, Ministry Of Trade And Industry, September 2010
- The Report Of The National Consultative Meeting On EACSPS Protocol, Held on 13th May 2009 at Hotel Mille Collines, Rapportours: Mrs Liliane Kamanzi and Mr Higiro Joseph
- The Report Of The Awareness Seminar On Food Safety Control System In Rwanda, Sponsored By Norad And Organized By Rwanda Bureau Of Standards In Conjunction With Unido, Kigali Serena Hotel, 2/6/2008
- The Food Safety Campaign Report, 17th to 23rd December 2009, by Charles, Rutagyengwa, NPC. TCB Project.
- The Report Of High Level Meeting On Food Safety Legislation, 27th October 2010, Lemigo Hotel, Kigali
- Capacity evaluation of the Microbiology and Chemical laboratories of Rwanda Bureau of Standards and National University of Rwanda in Kigali, Rwanda, by the Industrial Research Institute – Lebanon, based on the work of Amine Jbeily Chemical Expert, Hovig Kouyoumdjian Microbiology expert and Joseph Matta, team leader, Project Manager: Naji Abi Zeid, Research and Development Department, UNIDO.
- Minutes Of The Consultative Meeting On Terms Of Reference For the EAC CODEX Forum And Codex SPS Committee Held On 13th May 2011
- Technical Report on Lab Analytical Trainings: Activities from 29/05/2011 to 28/06/2011, Parts 1, 2 & 3. Prepared Ricardo Andrés Correa Ceballos and Dr. Ricardo Andrés Correa Ceballos, Project Manager: Mr Dejane Tezera, Agro-based Industries Branch.

Tanzania

- The Second Annual African Food Safety and Traceability Conference Held in Arusha, Tanzania, from 26th – 28th August 2008; Conference Report, Documented and edited by Gwynne Foster, September 2008
- Technical Report: ISO 22000 Mission In Tanzania, Prepared by Mrs Theresia Hubert - ISO 22000 National Food Safety Expert, Mr Archard Ngemela - ISO 22000 National Food Safety Expert and Mr Julius Panga - ISO 22000 National Food Safety Expert
- Report On The Awareness Workshop On SPS Protocol And SPS Measures For Private Sector Held At Blue Pearl Hotel Dar Es Salaam On 17th August 2010.

- Report On The Consultative Workshop Of The National Steering Committee And National Monitoring Committee, Held At Blue Pearl Hotel, Dar Es Salaam On 16th August 2010.
- Report On The National Sensitization Workshop On The Working Of WTO, TBT/ SPS Enquiry Points And Notification Authority Held At Apeadue Conference Hall-UNDP, Dar Es Salaam On 21st June, 2011 – Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania,
- Capacity evaluation of the Chemical laboratories of Tanzania Food and Drug Authority, Government Chemist laboratory Agency and Tanzania Bureau of Standards in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, by the Industrial Research Institute – Lebanon, Based on the work of Christiane Chidiac-Jbeily Microbiology expert, Edgard Najjar Chemical Expert and Joseph Matta, Team leader, Project Manager : Naji Abi Zeid, Research and Development Department, UNIDO.
- Report On The Awareness Workshop On SPS Protocol And SPS Measures For Private Sector Held At Blue Pearl Hotel Dar Es Salaam On 17th August 2010.

UGANDA

- Implementation Of ISO 22000:2005 Food Safety Management Systems In Selected Food Processing Enterprises In Uganda Gap Analysis Report October 2009. Prepared By: Arinaitwe Gilbert Mbalinda, NE Food Safety
- Draft Report On High Level Meeting for Development Partners and Stakeholders on Food Legislation in Uganda, August 2011
- Report of the Workshop PSFU/MAAIF National Sensitization & Consultative Stakeholders' Workshop On The Operation Of WTO Enquiries And Notifications Related To International Trade In Agro-Industry Products, Imperial Royale Hotel, Kampala, Uganda, 17th to 18th March, 2011
- Capacity evaluation of the Chemical laboratories of Chemiphar and Uganda Bureau of Standards in Kampala, Uganda. By the Industrial Research Institute – Lebanon based on the work of Christiane Chidiac-Jbeily Microbiology expert, Edgard Najjar Chemical Expert and Joseph Matta, Team leader, Project Manager: Naji Abi Zeid, Research and Development Department, UNIDO.
- Draft National Standards and Quality Policy September 2010: Theme for improved quality, safety and competitiveness of goods and services, Ministry Of Tourism, Trade and Industry P.O. Box 7103 Kampala, Uganda.
-

B. Other Documents

Abegaz, Dr. Mulat (2008), SPS Balance Sheet for Tanzania, STDF, WTO, Geneva, Switzerland.

Abegaz, Dr. Mulat (2010), SPS Balance Sheet for Kenya, WTO, Geneva, Switzerland.

East African Community (2006), EAC Development Strategy (2006-2010), EAC, Arusha, Tanzania.

East African Community (2010), Approved Standardization Programmes, 2009/2010, Catalogue of East African Standards 2010, EAC, Arusha, Tanzania.

European Commission (2008), Burundi Country Strategy and National Indicative Program 2008-13, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.

European Commission (2008), Kenya, Country Strategy and National Indicative Program 2008-13, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.

European Commission (2008), Rwanda, Country Strategy and National Indicative Program 2008-13, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.

European Commission (2008), Tanzania Country Strategy and National Indicative Program 2008-13, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.

European Commission (2008), Uganda Country Strategy and National Indicative Program 2008-13, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.

Ogwa, Moses and Sam Kuloba Watasa (2010), 'Impact Study of Regional SQMT Architecture in the East African Community' prepared for PTB, PTB, and Berlin, Germany

Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt (2011), Case Story II Establishing a Regional Quality Infrastructure in the East African Community (EAC), January 2011, Federal Ministry of Economic Development, Germany

Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt (2011) PTB Brief Establishment of a regional Quality Infrastructure in the East African Community, PTB, Berlin , Germany

Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt (2009) Report on 'Road Map for the establishment of an EAC Product Certification Mark QA&A Subcommittee WG 1 Meeting, Bujumbura September 2009, PTB, Berlin, Germany

Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt (2010), Summary of the report on the mid-term evaluation of the project "Establishment of a Regional Quality Infrastructure in the East African Community (EAC)", PTB, Berlin, Germany

World Bank (2008), Non-Tariff Measures On Goods Trade in the East African Community, Prepared for East African Community and Member Governments of Burundi, Rwanda, Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda, Mobilizing Aid for Trade for SPS-Related Technical Cooperation in East Africa

Standards Trade Development Facility (2008), Overview of SPS Needs and Assistance in Rwanda, STDF, Background Paper, Nov 2008, STDF, WTO, Geneva, Switzerland.

Standards Trade Development Facility (2008), Overview of SPS Needs and Assistance in Rwanda, STDF, Background Paper, Nov 2008, STDF, WTO, Geneva, Switzerland.

Annex 3 - Terms of Reference

Background

The project to be evaluated is a regional project with the East African Community (EAC), which also includes five national components.

The original project document covering Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda was approved by the UNIDO Programme Approval Committee on 18 July 2006. When the project was launched in December 2006, the EAC Secretariat requested UNIDO to extend their technical assistance to Burundi and Rwanda who effectively joined the East African Community in July 2007. With UNIDO funding of EUR 43,000, a preparatory assistance study was undertaken in 2007 to assess the status of the trade-related infrastructure, identify the trade capacity-related gaps and design a technical project for Burundi and Rwanda to smoothly integrate the on-going EAC trade capacity building program.

This analysis also covered relevant on-going technical assistance projects in the region of other donors such as the Physikalisch Technische Bundesanstalt (PTB), the EU and WTO/STDF. After discussions with these donors and the EAC it was decided that the revised UNIDO project document for the five countries should be streamlined taking into account the existing interventions.

In October 2007 NORAD and UNIDO agreed that the new project document should build on the existing one but integrate all five countries into one consolidated project. The revised project document updates the UNIDO approach and extends it from three to five countries, takes into account other on-going assistance and tries to build synergies.

The project objective is:

- To establish a mutually supportive national and regional mechanism to facilitate both inter and intra-regional trade in selected strategic food products such as fruits and vegetables, coffee and tea (especially for Rwanda and Burundi) as well as fish and honey.

The expected outcome at the regional level is:

Outcome 1: *At the regional level, SPS Protocol is adopted, and standards and conformity assessment procedures for selected agro-products are harmonized.*

The expected outputs at the regional level are:

Output 1.1 Support the EAC Secretariat in the development and implementation of SPS protocol

Output 1.2 Regional Awareness is raised on food safety/ standards/quality issues for local consumer safety and compliance with international market requirements

The expected outcome at the national level (in each of the five countries) is:

Outcome 2: *At national level, selected conformity assessment bodies are able to provide support to agro-based and enterprises and the enterprises to be able to increase export trade*

- *Output 2.1 Technical and logistic support to National Institutions to participate effectively in regional harmonization of SPS measures*
- *Output 2.2 TBT and SPS Enquiry and Notification Points are provided with technical and IT support to improve service delivery to Private sector*
- *Output 2.3: Selected national Chemical testing lab is upgraded based on needs identified and assisted to accreditation in selected scopes.*
- *Output 2.4: Selected national Microbiology lab is upgraded based on needs identified and assisted to accreditation in selected scopes.*
- *Output 2.5 Upgrading of enterprises for selected products by applying food safety management systems*

The project focused on SPS and food products. Initially, specific emphasis was given to five food products: coffee, tea, fruits and vegetables, fish and honey. During the course of the project, dairy products, cereal grains and some other food products were included.

III. PROJECT BUDGET

Planned budget € 3,077,600 excluding support cost

IV. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the:

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

The evaluation should provide the necessary evidence and analytical basis and make recommendations to the EAC, the Governments, to NORAD and to UNIDO for the ensuring the sustainability of the project achievements and for possible follow-up interventions. The evaluation should also draw lessons of wider applicability for the possible replication of the experience gained in this project in other projects.

V. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will endeavour to collect evidence and assess project performance along the following five main strands of action:

- Supporting the interaction process between the EAC Secretariat and the five participating countries for regional trade harmonization (policies and standards);
- Targeted upgrading of testing laboratories and other relevant parts of the National Quality System (NQS) in the five participating countries;
- Strengthening the national TBT/SPS notification and enquiry points in the five participating countries;
- Implementation of ISO 22000 or GMP/FSMS in about 25 companies (5 in each participating country);
- Raising awareness of regional and national stakeholders on food safety and compliance issues.

For strand 1 (regional trade integration) the following evaluation tools and methods will be applied:

- Identification of time-line indicators for regional trade integration and data analysis of these indicators (trade figures for relevant products and commodities; border rejection rates; complaints; etc.);
- Assessment of the achieved degree of harmonization of trade related legal instruments and procedures (laws; protocols; standards; etc.);
- Interviews with concerned officials in EAC and participating countries;
- Analysis of the state and progress of regional trade policy integration in the EAC and assessment of the specific support provided by the project in the light of this wider analysis of EAC harmonization processes;
- Interviews with stakeholders of intra- and extra-regional trade (manufacturers; traders; importers; exporters; etc.).

For strand 2 (upgrading of NQS) the following evaluation tools and methods will be applied:

- Assessment of the NQS mapping and gap analysis conducted by the project;
- Assessment of the support provided by the project to the NQS upgrading;
- Interviews with users and providers of SMTQ services in the five countries.

For strand 3 (TBT enquiry points) the following evaluation tools and methods will be applied:

- Assessment of statistics of notifications and enquiries conducted by the respective units supported by the project;
- Interviews with potential users of the SPS/TBT enquiry points about needs, achievements and persisting gaps.

For strand 4 (certifications of companies) the following evaluation tools and methods will be applied:

- Web-based survey among all companies participating in the project and a control group of non-participating companies;
- Identification of a sample of participating and non-participating companies for in-depth interviews during field visits in the five countries;
- Interviews with private sector providers of certification services in the five countries as appropriate.

For strand 5 (awareness raising) the following evaluation tools and methods will be applied:

- Stakeholder interviews with private sector organizations such as EABC; private sector foundations; chambers of commerce; commodity based associations; consumer associations.

Evaluation methodology

While maintaining independence, the evaluation will be carried out based on a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all parties. It will address the following issues:

The evaluation will be carried out in keeping with UN evaluation standards and the UNIDO Evaluation Policy.³⁴ The evaluation shall determine as systematically and objectively as possible the relevance, efficiency, achievements (outputs, prospects for achieving expected outcomes and impact) and sustainability of the

³⁴ Available from: <http://www.unido.org/index.php?id=o5122>

project. To this end, the evaluation will assess the achievements of the project against its objectives, expected outcomes and expected outputs as set out in the project document and the inception report, including re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and of the design. It will also identify external factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives.

The intended effects on regional trade integration will primarily be measured in terms of the achieved degree of harmonization of legal instruments and procedures related to trade (laws; protocols; standards). An attempt will be made to also measure downstream effects such as complaints and border rejection rates. The actual increase of regional trade figures will be considered as a longer term impact as far as data are available. For the data (time series including base lines) the evaluation will not collect primary data on its own but rely on project monitoring data.

The evaluation will assess project performance along the project life cycle and apply the standard DAC evaluation criteria.

Project identification and formulation:

- The extent to which a participatory project identification process was applied and counterparts have been appropriately involved and were participating in the identification of their critical problem areas and in the development the project design;
- The extent to which on-going projects and initiatives of the Government and of other donors were taken into account;
- Clarity and realism of the project's intervention logic: development objective, outcomes, outputs;
- Indicators including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries and prospects for sustainability.
- Realism and clarity in the specification of prior obligations and prerequisites (assumptions and risks);
- Realism and clarity of external institutional relationships, and in the managerial and institutional framework for implementation and the work plan;
- Likely cost-effectiveness of the project design.

Project coordination and management:

- The extent to which the national management and overall field coordination mechanisms of the project have been efficient and effective;
- The UNIDO management, coordination, quality control and input delivery mechanisms have been efficient and effective;

- Monitoring and self-evaluation has been carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and objectives and using that information for project steering and adaptive management;
- Changes in planning documents during implementation have been approved and documented;
- Coordination envisaged with any other development cooperation programs in the country has been realized and benefits achieved.
- Synergy benefits can be found in relation to other UN activities in the country.

Project ownership

- The extent to which counterparts are actively supporting the implementation of the project;
- Counterpart contributions and other inputs have been received from the EAC and Governments (including Governorates) as compared to the project document work plan.

Relevance:

The extent to which the project objectives are consistent with the requirements of the needs of the end-users and government and donor's policies.

Efficiency:

Efficiency and adequacy of project implementation including: availability of funds as compared to the provisional budget (donor and national contribution); the quality and timeliness of inputs delivered by UNIDO (expertise, training, equipment, methodologies, etc.) and the Government as compared to the work plan(s); managerial and work efficiency; implementation difficulties; adequacy of monitoring and reporting; the extent of national support and commitment and the quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by UNIDO.

Effectiveness and impact:

The extent to which the development objectives of an intervention were or are expected to be achieved. Full and systematic assessment of outputs produced to date (quantity and quality as compared with work plan and progress towards achieving the immediate objectives); the quality of the outputs produced and how the target beneficiaries use these outputs, with particular attention to gender aspects; the outcomes, which have occurred or which are likely to happen through utilization of outputs.

Sustainability

The continuation of project benefits after the development assistance has been completed.

Recommendations for a possible next project phase, or replication elsewhere

Based on the above analysis the evaluators will draw specific conclusions and make proposals for any necessary further action by the EAC, Governments, UNIDO and the donor to ensure sustainable development, including any need for additional assistance and activities of the project prior to its completion. The mission will draw attention to any lessons of general interest. Any proposal for further assistance should include precise specification of objectives and the major suggested outputs and inputs.

VI. MAIN EVALUATION TASKS AND TIMING

The evaluation will be carried out through analyses of various sources of information, including desk analysis, survey data, and interviews with counterparts, beneficiaries, partner agencies, donor representatives, program managers and through the cross-validation of data. In view of the particular aspects of this evaluation (no country visit by the international evaluation team members), particular attention will be given to the elaboration of a strategy for field surveys, the elaboration and test of questionnaires and the implementation of the surveys in line with agreed professional and impartiality standards.

The evaluation will encompass the following main tasks:

1. Contracting of the evaluation team; attribution of tasks and responsibilities to each team member;
2. Desk study of available documents and formulation of a catalogue of project specific evaluation questions, to which the evaluation should provide answers; this methodology will have to be discussed and agreed with the UNIDO Evaluation Group;
3. Interviews with the UNIDO project managers in Vienna, the CTA and the donor;
4. Data collection; design and execution of the web-based company survey;
5. Field mission to Tanzania (Arusha and Dar-es-Salam), Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi, interviews with project staff, counterparts, beneficiaries and stakeholders; verification of project outputs.
6. Presentation of preliminary results to project staff, counterparts and stakeholders in Arusha and in Vienna to collect feed-back;
7. Drafting of a preliminary summary report with main findings, conclusions and recommendations for discussion at the final Steering Committee meeting of the project;

8. Drafting of final report;
9. Incorporation of comments into final draft.

Date	Venue
20 - 23 September	Nairobi, Kenya
24 – 28 September	Kampala, Uganda
29 September – 4 October	Kigali, Rwanda
5 – 10 October	Bujumbura, Burundi
11 - 14 October	Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania
15 – 18 October	Arusha, Tanzania

VII. EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

The evaluation team will be composed of three persons:

1. Evaluation team leader with documented experience in:
 - Designing and managing complex evaluations;
 - Leading multi-disciplinary and multi-cultural teams of evaluators;
 - Trade policy and SPS issues;
 - Standards, Metrology, Testing and Quality projects;
 - Drafting reports in English(excellent drafting skills to be demonstrated)knowledge of French an asset.
2. National evaluator with documented experience in:
 - Conducting evaluations;
 - Trade policy and SPS issues;
 - Standards, Metrology, Testing and Quality projects;
 - Drafting reports in English (knowledge of French an asset).
3. Junior evaluator with documented experience in:
 - Evaluation data collection;
 - Designing, conducting and analysing web-based beneficiary surveys;
 - Trade related issues.

The evaluation team leader will be responsible for the elaboration of the evaluation strategy, including the design of the web-based company survey; providing guidance to the national evaluator; analysis of survey results and gathering complementary information from project staff, collaborators and stakeholders through telephone interviews and other means; presentation of conclusions and recommendations; drafting of the preliminary summary report with main findings, conclusions and recommendations and of the final report.

The national evaluator will assist the team leader with data collection, preparation and conduct of interviews, field visit logistics, and preparation of substantial parts of the evaluation report.

The junior evaluator will be UNIDO HQ based and collect data and design, conduct and analyse the web-based company survey.

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

VIII. CONSULTATIONS AND LIAISON

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

VIII. REPORTING

The evaluation report shall follow the structure given in Annex 1. Reporting language will be English. The executive summary, recommendations and lessons learned shall be an important part of the presentation prepared for the debriefing sessions in EAC and Vienna.

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

The evaluation report will be subject to quality assessments by UNIDO Evaluation Group. These apply evaluation quality assessment criteria and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback. The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the checklist on evaluation report quality.

Annex 1

Template of in-depth evaluation reports

I. Executive summary

- Must be self-explanatory

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

II. Introduction

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

III. Country and project context

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

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

IV. Project Planning

This chapter describes the planning process as far as relevant for the assessment under chapter VI

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

V. Project Implementation

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

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

VI. Assessment

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

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

VII. Issues with regard to a possible next phase

- Assessment, in the light of the evaluation, of proposals put forward for a possible next phase
- Recommendations on how to proceed under a possible next phase, overall focus, outputs, activities, budgets, etc.

VIII. Recommendations

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

IX. Lessons learned

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

Annex 2 Checklist on evaluation report quality

Report quality criteria	UNIDO Evaluation Group Assessment notes	Rating
Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?		
Were the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing?		
Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes or did it explain why this is not (yet) possible?		
Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations?		
Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity)?		
Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can they be implemented?		
Was the report well written? (Clear language and correct grammar)		
Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TOR adequately addressed?		
Was the report delivered in a timely manner?		

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

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

