



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE SOUTHERN AFRICA TRADE HUB



August 2014

This evaluation was made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this evaluation are the sole responsibility of Pragma Corporation and Management Systems International, and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE SOUTHERN AFRICA TRADE HUB

AUGUST, 2014

Pragma Corporation
116 East Broad Street
Falls Church, VA 22046 USA

Contracted under the USAID Management Support and Technical Analysis Services Project
Contract No. AID-OAA-M-13-00012

DISCLAIMER

This report was written by James Fox (team leader), Stephanie Monschein, Felix M'mboyi, Talitha Bertelsman-Scott, and David Adolwa of Pragma Corporation and subcontractor Management Systems International. The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Table of Contents..... i
- Acronyms..... ii
- Executive Summary iv
- Background..... 1
- Evaluation Purpose and Questions..... 3
- General Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations 4
- Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations by IR 9
 - IR I.1 Improved Trade Facilitation 9
 - Findings and Conclusions..... 9
 - Recommendations..... 14
 - IR I.2 Agricultural Value Chains 16
 - Findings and Conclusions..... 16
 - Recommendations..... 21
 - IR I.3 Increased Trade and Investment in the Textile and Apparel Sector 22
 - Findings and Conclusions..... 23
 - Recommendations..... 24
 - IR I.4 Strengthened Regulatory Capacity for Clean Energy 25
 - Findings and Conclusions..... 25
 - Recommendations..... 26
 - R I.5 Enabling Environment 26
 - Findings and Conclusions..... 26
 - Recommendations..... 30
- Annexes 31
 - Annex I: Evaluation Statement of Work..... 31
 - Annex II: Evaluation Methods and Limitations..... 42
 - Annex III: Complete Inception Report with Detailed Methodology and Data Collection Instruments.44
 - Annex IV: Supplementary Information FOR AG VC..... 59
 - Annex V: Final List of Interviews 67

ACRONYMS

ADS	Automated Directives System
ACE	Agricultural Commodity Exchange
ACTE	African Competitiveness and Trade Expansion Initiative
ACTIF	African Cotton & Textile Industries Federation
AfDB	African Development Bank
AGOA	African Growth and Opportunity Act
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
AVC	Agriculture Value Chain
BITC	Botswana Investment and Trade Centre
BOA	Border Operations Assessments
CASS	Central Africa Seed Services
CBA	Cost-benefit Analysis
CBM	Coordinated Border Management
CCP	Customs Connectivity Project
COP	Chief of Party
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative
DCC	Dar es Salaam Corridor Committee
DFID	Department for International Development
DO	Development Objective
DRC	Domestic Resource Cost
DTIS	Diagnostic Trade Integration Study
EE	Enabling Environment
FACTS	Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
FTF	Feed the Future
FY	Fiscal Year
GHFSI	Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative
GIZ	German Development Agency
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IGD	Institute for Global Dialogue
IR	Intermediate Result
JBC	Joint Border Committees
KII	Key Informant Interview
LOP	Life of Project
LTE	Leading Textiles Exhibition
MBS	Malawi Bureau of Standards
MRA	Malawian Revenue Authority
MRE	Monitoring, Reporting, and Evaluation System
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
NRA	Namibian Revenue Authority
NSW	National Single Window
NTB	Non-Tariff Barrier
NTM	Non-Tariff Measures

OSBP	One-Stop Border Posts
PMP	Performance Management Plan
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
REGO	Regional Economic Growth Office
RERA	Regional Energy Regulatory Association
SACU	Southern African Customs Union
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SADCSTAN	SADC Cooperation in Standardization
SAIIA	South African Institute of International Affairs
SATH	Southern Africa Trade Hub
SIDA	Sweden Development Agency
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
SOW	Statement of Work
SPGs	Strategic Partnership Grants
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
STTA	Short-term Technical Assistance
TBT	Technical Barriers to Trade
TF	Trade Facilitation
TH	Trade Hub
TIDCA	Trade, Investment and Development Cooperative Agreement
TL	Team Leader
TMSA	TradeMark Southern Africa
TRALAC	Trade Law Centre
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
WB	World Bank
WRS	Warehouse Receipt System
WTO	World Trade Organization
ZRA	Zambian Revenue Authority

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a mid-term evaluation of the Southern Africa Trade Hub (SATH) project, awarded in September 2010, but effectively begun in FY 2011 and scheduled to end in September 2015. The evaluation assesses progress in achieving SATH's goals, but also identifies possible improvements during the final fifteen months of the project. In addition, it recommends possible directions for a follow-on project.

The four evaluation questions are:

1. To what extent is the project likely to be successful in achieving results toward its stated objectives? How does the project address key areas of integration as prioritized by SADC and SACU?
2. To what extent has the management structure as implemented supported or hindered performance? What are the factors influencing the achievement and non-achievement of the objectives?
3. Based on the findings and analysis of the preceding questions, what are the key strategic, programmatic, technical, and managerial features of the project that should be taken into account when implementing a new Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Project in the region?
4. What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure sustainability of the project achievements and what is the potential for sustaining these benefits in the medium to long term?

In dealing with the four evaluation questions, the evaluators assessed the five major activities under the project as modified in 2012, expressed as intermediate results (IRs). These are:

IR 1.1: Improved Trade Facilitation

IR 1.2: Greater Competitiveness in Agricultural Value Chains

IR 1.3: Increased Trade & Investment in the Textiles and Apparel Sector

IR 1.4: Strengthened Regulatory Capacity for the Clean Energy Sector

IR 1.5: A Better Enabling Environment

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness (the Trade Hub) project, implemented by AECOM, commenced in September 2010. The Trade Hub's overarching goal was originally "Increased International Competitiveness, Intra-Regional Trade, and Food Security in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Region." This objective was to be accomplished through the advancement of the regional integration agenda and increased trade capacity of regional value chains in selected sectors. The delivery of targeted technical assistance was expected to help the SADC region, including the public sector, the private sector, and civil society organizations, to realize the advantages of greater regional and global trade linkages and export-oriented business development through assistance in eight results areas, described in detail in the full report.

EVALUATION DESIGN, METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

The evaluation design relied heavily on two approaches: review of all relevant documentation about the project; and key informant interviews (KIIs) on site in South Africa, Botswana, Namibia, Malawi, and Zambia. For the latter, more than fifty interviews were conducted with USAID, current and former Hub staff, partner governments, other international organizations, other development partners, and relevant outside observers.

Analytical methods used to analyze the data collected from project documents and other sources included planned/actual comparisons, pattern/content analysis, trend analysis, and divergence/convergence follow-up when statements from participants disagreed. Numerous sources of bias are possible with this approach, including mistakes in recall, biases of interviewees, and failure to identify potential candidates for interview. The team attempted to address these problems by cross-checking informant reports with existing documentation.

Further, any mid-term evaluation is based partly on expectations of what will be achieved during the remainder of the project. This cannot be assessed with complete certainty by the evaluation team, until the completion of the next 15 months of implementation, since many activities are still underway.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation team reviewed the activities under each of the five IR's, providing findings, conclusions and recommendations. Each is summarized below, though with more detail in the full report and in annexes for each of the five activity areas. Following that, a summary of the answers to the four evaluation questions is provided.

IR 1.1 Improved Trade Facilitation

The project began with an ambitious set of goals for trade facilitation, which focused attention on building the capacity of SADC to drive compliance with core trade protocol requirements, identifying and targeting critical non-tariff barriers (NTBs) across major value chains, and assessing critical trade-in-services barriers for analysis and removal. The project also envisaged technical support to promote the systemic utilization of regulatory impact assessment in SADC countries to analyze and promote removal of major NTBs. During the course of project implementation, its objectives were progressively narrowed. Some of the more ambitious objectives were discarded. However, considerable progress has been made on many of the current less ambitious set of goals. These include joint border posts, simplified administrative procedures, and reduced border transit times at selected crossings. One ambitious goal that remained, the National Single Window (NSW), is a longer-term project that is unlikely to be met during the remainder of the current project, even though embedding advisors in Namibia and Malawi – planned for July 2014 – should accelerate the process. A NSW is a complex undertaking, requiring much more than a Cabinet Decision (obtained in both countries) before it can be converted to reality by buy-in from the numerous ministries involved.

IR 1.2 Greater Competitiveness in Agricultural Value Chains

After a slow start, this activity gained momentum during the past 18 months, and shows promise of achieving increases in production and trade of the selected commodities. Important progress has been achieved in establishing storage capacity for grains, training, particularly for aflatoxin removal, and in stimulating private sector investment by value-chain partners. At the same time, it again warrants

emphasis that major outcome indicators (e.g. the volume/value of exported agricultural commodities, the leveraging of trade-related finance and investments, the application of value chain production risk management products, the leveraging of leasing and other asset-based financing) were either eliminated or reduced to such a degree that the extent to which the project achieved meaningful development results for this IR is difficult to assess.

IR 1.3 Increased Trade and Investment in the Textiles and Apparel Sector

The SATH countries increased exports of these products to the United States under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA). Source Africa, the flagship activity, made progress during its second year of operation, with the number of exhibitors increasing from 170 last year (2013) to more than 220 this year. However the total value of international and intra-regional trade directly linked to project activities was zero through Year 3 of the project, as deduced from the project's PMP reports. Year 4's target is \$9.8 million, but it is unclear whether that will be achieved. The target for the 5-year life of project (LOP) has been shifted downwards from \$50 million total in 2011 to \$9.8 million in 2014 and \$3 million in 2013, which total approximately 1/3 of the original target. This brings into question whether the program as currently formulated is optimally structured to leverage transformational impact on the competitiveness of the textile and apparel sector of SADC countries. Overall this activity should be continued through the remainder of the project as the activity itself is achieving results and is sustainable; it is the limited ambitiousness of the targets, captured from a project design perspective that is called into question. In the next project, an effort should be made to combine the efforts of the three hubs – and particularly the East Africa Trade Hub – for a joint cotton, textile and apparel value chain approach. In addition much more ambitious export and investment leveraging targets should be formulated for any follow-on program.

IR 1.4: Strengthened Regulatory Capacity for the Clean Energy Sector

This activity has introduced the concept of clean energy to the region with considerable success. Energy regulators have begun, with training from SATH, to analyze methods to incorporate production of clean energy into their systems, including tariff rates and other concerns. Current work in Swaziland shows promise for reforming energy policy there. The Regional Energy Regulatory Association (RERA) values the work of the Hub highly.

This work should be continued through the remainder of the current project, but should be spun off into a different vehicle, given its limited relationship to the rest of the work of the Hub. That subsequent effort might be linked to Power Africa, and might be expanded to include emissions reductions.

IR 1.5: A Better Enabling Environment

With collaboration from the governments of Swaziland, Lesotho and Namibia and with varying degrees of success (as noted in the full report), the project provided investor roadmaps for these countries. It also provided a document to the Southern Africa Customs Union (SACU) on implementation of the Trade and Investment Development Cooperation Agreement (TIDCA) with the United States. The product was initially weak, but the revised version was well received in June 2014 by SACU. Activity under this IR was subsequently narrowed to a focus on standards, gender, and environmental compliance. The work on standards aims to establish World Trade Organization (WTO) technical barriers to trade (TBT) Enquiry Points in Malawi, Zambia, and Lesotho and is on track to be completed by the end of the project.

We recommend that the work of the Enabling Environment IR be taken up within the other IRs for the remainder of the project, with the work on standards migrating to Agriculture Value-Chains (AVC), Trade Enabling Environment (EE) work to Trade Facilitation (TF), and Investment Promotion to Textiles and Apparel. Any new project should include a more robust activity in the enabling environment area, focusing on the concerns of promoting policy actions that improve the prospects for trade creation, specific to the work the project intends to carry out.

The Trade Hub's Work Plans, Annual Reports, and other documentation subsume both gender and environmental concerns as activities within the Enabling Environment Component, and not as separate components of the Trade Hub program. Therefore, the team will address them within the Enabling Environment IR sections below for purposes of consistency. The team recommends that these two "activities" be mainstreamed and/or integrated into the other IRs and viewed as cross-cutting themes. Managers of each IR should be responsible for assuring adequate treatment of both gender and environmental issues in the activities they undertake.

Answering the four evaluation questions:

1. To what extent is the project likely to be successful in achieving results toward its stated objectives? How does the project address key areas of integration as prioritized by SADC and SACU?

At the outset, the project lacked a clear results framework and a clear set of goals. Numerous quantitative indicators were established, but most were related to outputs, not outcomes. Consequently, we are unable to assess progress toward strategic goals in each IR. Performance has varied substantially from year to year on meeting outputs. However, the project is likely to meet or exceed most of the outputs specified in Modification 8, which reduced their number and scaled back several key targets. Some of the targets set for the project were extremely modest and easily surpassed. In addition the elimination of many of the more systemic outcome-related targets initially envisaged, and the dramatic reduction in others (e.g. reducing the LOP target for value of international and intra-regional trade from \$50 million to \$15 million) brings into question the capacity of the current program to have a transformational impact on regional trade and integration. As stated in point number 4 within Question 3 below, the follow-on program should adequately consider the balance and forward planning needed in order to be *realistically* transformational in the follow-on. More discussion on the structure and needs of the follow-on program are discussed below. The team does not recommend making substantial changes in the last 15 months of implementation because each set of changes has slowed down performance in achieving stated goals and intended results.

Cooperation with SADC and SACU has been uneven: good in some areas and quite weak in others. In 2012, the project substantially reduced its interactions with SADC, limiting cooperation and consultation between the Hub and that essential partner. This shift reduced the Hub's ability to interact effectively. Communication with other counterparts has also been considered by many to be slow and difficult. Any follow-on project should seek closer collaboration with SADC and SACU, dialoging with them to identify areas in which more systemic trade-expanding activities can be achieved in areas such as South Africa's rules of origin for imports.

2. To what extent has the management structure as implemented supported or hindered performance? What are the factors influencing the achievement and non-achievement of the objectives?

In 2011-2012, the project encountered serious management issues relating to conflicts between project management and USAID overseers. This led to several changes in the project Chief of Party (COP) during 2012. Eventually, the relationship stabilized under the current COP, with a modified and narrowed mandate. Nevertheless, numerous staffing changes at the Hub, which affected implementation timelines and robustness of project activities, occurred as a result of these conflicts. Recent changes in USAID oversight appear to have provided the basis for a stable relationship for the remainder of the project.

Budget issues have also presented major challenges, as funding each year after the first has been well-short of original planned amounts. Further, uncertainty until sometimes well into the fiscal year about the amount available has exacerbated this problem.

Overall, the effectiveness of the project was substantially damaged by the changes in management, project goals, activities, staffing, and the related budgetary issues. However, these were not the only factors affecting non-achievement. Others affecting the achievement and non-achievement of the objectives are lack of coordination with SADC; inconsistent communication with partners; and frequent modifications in objectives, scope, and targets.

A few of the primary factors influencing the achievement of the objectives and success of activities are dedicated and competent current project staff; fewer objectives and lower targets; specific and targeted, “easy wins” for activities; and fewer countries on which to focus.

3. Based on the findings and analysis of the preceding questions, what are the key strategic, programmatic, technical, and managerial features of the project that should be taken into account when implementing a new Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Project in the region?

A mid-term evaluation is not the most effective vehicle for shaping the design of a follow-on project, as there is still uncertainty about the extent to which the project will achieve its goals during the remaining fifteen months. In this regard a targeted analysis of the situation on the ground as the project enters its last year is necessary. In particular, the extent to which SADC countries are addressing their WTO commitments under the Agreement on Trade Facilitation will be critical in the design of a new project, and this was not something the Evaluation Team was in a position to undertake during this assignment. Consultations with other donors will also be important; some of this was carried out during the mid-term evaluation, but a project design team will need to meet with relevant actors from key donors to identify areas of collaboration and synergy.

Nevertheless, we offer four observations about the design of the next project;

- a) In implementing a new project, continuity of effort is important, and sometimes critical. The agricultural value chain activity is particularly vulnerable to a long interruption due to a change from one contractor to another or delays in contracting. USAID should require the outgoing contractor (assuming a change to another firm) to work collaboratively with the new contractor. While project documents provide much useful information to the new contractor, there is also much unwritten knowledge that needs to be shared if there is to be a relatively seamless transition. This includes information about the most effective counterparts,

idiosyncrasies of important interlocutors, and special challenges in dealing with individual partners. USAID should also take as many steps as possible to ensure a seamless transition, in terms of time period, between this contract and the next. This will ensure that the new project can build on momentum from the old and begin immediately to foster relationships (in the case there's a new project team and/or contractor).

- b) USAID should also seek ways to assure a greater degree of cooperation among the three Trade Hubs. They have much to learn from each other, so there is a need to find ways to increase cooperation beyond what has occurred in the past.
- c) Any follow-on project should have a clear results framework, with a clear set of strategic objectives, and an action plan to reach them, including outcome indicators that can be tracked during implementation.
- d) An effective trade/investment support program should be designed in a manner which is *ambitiously realistic* – i.e. which sets up a programmatic framework and staffing structure that is manageable, and that at the same time establishes goals that if achieved can have systemic impact on trade/investment integration and promotion objectives. In this regard important lessons learned can be derived from the experience of the current program. It is therefore important to sculpt the program from the beginning in a manner which is graspable and readily manageable in terms of the range of activities implemented; while at the same time, defining core objectives in a manner that ensures that their attainment will promote transformational progress towards trade integration and expansion for SADC members.

4. What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure sustainability of the project achievements and what is the potential for sustaining these benefits in the medium to long term?

Some Hub activities appear already to be sustainable, including Source Africa and procedural improvements in targeted border crossings, and we see none likely to fall into a state of permanent dependence. There has been a considerable hand-off of customs and trade facilitation work to SADC-member governments, though rapid progress is unlikely without further input from SATH.

Nevertheless, some activities will require additional support:

- Agricultural value chain work will need years of support before sustainability is likely.
- Achievement of National Single Windows is a longer-term project, and is likely to require continued attention.
- The implementation of the WTO agreement on trade facilitation should be a major focus of the project during its final year, but will continue to need attention during the follow-on project. It offers a potentially great opportunity to address trade issues that have so far eluded resolution.

BACKGROUND

The USAID Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness project (the Trade Hub or SATH) project implemented by AECOM commenced in September 2010, and effectively began implementation in FY 2011. It is scheduled to end in September 2015.

Project name: Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Project
Cooperative Agreement No: 674-C-00-10-00075-00
Project Dates: September 2010 – September 2015
Implementing Organization: AECOM
Ceiling Amount: \$83,670,195
Obligated Amount: \$40,229,389

The Trade Hub’s overarching goal was originally: *Increased International Competitiveness, Intra-Regional Trade, and Food Security in the SADC Region*. This objective was to be accomplished through the advancement of the regional integration agenda and increased trade capacity of regional value chains in selected sectors. The delivery of targeted technical assistance was expected to help the SADC region, including public sector, the private sector, and civil society organizations, to realize the advantages of greater regional and global trade linkages and export-oriented business development through assistance in the eight intermediate results areas below:

1. Enhanced Trade Liberalization
2. Improved Trade Facilitation in Transit, Customs, and Other Areas
3. Alignment of Regional Agricultural and Other Standards with International Standards
4. Strengthened Regional Capacity for Energy Sector Planning and Cooperation
5. New Trade Linkages Established and Greater Competitiveness in Staple Foods and Other Strategic Value Chains
6. Enhanced Private Sector Capacity to Comply with Regional and International Market Standards, Including Agricultural Standards
7. Increased Use and Availability of Financial Products and Services for Trade and Investment
8. Increased Use and Availability of Trade-Related Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Products

The Trade Hub was initially designed to take an integrated approach to two high-level United States Government (USG) priorities: the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative (GHFSI), which became the Feed the Future (FTF) program, and the African Growth and Competitiveness Initiative (AGCI). The AGCI expired in September 2010 and was replaced by the African Competitiveness and Trade Expansion Initiative (ACTE), which is building trade capacity across sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). ACTE was launched at the AGOA Forum in Lusaka, Zambia in June 2011. The Trade Hub was also designed as one of three USG Trade Hubs in Sub-Saharan Africa to increase exports to the U.S. under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) and to provide “Aid-for-Trade” assistance as mandated by USG commitments under the Doha round of negotiations at the World Trade Organization. The total ceiling on the Trade Hub contract including one option year is \$82,610,195. However, the actual obligations during the evaluation period (Oct. 2011 - March 2014) were \$40,229,389 (approximately \$10 million per year) of which \$ 1.8 million is bilateral South Africa FTF funds earmarked for grants under contract.

The original Trade Hub base contract end date was September 2014, but has been extended one year to September 2015. The Trade Hub objectives were initially pursued through the following objectives and intermediate results:

Objective 1: Advancement of the Regional Integration Agenda

IR 1.1: Enhanced Trade Liberalization

Sub-IR 1.1.1: Effective Implementation of the SADC Free Trade Agreement (FTA)

Sub-IR 1.1.2: Successful Implementation of the Tripartite Summit Agreement

Sub-IR 1.1.3: Increased Capacity of Member States to Engage in Trade Negotiations and Implement Trade Agreements

IR 1.2: Improved Trade Facilitation in Transit, Customs, and Other Areas

Sub-IR 1.2.1: Improved Performance of Trade Corridors and Transit Systems

Sub-IR 1.2.2: Streamlined Customs Procedures

Sub-IR 1.2.3: Increased Investment through Improved Policies and Promotion Efforts

Sub-IR 1.2.4: Greater Trade in Services through Improved Policies

IR 1.3: Alignment of Regional Agricultural and Other Standards with International Standards

IR 1.4: Strengthened Regional Capacity for Energy Sector Planning and Cooperation

IR 1.5: A Better Enabling Environment

Modification 8 of the contract with AECOM, approved in November 2012, reduced the above set of 13 goals (counting the objective, IRs, and sub-IRs) to the current five IRs and one objective (there is no longer sub-IRs and the objective does not have indicators as defined in the PMP):

Technical Focus: Advancement of the Regional Trade, Investment, & Integration Agenda

IR 1.1: Improved Trade Facilitation

IR 1.2: Greater Competitiveness in Agricultural Value Chains

IR 1.3: Increased Trade & Investment in the Textiles and Apparel Sector

IR 1.4: Strengthened Regulatory Capacity for the Clean Energy Sector, and

IR 1.5: A Better Enabling Environment

Changes in the definition of the region, beneficiaries and personnel also affected the project. The region was redefined, changing from the 15 countries of Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) to Southern Africa as defined by USAID/AFR which, in practical terms, includes the five Southern Africa Customs Union countries (Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland and Lesotho) and the three FTF focus countries (Mozambique, Malawi, and Zambia). Project beneficiaries were broadened to include not only SADC but also member state governments and the private sector. The explanation and justification for these changes are detailed in the project's revised SOW. In addition, during 2012 the prime contractor, AECOM, had several changes of COP with the departure in January of the original COP, followed by two interim COPs before the current COP took over in November 2012. Conflicts with the USAID Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) during this period were frequent. Numerous changes in Hub staff also took place during this period. The combined result of the changes was a less ambitious project.

The principal focus of this evaluation will be on the activities since the implementation of Modification 8. However, some references to earlier activity will also be made.

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS

The purpose of the evaluation is fourfold, to: 1) use evidence to document the degree to which the USAID-funded Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Project through AECOM did or did not carry out its defined tasks and effectively move towards achievement of its defined performance objectives; 2) identify best practices, lessons learned, and areas of improvement; 3) provide recommendations to inform USAID's follow-on; and 4) assess what will be required to achieve existing strategic goals and results.

The primary stakeholders for this evaluation are the technical teams within USAID/Southern Africa, particularly the Regional Economic Growth Office (REGO) and the Program Office. Secondary stakeholders include USAID development partners, other donors, industries and private sector, NGOs, and stakeholders in Southern Africa Trade Hub.

The Evaluation Questions

1. To what extent is the project likely to be successful in achieving results toward its stated objectives? How does the project address key areas of integration as prioritized by SADC and SACU?
2. To what extent has the management structure as implemented supported or hindered performance? What are the factors influencing the achievement and non-achievement of the objectives?
3. Based on the findings and analysis of the preceding questions, what are the key strategic, programmatic, technical, and managerial features of the project that should be taken into account when implementing a new Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Project in the region?
4. What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure sustainability of the project achievements and what is the potential for sustaining these benefits in the medium to long term?

GENERAL FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Question 1. To what extent is the project likely to be successful in achieving results toward its stated objectives? How does the project address key areas of integration as prioritized by SADC and SACU?

1. The project documentation does not include a results framework that permits an evaluation of progress toward achieving higher-level results. Most of the indicators included in Trade Hub Performance Management Plans (PMPs) are output indicators, interspersed with a limited number of outcome indicators. Project documentation lacks measurable progress toward development objectives and assumptions required to reach the objectives. This impedes a completely objectively verifiable evaluation of the project's likely results.
2. The project exhibits mixed progress on meeting its output and outcome indicators. During FY 2011, as noted in the FY 2011 Annual Report, the Hub tracked 47 indicators (primarily at the output level). It met or exceeded six and did not make 41. Of the latter, it made some progress on twelve and none on 29. For FY 2012, the Annual Report includes 27 indicators of which eight met or exceeded targets. Of the nineteen that were missed, it made some progress on ten and none on the remaining nine. In the Fourth Quarter 2012 PMP, there is a second "approved indicator table" which includes 47 indicators, but 34 set no targets. Of the 13 with targets, it made eight. Some progress was made on the five targets that it missed. The FY 2013 PMP tracks indicators for 19 indicators. It met twelve of these and missed seven. However, it made some progress on five that were missed. Two indicators are aggregate averages (time and cost) across four borders for exports and imports. The determination of "met or exceeded" applies to averages across borders, even though data exists for individual borders. Not enough information is available to reach a conclusion yet regarding the degree of overall progress in 2014.
3. As noted above, most of the performance targets are output related rather than representing outcome targets. It is also worth noting that as of the end of Year 3 the project did not report any direct increase in value of traded goods resulting from project activities.
4. Interviews with USAID, SATH, and a review of key documentation indicate that some of the delays and missed targets from all years can be attributed to a reduced funding level and late funding (for example, learning of the current year's funding levels four months into implementation, or learning of a 40% reduction in funding well after work planning has been completed -- as noted below).
5. Some targets were set very low. Funding uncertainties contributed to this because PMP targets are hard to change once they enter USAID's Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System (FACTS) system. Extremely low targets set in some key areas (for example, warehouse receipts financing and the leveraged value of new agricultural investments) open up questions regarding the developmental relevance/impact of significantly exceeding those targets.

Question 2. To what extent has the management structure as implemented supported or hindered performance? What are the factors influencing the achievement and non-achievement of the objectives?

6. Conflicts affected the project, and likely project objectives and project results. Conflicting relationships between the COR and the COP and project staff affected project performance, especially in 2012-2014. These conflicts led to four changes of COP in 2012 as well as large numbers of departures of technical staff. This, paired with limited progress towards core performance objectives, contributed to narrowing the project's focus from thirteen IRs to seven -- and subsequently to five.
7. In addition the failure of USAID to provide expected funding further contributed to a scaling down of the project and failure to meet targets. It now appears that project funding will be little more than half of the \$82 million proposed in the original Statement of Work (SOW). Delays in staffing reflecting budget shortfalls and uncertainties exacerbated non-attainment of project targets.
8. The project has experienced a communication problem with key counterparts and beneficiaries, noted in 75% of interviews with stakeholders/beneficiaries. Several "key" players are unaware of SATH's presence or have not heard from them in the past two years since the transition. Far more frequently than is typical in such projects, development partners, or potential partners have complained about lack of response to queries, or inability to contact project staff in a timely manner. That being said, current beneficiaries also cited high levels of satisfaction with Trade Hub support.
9. Starting in Year 3, the project reduced the number of its objectives. It also ratcheted down the ambitiousness of the key trade integration and promotion goals. Most importantly, the project essentially eliminated the following: (1) Building SADC's capacity to proactively monitor trade protocol implementation and to effectively initiate dispute resolution mechanisms/processes; (2) Identifying and targeting critical NTB's across major value chains; (3) Assessing critical trade-in-services barriers for analysis and removal; and (4) Promoting the systemic utilization of regulatory impact assessment in SADC countries to analyze and promote removal of major NTBs. The project either eliminated or scaled back key outcome goals related to: the value of exports; the volume/value of exported agricultural commodities; the leveraged value of trade-related finance; the leveraged value of export investments; the value of value chain production risk management products; and the leveraged value of leasing and asset-based financing. Although the scaling back of project objectives simplified managerial oversight, at the same time, it diminished the capacity of the program to achieve the type of transformational impact on trade and investment integration and promotion that USAID is striving to achieve through such programs. This is understandably a complex and difficult trade-off. This experience should be taken carefully into account as follow-on trade hub program planning is contemplated.

Question 3. Based on the findings and analysis of the preceding questions, what are the key strategic, programmatic, technical, and managerial features of the project that should be taken into account when implementing a new Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Project in the region?

10. Any follow-on project should have a clear logical framework and results framework that include an objective or objectives (at the goal, purpose/intermediate result, and sub-purpose/-IR levels), a clear strategy for reaching the objective(s), a statement of critical assumptions needed to

reach the objective(s), and an action plan for reaching them. The latter should include outcome indicators that will be tracked to monitor progress toward the objective(s). Critical assumption (or context) indicators should also be identified and tracked throughout the LOP. These can include critical assumptions stemming from other donor activities or host-country governments, and enabling environment/trade/EG context indicators directly or indirectly affecting project performance. More importantly, a plan for data use and learning should be incorporated. This should cover the life of the project and not just year-to-year planning. This needs to be done prior to project implementation. This framework will serve as a basis for monitoring and possible project modifications at periodic review meetings.

11. Following the previous point, more rigorous indicators that are tied directly to achievement/non-achievement of key project activities need to be tracked over the life of the project. The SATH PMPs demonstrate little evidence of a coherent strategy. These documents should be among the most important management tools that demonstrate achievement or non-achievement of key objectives and provide guidance to make mid-course corrections based on the existing data. Stronger indicators should be developed for each level of the causal linkage framework (what does “success” look like – how can we measure it?). This is much more meaningful and important than simply collecting output indicators to meet reporting requirements and trying to reach targets that aren’t necessarily ground-truthed.
 - Outcome indicators and indicators tied to behavior change/knowledge increase in trainings need to complement the “numbers trained” indicators.
 - Time and cost indicators should be modified and both “reduction” and net time should be monitored. For example, a 93% reduction sounds great, but not if the wait time is still 18 hours compared to 4 or 5 at other borders. These indicators can include assumptions based on inputs of other donors (i.e. time will only decrease if the WB finishes its infrastructure project).
 - A consistent framework for measuring targets should prevail throughout the life of project, even if the values of targets need to be revised.
 - Dramatically overshooting or undershooting targets warrant explanations and should be explained in PMP reports. This can be mitigated by doing some initial analysis (e.g., what does the literature say about the average time reduction at borders where Joint Border Committees (JBCs) were introduced?)
12. Estimates for all targets need to be set prior to implementation, preferably during data collection for baseline data. The FY 2012 Annual Report Approved PMP table lacks targets (35 of 47 indicators do not have targets for FY 2012 as of Q4-2012). This renders difficult and subjective an overall determination of Hub progress in meeting its stated objectives. The “proposed” indicator table for FY 2012, however, has more targets and those have been utilized in data analysis. The National Single Window (NSW) and several activities – in particular finance-related activities – that strengthen agricultural value chains (AVCs) will not be inherently sustainable at project completion. Sustainability will be determined on a grant-by-grant and case-by-case basis. Regarding the NSWs, the Hub did a good job in getting them started. In addition to the results framework mentioned above, any decision to continue this process in a new project should be accompanied by the selection of “champions” to complement future USAID support and ensure that the NSWs are in fact completed and in operation. Likewise regarding AVCs, USAID did a good job at starting them. Any continuation of USAID AVC support needs to carefully map out a strategy for achieving sustainability – with indicators that correspond to sustainability – within the results framework.

13. Both the NSW and AVC activities noted above should be considered as continuous processes. If USAID support to these activities is continued, there should be no gap between support provided by the current SATH and a follow-on project.
14. The response of the SADC countries to meeting the WTO requirements under the Agreement on Trade Facilitation will be an important element of the SATH program for the next year, but will also be important in setting the agenda for the next SATH project.
15. Discussions with other donors about the division of labor among donors need to be an important input into the design of the next project, especially with regard to Trade Facilitation work. The Hub needs to coordinate with and capitalize on other efforts in the regions, especially considering its focus on NSWs and Joint Border Committees (JBCs). Some work has been done in this area. It should be a more fully integrated area of the project.
16. Gender needs to be a much larger focus of the follow on project, especially with regard to agricultural value chains, and textiles and apparel. This should be integrated into project design. Disaggregation of numbers trained by sex is not sufficient.
17. Based on KII with stakeholders and its own observations, the team has found that a move to Pretoria would result in lost time, extra cost, and a potential loss of key personnel with little more than 12 months left before close-out procedures begin. The team concludes that this could result in another hindrance to the attainment of project targets and negatively affect performance in the final year of implementation. The team therefore recommends that USAID consider the move for the follow-on project, based on an analysis of pros and cons, but leave the current Trade Hub in Gaborone.
18. Close coordination with SADC and SACU is fundamental for the sustainability of project activities, especially those pertaining to trade facilitation. These are the regional entities charged with key objectives pertaining to trade and integration. SATH and any follow-on project should not ignore them or downplay their importance. However, support to SADC should be strategic and organized. As difficult as it was in the beginning to work with SADC and as marginalized as the relationship appears to be now, the remainder of the project as well as the follow-on should coordinate with SADC, even if it is just as a key partner in the region. The Hub and USAID made the correct decision to move away from demand-driven support to SADC, but ignoring SADC or downplaying its importance means slighting a key player and partner. Based on conversations with other donors, it is clear that they “walk the halls” of SADC to foster relationships, both formal and informal. At times success of project activities is based on relationships of individuals involved in implementation.
19. The team recommends that some of the analyses and research studies completed in the first two years of the project continue with SADC and other key regional players, but in a more targeted and strategic manner to directly support Trade Hub activities and work plans in the region. Impact analyses should be carried out much more frequently than currently. Two examples might include an impact analysis of the South African Rules of Origin or a review of chokepoints and infrastructure levels at key borders in the region, especially for USAID supported value chains.

Question 4. What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure sustainability of the project achievements and what is the potential for sustaining these benefits in the medium to long term?

20. The Evaluation Team does not believe that any of the activities being financed by the Hub are likely to fall into the category of permanent dependence on donor support. However, interviews with the Trade Hub staff identified several issues: (i) national governments rely too heavily on the Trade Hub to finance government employee attendance at meetings and workshops, and completion of several project activities, in particular the NSW, will require meetings and workshops after the close of the present project; and (ii) several project activities, especially the NSW and some AVC activities, will require additional donor funding and support well beyond the close of the current project. Once paid for and implemented, the systems themselves are relatively “easy” to upkeep.
21. We believe that a number of achievements of the project are already sustainable. These include:
- Simplified documentation and procedures, as well as agency coordination, at border crossings, most notably the work on JBCs. Both Mwanza and Songwe JBCs are successful and have achieved sustainability. The Trade Hub gave the MRA and MIT the tools necessary to replicate their successes at other borders. Namibia and Malawi will have advisors embedded from the Trade Hub to support the handover and implementation of the NSW. Coordination with SADC or SACU could increase likelihood of sustainability, in particular if SADC and SACU were to encourage implementation of the NSWs, JBCs, and other trade facilitation tools in light of the WTO Bali Agreement.
 - A fully sustainable annual trade show on textiles and apparel.
 - Understanding among regulators of the issues needing to be addressed on clean energy.
 - Activities within Strategic Partnership Grants, including the AgroTech exposition with Spintelligent are generally sustainable, if the partnership remains and the objectives of the grant are met.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY IRI

IRI.1 IMPROVED TRADE FACILITATION

The goal of Trade Facilitation component is to reduce time and cost of transportation at four key borders through Coordinated Border Management (CBM) efforts like Joint Border Committees (JBCs), and to improve customs procedures through National Single Windows (NSWs) in Malawi and Namibia, and Customs Connectivity in Botswana and Namibia.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The project began with an ambitious set of goals for trade facilitation, which focused on building the capacity of SADC to drive compliance with core trade protocol requirements, identifying and targeting critical NTB's across major value chains, and helping assess critical trade-in-services barriers for analysis and removal. The original design also envisaged technical support to promote the systemic utilization of regulatory impact assessment (RIA) in SADC countries to analyze and promote removal of major NTBs. Afterwards, program objectives were progressively narrowed. Considerable progress has been made, however, on the current much less ambitious set of goals.

The time and cost to trade on four selected borders has decreased, but the National Single Window implementation will not be achieved during the life of this (or perhaps even the next) project. In addition, customs connectivity work needs to be reassessed.

The National Single Window is a longer-term project that is unlikely to be met during the remainder of the current project, even though embedding advisors in Namibia and Malawi – planned for July 2014 – should accelerate the process. Clearly, a NSW is a complex undertaking, requiring much more than a Cabinet Decision (obtained in both countries). It can be converted to reality only by buy-in from the numerous ministries involved and additional donor support after the close of the current project. Once funding is ascertained from another donor, the implementation process should move more smoothly.

Other activities, including establishment of Joint Border Committees, simplified administrative procedures, and reduced border transit times, have been achieved at selected crossings, but with considerable variations between the time and cost of exporting and importing. These are discussed in more detail below.

Stakeholders have argued that more could have been achieved if the Hub had greater continuity of staffing, better communication, and a more targeted approach from the beginning.

More needs to be done to monitor progress of Trade Facilitation activities. Targets set for time and cost to trade on selected borders were far too modest.

More detailed analysis:

Coordinated Border Management program

SATH conducted Border Operations Assessments (BOAs) in 2011 (FY 2012) and established Joint Border Committees at Songwe (Malawi/Tanzania), Mwanza (Malawi/Mozambique), Nakonde

(Zambia/Tanzania) and Kasumbalesa (Zambia/Democratic Republic of the Congo), on the Dar Corridor and the “Feed the Future” countries of Mozambique, Malawi, and Zambia to support the flow of agricultural trade in priority value chains. The results of these SATH BOAs show average reductions in cost and time to move cargo. Substantial improvements in border crossing procedures, harmonization of operational hours, and sharing of information among agencies have led to reductions in border crossing times at the majority of borders where the project has been active in establishing JBCs.

The project has partially met its targets on time and cost for exports and imports:

- In reference to time reductions, the project achieved the targeted reductions on exports for all four border crossings and on imports for two of the same four crossings during the fourth quarter of FY 2013 (Table I below). Although the crossing times for imports decreased at the Nakonde and Kasumbalesa crossings, they fell short of the specified targets.
- Regarding cost reductions, the project helped reduce the costs of crossing two of four borders for imports, and three of four borders for exports in the fourth quarter of FY 2012 (Table 2 below). In Songwe, Malawi, the overall crossing time rose due to the introduction of a new central clearance system. Nakonde and Kasumbalesa (both in Zambia) still face challenges in infrastructure, and overall net time and cost to trade is relatively high compared to Mwanza, Malawi. The former have both seen dramatic reductions, but costs of crossing Zambia’s borders still surpass those of the baselines in Malawi (albeit varying levels of volume). Total time and cost savings, targeted at 5% for the fourth quarter of FY 2012, were exceeded. Both the sums of total time and total costs decreased by 12% in this period (See Table 4, which is based on figures in Table 3). The unweighted average crossing times for the four targeted crossings in FY Q4 2012 were reduced by 4 hours per border or 12%, which translates to a 240% reduction against a targeted 5% reduction. These reductions prompted at least one government --Zambia-- to begin the process of deepening this intervention by a border management agency bill, which now being reviewed by the government. In the fourth quarter of FY 2013, the costs decreased of crossing the selected borders for exports and imports at all four of the selected border crossings. The cost reduction targets for exports were attained at three of the four crossings; they fell slightly short of the target at the Nakonde for exports (97% of the target). Three of the targets for reduced costs of import crossings decreased enough to easily meet their corresponding targets. Only the import cost reduction for crossing the Kasumbalesa border fell short; it was at 90% of its target.

Table I. Crossing time at Trade Hub targeted borders FY Q4 2013

Border	EXPORTS				IMPORTS			
	Baseline*	Target^	Change (FY Q4 13)	%	Baseline*	Target^	Change FY Q4 13	%
Mwanza – Malawi	4hrs 45	-28min	-55 min	196%	7hrs 12	-42min	-2hrs 8min	305%
Songwe - Malawi	4hrs 49	-28min	-2hr 27 min	525%	15hrs 29	-1hr 32 min	-8hrs 47 min	573%
Nakonde- Zambia	30hrs 14	-3hrs 01	-13hr 2min	432%	44hrs 38 hours	-4hrs 25 min	-2hrs 39 min	60%
Kasumbalesa - Zambia	24hrs 07	-2hrs 25	-12hr 35min	521%	5hrs 40	-32 min	-29min	91%

Source: SATH Annual Report 2013

*Baseline is FY Q3 2011

^Targets are for reduction in time.

Table 2. Expanded table of cost of trading goods across Trade Hub targeted borders – FY Q4 2012

Border	EXPORTS				IMPORTS			
	Baseline* (US\$)	Achieved [^] (US\$)	Change FY Q4 12	(+/-) %	Baseline*	Achieved [^]	Change FY Q4 12	(+/-) %
Mwanza – Malawi	89.06	63.75	-25.31	-28%	135	199.69	+64.69	+48%
Songwe - Malawi	90.31	118.13	+27.82	+31%	290.31	438.13	+147.82	+51%
Nakonde-Zambia	566.81	325.93	-240.88	-42%	836.88	806.25	-30.63	-4%
Kasumbalesa - Zambia	452.19	216.25	-235.94	-52%	106.25	97.18	-9.07	-9%

Source: SATH PMP November 2012.

*Baseline is FY Q3 2011

[^]Net cost to trade

Table 3. Reduction in Cost of trading goods across Trade Hub targeted borders FY Q4 2013

Border*	EXPORTS			IMPORTS			CUMULATIVE	
	Target (US\$)	Change (US\$)	% change	Target (US\$)	Change (US\$)	% change	Target (US\$)	Total (US\$) (%)
Mwanza – Malawi	88,476	168,192	190%	389,272	1,174,387	302%	477,748	1,342,579 (281%)
Songwe - Malawi	58,546	298,716	510%	376,534	2,146,492	570%	435,080	2,445,208 (562%)
Nakonde-Zambia	3,230,688	3,133,160	97%	728,540	1,938,588	266%	3,959,228	5,071,748 (128%)
Kasumbalesa - Zambia	2,656,251	13,813,425	520%	595,556	537,426	90%	3,252,807	14,350,851 (441%)

Source: SATH Annual Report 2013

*Cost to trade is actual cost saving for truck operators and/or importers/exporters that derives from improvement in clearance processes and crossing times at each border, taking into account the number of trucks crossing the border every day for a period of 365 days

Table 4. Reduction in Time and Cost of trading goods across Trade Hub targeted borders FY Q4 2012

	Target*	Actual	% reach
Cost	5%	12%	240%
Time	5%	12%	240%

Source: SATH PMP Q4 2012

*Targets are for reduction to trade, in percent form

Stakeholders in both government and private sector, including the Malawian Revenue Authority (MRA) and Zambian Revenue Authority (ZRA) attested to the positive impact of JBCs on their borders as a means of easing movement of cargo through borders.

Work at both Mwanza and Songwe borders is considered successful and sustainable, based on conversations with project staff, the MRA, and a review of key documents. According to the MRA, Malawi is in the process of replicating the successes at Mwanza and Songwe at other borders where initial assessments have been completed (Mchinji and Dedza), utilizing the tools and Roadmap the Hub has imparted. The volume of goods is low at Mchinji, contributing to a low baseline. The project was

unable to collect data in 2013 for Dedza.

According to the Zambian Revenue Authority, the Nakonde JBC is seeing positive results in time and cost (24% improvement in efficiency in 2013) but faces infrastructure challenges; the Kasumbalesa JBC is weak and requires further levels of support and deeper coordination among agencies before it sees greater a reduction. The JBC has contributed to a large reduction in time and cost, but the net time and cost are still 4-5 times that of Malawi.

Based on Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Annual Reports, inadequate infrastructure is the principal bottleneck to improved JBC success in Zambia (Nakonde and Kasumbalesa). As a result of infrastructure deficiencies, coupled with low trade volumes at Mchinji and Dedza, in year 4 the project shifted its focus more toward NSWs.

Our primary conclusion, based on the findings above related to Coordinated Border Management (CBM) are that activities in TF would benefit from more initial “stocktaking” and review of chokepoints, current levels of infrastructure, and donor mapping to identify priority areas for intervention. The prioritization of USAID funding toward the most critical intervention points could be informed by a donor meeting during project design, paired with a team of experts that: reviews existing data on border and corridor crossing times; carries out primary data collection for those borders and corridors with no existing data; assess infrastructure strength (either through primary means like site visits or observation or secondary data in existing literature); and identifies regional needs (perhaps with SADC and national governments). JBCs are an important component of Coordinated Border Management and the more efficiently they can be established, the more effectively One Stop Border Posts (OSBPs) and other valuable pieces of CBM can be implemented to further reduce time and cost. In regards to sustainability, once JBCs have been handed over to a government body, the entity is self-sustaining as long as government agencies continue to collaborate and coordinate and a budgetary line item is created for any upkeep. Therefore, the CBM trade facilitation work that was completed is sustainable and will continue to see results in the medium-to-long term.

SADC priority OSBPs include: Beitbridge Border Post (RSA/Zimbabwe), Kazungula Bridge (Botswana/Zambia), Kasumbalesa (DRC/Zambia), Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe) and Ramokgwebana/Plumtree (Botswana/Zimbabwe). OSBPs are costly and complex and this means that SADC will have to wait a number of years before we see OSBPs rolled out at SADC borders. In the meantime JBCs will continue to be an important trade facilitation tool in streamlining border operations for years to come. Delays in implementing OSBPs are further compounded by the absence of the now defunct Department for International Development (DFID) Trade Facilitation project, Trade Mark Southern Africa (TMSA), which was spearheading establishment of OSBPs in SADC.

National Single Windows

The Hub’s major activity in promotion of National Single Windows is a work in progress whose impact in reducing the cost and time to transport goods across corridors may not be realized during the lifespan of the current project. Based on conversations with the Malawian Revenue Authority – the recently identified champion of the effort—Malawi is 18 months from beginning implementation (conversations with the Trade Hub staff put the entire timeline at 5-8 years before it’s fully sustainable). Namibia and Malawi are most advanced in moving toward a National Single Window, which should be supported by embedding a Hub staff member as a long-term advisor in the MRA and Namibia Ministry of Trade and Industry. Lack of motivation and forward movement on the part of national counterparts when the Hub isn’t physically present impede implementation on the part of Trade Hub staff, while counterparts in national governments cite communication issues and “loose ends” (i.e. close-out and handover reports for finished activities to officials). Malawian Revenue Authority says that it is waiting for an official close-out report, while the Hub deems the activity in the country’s hands. There appears

to be a lack of regular communication, though each party cites the activity as largely successful overall and moving forward. The embedded advisors are a viable solution for remedying the aforementioned communication issues.

Each country is currently “donor shopping” to finance full implementation of the NSW, and the Hub has coordinated meetings with the African Development Bank and the World Bank. Donor coordination on this activity is crucial to ensure there are no gaps between the completion of the NSW Roadmap/Action Plan and having the funding necessary to carry it out. The project would have been more successful in completing its activities (i.e. NSW, JBCs) if it had worked to identify a champion in host-country governments or SADC prior to beginning work and completing the Roadmap. A prerequisite for support to a government could be an identified champion, or part of the initial technical assistance package to the government could include stakeholder meetings to identify the individual. Without a champion, the development of the Roadmap is poorly timed. We also advise that the Hub, in future NSW work, coordinate with other donors from the beginning to identify the funding source as the Roadmap is being developed. Once the Roadmap is completed and the Revenue Authority or Ministry of Trade is ready to implement is too late. This is something the Hub can help facilitate, which would improve its overall donor coordination function.

NSWs are slightly more complicated with regard to sustainability because handover of the Roadmap/Action Plan to the government body responsible for implementation—even with a champion—does not necessarily imply sustainability: funding does. The Hub has worked with Malawi and Namibia’s Revenue Authorities to attempt to secure funding for implementation from the World Bank and African Development Bank. This increases the likelihood of implementation and therefore sustainability of the Hub’s initial work in the area. The Hub’s embedding of long-term advisors into the government bodies of Malawi and Namibia will not in itself ensure sustainability but it will help to secure longer-term results by facilitating implementation of the NSW and other Trade Facilitation activities.

Customs Connectivity

According to a 2014 report and discussions with the SATH team, the work to implement the Customs Connectivity Project (CCP) between Botswana and Namibia has been stopped for technical reasons and will be discontinued. Once the source code was secured from the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) after a long waiting period, it was determined the code was incomplete. After more attempts to coordinate with UNCTAD, UNCTAD sent a letter stating that ASYCUDA ++ is obsolete and it would therefore not provide the missing parts of the code. Microsoft has since pulled out of the project and the technical lead coordinating with SATH has departed. The primary lesson learned is the need for coordination with UNCTAD from the very beginning. This would have avoided the situation and the project goal might have been achieved. At this stage, the evaluation team agrees with the recommendations in the note that the CCP be halted and a new approach devised alongside a process for coordinating with UNCTAD.

Measuring Progress: Indicators and Targets. Based on the extent of targets met for export time and cost, it is worth exploring whether or not the targets were adequately aspirational. Targets seem low and should be based on the average reduction in time and cost (perhaps in other regions) which occurs after the establishment of JBCs. The future SATH should consider this when completing its PMP.

For monitoring progress in Trade Facilitation, USAID had suggested utilizing the World Bank Doing Business Trade across Borders data. The team finds the Trading across Borders indicator far too national an indicator for activity-level monitoring, covering pieces of the corridor on which the Hub is not working and is best viewed as a contextual indicator. Tanzania and Namibia are reported by

transporters to be the best performing countries for cost of trading across borders. It seems that this indicator is not suited to a project of this nature because the activities are only targeting a few borders, which contribute only a small portion of the overall country-level time and cost to trade. A more suitable indicator is the time and cost to trade at key borders (also demonstrated as a percent reduction), instead of “reduction in cost/time”. It is useful to see by what percent the time/cost was reduced, but a reduction of, for example, 90% that still leaves goods waiting for 23 hours is misleading. It should also be noted that for measuring time/cost to trade in relation to work on JBCs, data collection should be completed at least bi-annually (twice per year) to gauge seasonality and should not be discontinued once the activity is completed. In reviewing the 2012 and 2013 PMP indicator data, it seems no new data was collected in 2013 as a follow up to Songwe, Mwanza, Nakonde, and Kasumbalesa.

Setting up of systems to address non-tariff barriers

The SATH gave a \$100,000 grant to the Dar es Salaam Corridor Committee (DCC) for its capacity building efforts and supporting interventions to reduce transport costs. The DCC is a joint private-public sector entity established to design and implement cross-border and multi-country programs to eliminate these expensive barriers to intraregional and international trade. This funding unlocked further support from the World Bank, which is now taking the lead on implementation of the Corridor Performance Monitoring System along this corridor.

Training in transit, customs and cross border trade issues

The Trade Hub conducted the first Southern Africa Trade Facilitation Conference. The conference brought together key stakeholders in trade facilitation in the region, including representatives of borders being targeted in the CBM program. 94 participants (68 males and 26 females) benefitted from discussions about the latest trade facilitation tools, trade facilitation challenges in the region and proposed possible solutions offered by the Trade Hub and other players in this sector. The Hub has provided no information on changes by the relevant governments in procedures as a result of the training.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Clearly, much has been achieved under this IR. However, more investigative and preparatory work could have been done on the front end to ensure that the correct borders were selected, that the countries had identified “champions”, and that all necessary materials were gathered (e.g., source code from UNCTAD) and partnerships established (i.e. with other donors for NSW funding, with SADC in general, or with UNCTAD for customs connectivity). Since the National Single Window is unlikely to be realized in Namibia and Malawi during the current project, the project should coordinate with other donors to find support this effort. It should also develop an action plan for any gap in SATH implementation.

A champion is needed prior to beginning work to ensure the completion and sustainability of a NSW in any country. If no champion is identified, support given to the host-country government should be in coordinating Ministries *et al* to identify a champion. Otherwise, work will stall and will need to be duplicated/ restarted once the parties are ready. Embedded advisors, as the Trade Hub is planning to establish in July 2014, will potentially provide the impetus for full implementation. Key Hub staff identified the waning/waxing level of interest by key government actors as a primary impediment to implementation in Malawi and Namibia. When the Trade Hub is there and working directly with the MRA or NRA, there is a high level of forward movement, but when the Trade Hub returns to home

base, the momentum wavers. Embedding advisors should alleviate this issue. But the latter also seems to stem from poor communication on the part of both counterparts and Hub staff. This activity, if implemented in the countries in the region, has the potential to reduce time and cost to trade. The Hub should continue to facilitate this process in countries that have interest in identifying a champion, securing donor funds, and mapping out an action plan for implementation. Impact analyses should be done, perhaps via STTA or another project or in coordination with SADC, to determine the potential impact of NSW adoption.

During implementation, the project's focus moved away from border crossing activities because major choke points were often found to be located beyond borders. Trade volumes at some of the borders on which the Trade Hub was working are extremely low and at others infrastructure is so poor that time and cost to trade won't change without significant changes in port and border infrastructure, both of which are outside the purview of the Trade Hub. This is generally a good decision. However, it is recommended that the future Trade Hub coordinate with other donors from project design and conduct a donor activity mapping exercise alongside collation of existing data on most notable chokepoints along key corridors and borders in the region to identify priority areas for Hub intervention that provide value added to other donor activities, especially in the area of port and border infrastructure. It is important to note that we are not suggesting the Hub work on infrastructure, but rather focus on borders where another donor has already tackled infrastructure. There is no sense in working to reduce time and cost to trade on a border that first needs significant investment in infrastructure.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1 Early on in its planning for the next project, USAID should seek deeper coordination with other donors involved in Trade Facilitation, including the WB, African Development Bank (AfDB), DIFD and Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA). This need to coordinate is crucial for compliance with WTO requirements under the Agreement on Trade Facilitation and, relatedly, the creation of national single windows.
- 2 The Hub should continue to support existing JBCs, while working with governments to promote formation of Border coordination agencies to take up the role of implementing border coordination.
- 3 Capacity-building and promotion of private sector partners should be given greater emphasis in the Project's Trade Facilitation activities. It would appear from interviews with stakeholders in the private sector that most of the region lacks well-organized associations that could push the advocacy agenda. This has sometimes forced the hub to exert much of its energy in seeking buy-in from stakeholders.
- 4 The Hub should also be encouraged to undertake an assessment of private-sector logistics capacity, as SADC investment in Trade Facilitation will only bear fruit if the private sector is able to play its role in a competent manner.
- 5 Private sector logistics service providers are clear that corruption remains a big challenge to transport logistics in SADC. Although all of SATH customs and trade facilitation initiatives seek to reduce the opportunity for corruption, stronger efforts to monitor and track corruption levels and to use this information to seek government actions to address the problem are needed.

IR 1.2 AGRICULTURAL VALUE CHAINS

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The goal of agriculture value chain (AVC) development for the project is: “Greater regional food security through more competitive regional agricultural value chains including increased productivity, lower post-harvest loss, and increased intra-regional trade—in staple foods and other agricultural commodities.” The project documentation presents no measurable indicators or tracking system to determine when the goal is reached or approached. Only a limited number of outcome indicators show what the project expects to achieve toward meeting it. This impedes the ability of the evaluation team to assess project results. However, KIs suggest that some (unmeasurable) progress may have been made toward the objective.

Most of the AVC indicators included in the project documentation are output indicators. The team reviewed these and a limited number of outcome indicators, and presents its findings in this section.

After a slow start, activity associated with this IR has gained momentum during the past 18 months, and shows promise of achieving increases in production and trade of the commodities. Progress has been achieved in establishing storage capacity for grains, training, particularly for aflatoxin removal, and stimulating private sector investment by value-chain partners. From the results obtained and analyzed in the PMP and results of discussions with key stakeholders across Zambia, Malawi, and Mozambique where SATH is implementing the AVC activities, and triangulation of these data (both qualitative and quantitative) indicate that the project is now more firmly on track to achieve its targets within the IR. This contributes to its IR goal of greater regional food security through more competitive regional agricultural value chains, including increased productivity, lower post-harvest loss, and increased intra-regional trade in staple foods and other agricultural commodities.

The project completed 14 of 20 planned activities in 2013 and met or exceeded targets on seven of eleven indicators; this is an improvement from 2012 and 2011, both of which saw progress on only three of ten indicators, of which many were changed in the 2013 PMP. Overall it should be noted that at the mid-point of the project key agricultural value chain-related outcome goals (e.g., the volume/value of exported agricultural commodities; the value of trade-related finance leveraged; the value of export investments leveraged, the value of value chain production risk management products, and the value leasing and other asset-based financing leveraged) were either eliminated or reduced to such a degree that the prospective developmental impact of the agricultural value chain development work done under the program was necessarily and severely curtailed.

More detailed analysis:

The Hub generated \$2.00 million in agricultural and rural loans in 2013, and targets \$2.74 million in 2014. Data for this year is unavailable at this date. The Hub generated \$2.5 million in new private sector investment in 2013, 456% of the target. This same indicator is also used for IR3; it should only be used once. In 2014, the Hub targets \$2.0 million, but progress has not yet been reported. The Hub targeted ten management practices or technologies supported under one phase of development and achieved twelve (120%). In 2014, the Hub targets 17, but has yet to report data.

In 2013, the SATH trained 390 people, hitting only 63% of its target for the year (the indicator was not used in the 2012 PMP). In 2014, after two full quarters, the Hub has trained 606 people of its 3050 individual target (20%). In 2013, 174 food security entities were receiving USG assistance against its target of 73 (238%); the numbers for 2014 show less progress, but it is too early to be definitive: 24

entities out of a targeted 220 (11%). These numbers should be reassessed after the fourth quarter of Year 4.

Beneficiaries interviewed cite the training as useful and beneficial in increasing product quality. AfriNuts in Malawi exported to Holland for the first time after the training on aflatoxin removal and gives credit to the SATH for its success (the size of the export deal was not given). It hopes to continue to export its groundnuts. Since the training, AfriNuts has spent much of their time in the field with farmers to impart knowledge regarding quality of groundnuts. Follow up work by the Hub should be completed to methodically collect data on “impact”.

More work should be done to track the impact of the grants, and levels three and four of Kirkpatrick’s levels of training evaluation should be considered (both knowledge and behavior change) instead of just tracking numbers trained. Systematic follow up should occur with processors or firms trained to capture “impact”. This IR (and all IRs) should have input, output, and outcome indicators as well as context indicators. More time should be spent throughout the project to collect and collate data on results and “impact” to facilitate easier and better evaluations of project activities.

Of a targeted 55 entities to receive training in management practices and technology, 34 entities (66%) are utilizing new management practices or technologies as a result of USG assistance. In the second quarter of 2014, only four of a targeted 100 are doing so. Four of four targeted policies/regulations were achieved in 2013; no targets have been established for 2014.

The project awarded \$600,000 in grants to six firms in Zambia, Malawi, and Mozambique over the period from 2012-2013. Each was for \$100,000. All of these grants paired a South African firm and a local firm to transfer new technologies or practices. These Strategic Partnership Grants (SPGs) are considered sustainable if the partnership between the South African firm and the Zambian/Malawian/Mozambique firm continuously generates more income for the smaller firm. It is assumed that the firm will then invest its income into more product and new technologies. Conversations with beneficiaries of the grant, primarily on the South African side, indicated that the partner firms are increasing incomes and investment with the improved seed or product and an increased ability to export. The only downside to this activity is the limited number of grants (there were only six), and difficulties in reaching meaningful conclusions based on a very small sample. Each was awarded the maximum amount of funding instead of varying the awards in accordance with the type of activity and an assessment of financing needs.

Kills with Trade Hub staff and beneficiaries recommended that future grants vary in size and objectives, ranging from \$20,000 to \$100,000 depending on the size of the activity. Grants given during this period were all the same size due to a misinterpretation of grant objectives. Uncertainty about the project extension paired with late-coming budgetary information affected the award of new grants in this current year (2014). However, with the extension to September 2015, work will continue on these activities through SPGs now in concept paper form and on warehouse receipt activities with the Agricultural Commodity Exchange (ACE) in Malawi. A secondary analysis on 2014 results will need to be undertaken once progress has been made later in 2014. This can largely be a desk review.

The year 2014 marked the inaugural Agritech Exposition held in Chisamba, Zambia. It had 7,432 visitors and 104 exhibiting companies, representing 19 countries and a breadth of farming types (from commercial to emerging and small-scale farmers). USAID supported grant allocations for 50 farmers to attend the event, matchmaking opportunities to increase market linkages, workshops on various topics including ag-sector productivity and yield, improved and sustainable technologies, management, and processes. 706 matchmaking meetings were held over the two-day exposition. Workshops were all

overbooked. 50 farmers outside of Zambia were given travel grants to attend the event on the understanding that they would attend 10 meetings and workshops. Based on site visits and interviews with the organizing team, it was found that Spintelligent is well-organized and well-suited to run this activity in the future with similar USAID support. The nature of the event, held at the GART research center with live crop trials and demonstration fields is well suited to increasing agricultural sector productivity, market linkages, and enhanced technologies. Some lessons learned identified during our meetings included: the need for more marketing and the attendance of more SME's; larger workshop space; more U.S. knowledge and companies present; and the need for a day-one event to bring participants together and begin networking at the earliest stages. Follow ups with attendees will be undertaken by Spintelligent to frame next year's event.

I. I Improved SADC market linkages

Expanded and Strengthened Warehouse Receipts System [WRS]

Evidence shows that there was an increase in installed storage capacity for grains in project countries as projected by SATH. According to Table 8 of Annex IV, the PMP planned to achieve a target of 15,000 MT of installed storage capacity for cereals in the project countries. This was fully achieved. This achievement was important because farmers in Malawi and Zambia are especially vulnerable to price manipulation by middlemen and with these structures constructed deep into the rural areas, farmers are assured of a market and a higher and more stable price. Between 2011 and 2012, warehouse receipt financing increased from just US\$10,000 to almost US\$150,000 with an increase of individual receipts from three to 63. In FY 2013, the financing value increased by an additional 41% to \$207,925; ACE expanded its certified storage base by four additional facilities and 15 collection points. The total finance ceiling for receipts and forward contracts went up by a factor of 10 to more than \$1.5 million. Although small, these advances represent steps in the right direction.

The AVC team is currently developing a warehouse receipts pilot activity in Mozambique. Financing facilitated through the ACE warehouse receipts system in Malawi has increased from \$300,000 last year to about \$3,000,000 this year. Again the amount is relatively small, but it aims to open up a new source of finance for small farmers.

In FY 2014, the AVC team worked to develop two SPGs with South African-based trading firms and ACE of Malawi. When complete, these grants will result in 2,000 metric tons of new rural storage which will be open to warehouse receipt deposits, though the results will not be seen in the short term.

Enhanced Grain Grading and Storage Management Training

According to results of analysis in Table 2 of Annex IV, for the period running until year 3, according to the PMP, the target for the period was 615 participants in the training program and SATH achieved a training total of 390 (63%) with the remaining earmarked to be trained in year four and five.

Gender mainstreaming was also partially achieved in the capacity building program training 276 males (71%) and 114 females (29%) totaling 390 trained beneficiaries. The project, on a whole, only achieved 14% of female participation in trainings and capacity building programs, of a targeted 40%. However, more work can be done to tailor training and activities to men and women, which is currently not a focus of the project. This will increase the likelihood and the level of meaningful positive gender "impacts". There has been a significant increase in the number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers, organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance. Table 3 in Annex IV

shows that the project target for training relevant stakeholders was 73 participants through year 3, while the actual achievement was 174 participants. Thus the target was overshoot by 238%.

Case 1 in Annex IV entitled: “*Making the Grade: USAID Training Program Protects Crops. USAID Southern Africa Trade Hub trains warehouse managers to help reduce severe grain losses in region*” shows how the project aims to made a difference.

Successfully Executed Various Strategic Partnership Grants

Evidence shows that the value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation increased beyond expectation. According to Table 4 in Annex IV, the PMP target for the value of private sector investment in the agriculture sector leveraged by FTF was supposed to be \$540,000 while the actual value achieved in the same period was \$ 2,464,950. Thus the target was overachieved by 456%. Most of this result is explained by the number of SPGs that were signed between SATH and the private sector, which in turn stimulated additional investment venture capital in the sectors.

The number of public-private partnerships (PPPs) formed as a result of FTF assistance achieved a measured success. According to the PMP analysis in Table 6 in Annex IV, the projected target for new public-private sector partnerships that would be formed was projected to be 15, while the actual partnerships formed in the same period was 12, achieving 80% of the target. The missed target reflects the slow negotiation process in Zambia and Mozambique.

Evidence from Table 1 in Annex IV shows that the Trade Hub has made progress in processing the SPGs to support private sector in implementation various agricultural development activities including technology transfer and sanitary and phyto-sanitary (SPS) standards development to support intra-regional trade between advanced economies like South Africa and upcoming economies like Zambia, Malawi, and Mozambique.

According to observations in Table 1 of Annex IV, Zambia has received the bulk of SPGs resources because it has advanced its agriculture activities in aligning private sector and farmers towards commercialized agriculture. Other countries that have benefited include Malawi and Mozambique.

In year 3, the AVC team provided grant funding for the purchase of a sorting and grading line to allow a Zambian peanut butter processor, Jungle Beat, to provide aflatoxin-compliant nuts to Central African Seed Services (CASS) in South Africa. Based on the technological capacity to grade and meet export requirements, the firm off-take agreement coupled with support of a Zambian DCA guarantee, Jungle Beat has been able to source US\$1.8 million in commercial working capital finance. This is expected to increase the company’s small holder procurement from approximately 2,700 Metric Tons (MT) last year to more than 7,000 MT this year, resulting in up to an estimated US\$6 million in exports in the next fiscal year. In year 4, the first export deal for aflatoxin-compliant groundnuts was achieved under the CASS/Jungle Beat Strategic Partnership Grant

Case study 2 in Annex IV entitled: “*USAID Grants Accelerate Peanut Trade from Zambia. Exporting to South Africa will increase farmer profits and improve standard of living*” documents a successful example of how SPGs have been effective in promoting private sector and economic benefits of smallholder farmers.

1.2 Enhanced agriculture value chains in the SADC region

Improved Access to Commercial Seed by Smallholder farmers

In quarter 1 of year 4, 437 farmers received improved seed for groundnuts under the Jungle Beat/SAGM SPG. The new seed varieties aim to enable these farmers to produce high quality ground nuts that can be exported to South Africa market and hence stimulate intra-regional trade. In year 3, the AVC team used the SPGs to bring investment and technology to the regional production sector through sustainable, commercially-based activities. Through the SPGs mechanism, the AVC team facilitated increased use of new hybrid seed in all three targeted value chains and is supporting increased leverage of cash-crop out grower investments for food crop production. Through a SPG that pairs two independent regional seed companies in year 3 –Capstone Seed in South Africa with Peacock Seed in Malawi –the AVC team facilitated the multiplication and commercial distribution of 80 MT of CAP 9001 drought tolerant hybrid maize. Peacock Seed is currently marketing the certified seed in 10 kg packs to the small holder market and expects as many as 8,000 farmers to purchase and benefit from the improved seed. In the coming season, Peacock Seed will import CAP 9001 parent seed without grant support on a commercial basis

Case of NWK/Dunavant Cotton Strategic Partnership Grant Demonstrates Private Sector Investment in Food Crops

In the Year 3 period, the Trade Hub awarded an SPG to NWK to bring finance, quality inputs, and cutting edge agricultural technology to an initial group of 920 small holder and emerging commercial farmers in Zambia, and to add soybeans to their cropping rotation. Participating farmers receive inputs, agronomic training, and “I receive” mobile technology, which includes bulk SMS to advise farmers on production and marketing opportunities. To date, 250 samples from small holder farms have been analyzed and mapped. Grant funding supports the upfront costs of developing these technological services for farmers. NWK will make them available to farmers through their out grower network. In addition, NWK/Dunavant has completed the development of a soil mapping database, which will overlay new soil testing information on existing soil type maps to develop specific amendment and rotation plans for farmers. Highlights of these activities are a strong focus on activities where commercial and project objectives overlap and on clear grantee ownership and meaningful cost-sharing.

In the coming year 4, the Trade Hub will put additional resources into developing more SPGs in Malawi and Mozambique. To date, beneficiaries of \$100,000 SPGs include: CASS of Zambia; CAPSTONE of Malawi; AFGRI of Zambia; SAGM of Zambia; NWK of Zambia; and SAGL of Zambia.

Technology Transfer to Smallholder Farmers

The number of new technologies or management practices achieved in the reporting period was above the target. According to Table 5 in Annex IV, the target for the number of new technologies that were to be developed under phases 1, 2 and 3 was 10; however, the project achieved a higher actual value of 12 new technologies, thereby surpassing the target by 120%. Overachievements in Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique incorporated technology transfers coming from South Africa which promoted advanced farming and agro-processing practices.

In year 2, the Trade Hub and the U.S. Commercial Services led a trade mission to South Africa in May for the NAMPO Harvest Day, consistently attracting more than 60,000 participants with 650 exhibitors from across the region. The U.S. pavilion featured more than 20 U.S. companies and 106 participants from Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana, and Malawi as exhibitors and participants in the trade exhibition.

The Trade Hub followed up on support provided to 106 private sector entities that attended NAMPO. As part of the follow up, two post-trade show training events were held in Malawi and Mozambique. As a result of NAMPO participation, the estimated values of transactions initiated during NAMPO per country were: Mozambique - US\$230,000; Malawi - US\$120,000; Botswana - US\$100,000; and Zambia - US\$320,000 (SATH Annual Report 2012).

In quarter 1 of year 4, the AVC team signed a grant agreement with Spintelligent and the Zambian National Farmers Union for the regional expansion of the Agritech Expo in Zambia. This grant adds a sustainable dimension to the technology and investment support that the Trade Hub has been providing to regional producers and service providers through subsidized attendance at NAMPO in South Africa. The technologies and services on exhibit in Zambia will be more targeted to emerging commercial farmer needs and resources than NAMPO. The latter is targeted to large scale, capital intensive farming in South Africa. Additionally, working through the Agritech Expo allows the project to expand its support to include regional small and medium enterprises (SME) exhibitors as well as regional buyers. The expositions enabled approximately 50 emerging commercial farmers in Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia to receive buyer-seller matching for investments in appropriate agricultural technology and to support approximately 10 regional SMEs focused on provision of technology and services aimed at emerging commercial farmers. The technology and services included inputs, extension services, storage and processing and a two-day program of workshops targeting approximately 5,000 farmers attending the Agritech Expo.

Case example 3 of Annex 2 entitled: “Bringing Better Seed to Malawi. *Quality seed improves drought resistance for Malawi’s crucial corn crop*” shows how technology transfer has benefitted smallholder farmers in improving their yields, food security and incomes.

I.3 Strengthened regional organizations in SADC

The numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures developed as a result of USG assistance was on target. According to Table 9 of Annex IV, the PMP the target number was 4, and the actual number of these instruments passed by a number of countries was 4. This was 100% achievement for the project. This achievement is significant because it had a positive impact on the roles AVC players would play in an enabling environment that stimulated agricultural activity at all levels along the value chain.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above findings, the evaluation team makes the following recommendations for the remaining 15 months of the project:

1. Broaden and deepen SATH support to private sector entities, especially those that support progressive policy advocacy or have the potential to do so. The Strategic Partnership Grants (SPGs) should be increased and negotiations with supported institutions fast-tracked to reach more beneficiaries. This will further spur private sector investments in the agro-processing subsector. Collaboration with business and advocacy groups may prove useful for leveraging their efforts to achieve meaningful change and progress.
2. While many associations in neighboring countries fear being dominated by South Africa, the SADC economic giant, business entities in countries like Zambia, Malawi, Tanzania, and Mozambique should work closely with SATH to foster closer relationships with South African entities that possess the potential for relevant technology transfer to these countries. Entities

like CASS and Capstone have openly expressed their willingness to unconditionally help in technology transfer to smaller business entities in the developing SADC countries.

3. Utilize documented scientific databases in decision making in the AVC development. SATH should work to rigorously prioritize high potential value chains within Trade Hub programs, through the application of Domestic Cost Resource (DRC) analysis and Cost-benefit Analysis (CBA) principles. According to ReSAKSS, a NEPAD/CAADP agriculture think tank, SATH programs should promote rigorous qualitative analytical approaches that focus on prospective market demand trends and competitiveness trends in competitor countries and regions. Through partnering with programs such as ReSAKSS, the SATH can develop strategic competitiveness enhancement plans at the subsector level and, where relevant, for bilateral program implementation.
4. Strengthen regional and national level agricultural association. Discussions with these key organizations indicate that SATH has not been effectively proactive in extending required support that would make these agriculture business associations play a meaningful advocacy role for promoting AVC development in the SADC. A number of these associations, though well intentioned, have yet to become self-sufficient and require measured support to jumpstart their operations. However, in order to attain such independence, a stronger case needs to be made by SATH that the associations offer services that can benefit members. There is an array of association advocacy capacity development interventions that could be supported by the trade hub in this effect.
5. SPS is a key impediment for enhancement of intra-regional trade. Without South Africa support towards improvement in such areas, AVC development will not go beyond individual country borders. The SATH should develop a more comprehensive approach to prioritizing and improving institutional compliance with SPS requirements for high potential commodities in major export markets: for example, expanding on its successful initiatives to achieve ground nut compliance with aflatoxin standards for the South Africa Market. This will probably require close collaboration with major bilateral programs and at an inter-agency level. This is especially critical from the perspective of accelerating agricultural exports.
6. Capacity building across the whole value chain should be sustained to enhance the chances for sustainability after completion of the current project. Evidence suggests that due to the high impact of training activities, stakeholders including farmers, farmer associations, private business entities and government institutions have positive perceptions of these programs and want them continued until a critical mass of trained personnel is reached for future sustainability in AVC development.
7. Future programming in this area should be framed in a manner which promotes and targets more systemic impact on agricultural exports and investment leveraging than has been envisaged under the current SATH project.

IR 1.3 INCREASED TRADE AND INVESTMENT IN THE TEXTILE AND APPAREL SECTOR

This activity was established as one of the five core activities under Modification 8, but had been subsumed under general foreign investment promotion prior to that time.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This IR also lacks a clearly defined results framework or statement. But, this IR posits three indicators for 2013. Two are clearly outcome indicators and the third one may be considered a low level outcome indicator. A more cohesive results framework might adopt the first indicator to track progress towards the IR and the two remaining indicators to track progress against sub-IRs.

The first targeted outcome indicator calls for \$3 million in the value of international and intraregional traded goods, included agricultural products, facilitated by the Trade Hub in 2013. The estimated value in the Southern Africa Trade Hub FY 2013 Annual Report is \$0, indicating either: (i) that the Trade Hub interventions had no measurable effect on the targeted indicator; or (ii) that an estimate was still not available at the time the report was published. The target for 2014 is \$9.8 million, but to date no data is available on trade generated. Data from Source Africa may contribute to this yearly total. The total target for the 5-year LOP target has been shifted downwards from \$50 million in 2011 to \$9.8 million in 2014 and \$3 million in 2013, which total approximately 1/3 of the original target. This brings into question whether the program as currently formulated is optimally structured to leverage transformational impact on the competitiveness of the textile and apparel sector of SADC countries.

The second outcome indicator is the value of investment facilitated by the Trade Hub. This indicator is targeted at \$540,000 and the estimated value was \$2,464,950. While the indicator appears favorable, it duplicates the same indicator presented in the previous IR. It should only be presented once. But not only that, if the indicator applies to agricultural loans, it is not an appropriate indicator for the textiles and apparel sector. In addition, the value of the targeted indicator appears trivial in relation to the magnitude of the sector being impacted.

The third indicator is the number of buyer/seller linkages established in export capacity as a result of USG assistance. Targets and actual values for this indicator exist for 2011 and 2012 as well as for 2013. In 2011 and 2012 the targets called for 50 linkages, but the actual values of 493 and 218 exceeded the targets. In 2013, the target rose to 375, while the actual value of 598 linkages again exceeded the targets.

More detailed analysis

The SATH countries have continued to increase exports of these products to the United States under AGOA. There has also been a substantial increase in intra-regional trade, particularly an increase of \$157 million in exports to South Africa from Swaziland and Lesotho. This has occurred almost entirely from other SACU members, as South African rules of origin requirements for materials present a great obstacle for exports from other non-SACU SADC members. Exports from SACU countries to South Africa appear to have increased by more than \$100 million over the past four years, though neither documentation nor the link to the Hub has been clearly established.

Neither SADC nor SACU appears able to provide up-to-date statistics on intra-regional trade. SACU's 2011 Trade report, the latest document available at the SACU office, did not even provide complete trade statistics for 2011 among the SACU countries. SADC's web page is even less useful for obtaining recent trade data among member countries.

Source Africa, a trade show promoted by the Hub, has completed its second year, and appears to be a sustainable operation without USAID support. But the team has little information regarding the results of the trade show. The Source Africa Trade Show in fact may be on a self-sustaining basis, and this argues well for the yearly event. The bigger opportunity, replacing imports from China into South Africa

with regional products is unlikely to have much impact on the non-SACU countries in SADC, as the South African rules of origin for textiles are a major impediment, preventing cotton spun outside the region from entering South Africa duty-free.

Source Africa, the flagship activity, made considerable progress during its second year of operation, with the number of exhibitors increasing from 170 last year to 217 in 2014 representing 18 countries. There were a total of 1,185 African Visitors. 138, 187, and 125 individuals attended the seminars on days one, two, and three, respectively. The Hub's primary contribution was in organizing Business-to-Business matchmaking events and meetings between exhibitors and international buyers. In the 2014 Source Africa show, an estimated \$1.1 million in business leads for deals were generated; 395 business matchmaking meetings were confirmed.

In the next project, an effort should be made to combine the efforts of the three hubs – and particularly the East Africa Hub – for a joint cotton, textile and apparel approach.

Based on site visits, and discussions with beneficiaries, the African Cotton & Textiles Industries Federation (ACTIF), Leading Textiles Exhibition (LTE), and SATH, LTE is doing a good job organizing and carrying out Source Africa. Participation in Source Africa is high and growing each year, but there is a lack of potential U.S. buyers. Beneficiary interviews indicate that small-scale artisanal designers and producers are less helped by Source Africa and are less likely to find it useful for their business moving forward than larger producers. A handful of designers selling product at the show were “successful” monetarily, but the bulk, who make a low volume of high-quality products are less likely to find a match at Source Africa, which seems to be dominated by large-scale manufacturing and high-volume producers. The small-scale producers with whom the team spoke from East Africa were unaware of the East African Trade Hub, so it is recommended that the Southern Africa Trade Hub and the East African Trade Hub coordinate more closely to increase impact of the Source Africa and Origin Africa shows.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Trade Hub support to establishing buyer/seller linkages at Source Africa should continue through the remainder of the project. The Trade Hub should focus its energy year-round, in advance of the show, in identifying potential buyers that match the demographic of the sellers/firms present at the show.
2. The project should continue to promote Source Africa through seminars during the exhibition. The event itself now appears sustainable, though Hub support for attracting additional international and regional buyers to the exhibition would be useful.
3. The Hub should work with other SADC members to address South Africa's protectionist rules of origin, which severely limit exports of textiles and apparel from all but the SACU countries. Work in this area should consider focusing on regional value chains, coordinating with the Hubs in East and West Africa to identify potential supply chains and partnerships. This might be part of an overall effort to facilitate intra- and interregional trade in SSA.
4. The Hub should consider outreach activities to garner more participation by U.S. buyers and sellers at Source Africa.
5. Collaboration with the East Africa Trade Hub (and its partner, ACTIF) should be considered, especially if East African firms are attending Source Africa and Southern African firms are attending Origin Africa. The Team has no strong opinion on whether the shows should be combined, but recommends that the Hubs consider the possibility of coordination regarding the timing of the shows, their targeting (Origin Africa might focus on one kind of producers and Source Africa target another), and ways to achieve self-sufficiency.

6. Future programming in this area should include a focus on combining the efforts of the three hubs – and particularly the East Africa Hub – for a joint cotton, textile and apparel approach. In addition much more ambitious export and investment leveraging targets should be formulated for any follow-on program.

IR I.4 STRENGTHENED REGULATORY CAPACITY FOR CLEAN ENERGY

This activity has introduced the concept of clean energy into the region, undertaking assessments of the potential for clean energy in Botswana, Namibia and Mauritius, and identifying regulatory issues that could promote or impede the use of renewable energy. Energy regulators have begun, with training from SATH, to analyze methods to incorporate production of clean energy into their systems, including tariff rates and other concerns. Current work in Swaziland shows great promise of reforming energy policy.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The only indicator used by the Hub to track progress of this IR is the number of person hours of training completed. They targeted 3,600 hours and achieved 1,656 (46%). This indicator is an output indicator that doesn't delve deeper into Trade Hub impact/results of the training. It affords little information regarding the results of the training. This impedes the ability of the Evaluation Team to make inferences regarding the results of the training. We only know that the Regional Energy Regulatory Association values the work of the Hub highly.

The Trade Hub expects to reach the overall (cumulative) goal of the IR, that is to provide 6400 person hours of training.

However, the focus of this IR is only remotely connected to the principal focus of the SATH. The only connection is via the regulation of clean energy, but much larger issues loom in the trade of services, in particular issues related to the overall harmonization of energy policies and regulations.

More detailed analysis

The Trade Hub assisted the Regional Electricity Regulatory Association (RERA) in developing a strategic plan to promote the regional adoption of a regulatory framework for the promotion of clean energy technologies. This includes the development of tariffs for the introduction of clean energy into power grids, and concepts that might promote private investment in clean energy.

The Hub provided training courses in clean energy regulation and finance, together providing training to more than 150 individuals from ten countries on these issues. More recently, the Hub hosted an energy capacity-building workshop in Johannesburg with participants from six SADC countries, focusing on the regulatory issues surrounding the introduction of clean energy.

The project has worked with USAID/Zambia to find ways to promote rural electrification in remote areas. In Swaziland, the project is working closely with the energy regulator to establish a new regime that will promote and regulate the use of clean energy.

While the IR may meet its objective and has a good working relationship with RERA, the value added of this activity in a project of this nature is questionable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This work should be continued through the remainder of the current project, but then spun off into a different vehicle, given its limited relationship to the rest of the work of the Hub. That subsequent effort might be linked to a standalone Power Africa project, and might be expanded to include emissions reductions in greenhouse gases.

If the IR is kept, work should be done to increase the utility of the indicators tracked. The number of persons trained as the only indicator is insufficient to target and measure project results. The Hub should spend time looking into behavior change and knowledge increases due to training (i.e. the third and fourth levels of Kirkpatrick's training impact model). At the very least, pre- and post-tests or observations to gauge knowledge should be completed.

IR 1.5 ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

The Trade Hub's Work Plans, Annual Reports, and other documentation subsume both gender and environmental concerns as activities within the Enabling Environment Component, and not as separate components of the Trade Hub program. Therefore, the team will address them within the Enabling Environment IR sections below for purposes of consistency. The team recommends that these two "activities" also be mainstreamed and/or integrated into the other IRs and viewed as cross-cutting themes.

The project provided investor roadmaps for Swaziland, Lesotho and Namibia, with varying levels of success. Whether the roadmaps should be considered trade facilitation or as improvements in the enabling environment can be debated. However, the Trade Hub includes the Investor Roadmaps as a primary activity within the EE component, and therefore the evaluation team has done so as well.

The project also provided a document to SACU on implementation of a Trade and Investment Development Cooperation Agreement (TIDCA) with the United States. The product was initially weak, but the revised version was well received in June 2014 by SACU. Activity under this IR was subsequently narrowed to a focus on gender and environmental compliance.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary goal was to improve the trade and investment climate, gender integration and environment compliance as enablers of competitiveness and sustainability. In general good progress is being made against the stated objectives, although some areas have shown some unexpected delays.

The primary indicator tracked for the completion of this IR is the number of policy reforms, regulations, and administrative procedures passed/approved to enhance sector governance and/or facilitate private sector participation and competitive markets. The Hub targeted three and achieved six (200%).

For gender specifically, the Hub targeted 40% participation of female participants in USG assisted programs, but only achieved 14%. Areas where progress has been made have been well received by stakeholders and counterparts.

The project has had some successes in improving the trade enabling environment in SADC and SACU. This is an area that suffered from the changes implemented in November 2012, with trade policy work being cut out of the objectives and IR's of the Hub. The EE team now has limited scope to underpin the work of SATH with sound research and networking activities. It is again worth underscoring that the

target for the key indicator in this area (number of reforms passed/approved) has been defined in a manner that seems quite modest.

The very high turn-over in COPs and other staff changes over the duration of the project contributed to delaying impact in several EE activities. This can also be due to the small staff complement of the EE team, which at present consists of only one person, who is also the team leader. The team leader has, however, has been in post for a number of years, having been with SATH from 2008-2010 and then again from July 2012 onwards. The limited staff on this team has in some cases resulted in poor communications with partners and stakeholder.

SATH would benefit from a gender official who can mainstream gender further and who could design training materials and toolkits to be used with all stakeholders.

More detailed analysis

Trade and investment climate

In this area the team achieved several noteworthy outputs. Under the US-SACU TIDCA of 2008, the SATH team in 2013 completed a large study for the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) on *Technical Capacity Constraints that Affect SACU Export Access into the U.S. Market under TIDCA and their Mitigation Measures*. The final product was delayed due to member state review and requests for additional inputs. The final presentation took place early in June 2014. The study will be used as a tool by the SACU member states to promote export products that show potential and market access in the US. The Lesotho Diagnostic Trade Integration Study (DTIS) was completed in February 2013. Work with the Botswana Investment and Trade Centre (BITC), which involved a stakeholder workshop, resulted in the points-based system for work permits to be amended, making it easier for foreign nationals to work in Botswana. KIIs indicate that this will have a positive impact on foreign investment. In addition, SATH developed a company registration checklist for BITC.

In collaboration with GIZ, the Enabling Environment team helped design a SADC FTA Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation System (MRE), that culminated in a validation workshop in April 2013. Following the workshop, the Guidelines and Procedures for the MREs, the core matrix, and the indicators for the SADC Protocol on Trade have been completed and accepted by the SADC Secretariat. The final implementation go ahead is expected from the Trade Negotiating Forum in July 2014, pending a determination of the Enforcement Mechanism. This MRE replaces the Trade Audits, which the SATH used to do on an annual basis. Although the trade audits were well received, the slow pace of FTA implementation does not warrant an annual audit. The move to the MRE is, therefore, considered a well thought out and welcome change.

The main focus of the EE team since November 2012 has been on Standards and the capacity of SADC member states to comply with WTO requirements. In Malawi the SATH has worked with the Malawi Bureau of Standards (MBS) in assisting them to become the National Enquiry Point, with the Ministry of Trade and Industry being the national Contact Point. Work in this regard included sensitization workshops and a U.S. tour to visit the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to learn first-hand from a functional Enquiry Point. The SATH still has to conclude the procurement process and sensitization workshops before MBS can open its doors as the Enquiry Point. This should happen in the latter half of 2014 and activities seem on track despite some procurement delays. In Zambia, the SATH worked with the Zambian Bureau of Standards and achieved similar outputs to those in Malawi. In Lesotho, the SATH has worked with the Lesotho Department of Standards and Quality Assurance (in the absence of a Standards Bureau) in order to

establish a National Standards Body. Lesotho officials joined in the trip to ANSI and NIST and planned how to establish National Enquiry and Contact Points. Equipment to establish an Enquiry Point was procured. The sensitization work still needs to be completed. Technical assistance and a workshop focused on developing a national food safety policy.

SADC Cooperation in Standardization (SADCSTAN) is the regional body mandated by the SADC Council of Ministers to coordinate standardization activities in the region. The EE team worked with SADCSTAN to develop a regional program. As a first step, SATH participated in the Annual Quality Awards Ceremony in March 2014 and briefed all the present standards authorities of SADC (12 out of 15 member states) on the proposed program to work with ANSI on standards harmonization in SADC. This work will now be taken forward. Assistance to SADCSTAN will result in improved harmonization of standards and technical regulations in the region.

The EE Team, alongside the Agriculture Value-Chain Team participated in a GIZ-hosted NTB workshop, during which they shared their work on standards and aflatoxin control in the region. Developing a tripartite-wide NTB/NTM reporting mechanism was discussed, as well as the potential host of the NTB monitoring mechanism in the absence of TradeMark Southern Africa. Both GIZ and SATH have expressed interest.

The project has contributed to the promotion of the region as an investment destination. It developed Investor Roadmaps for Swaziland, Lesotho and Namibia, with different responses and uptake. The Swaziland Roadmap was launched by the King at a high-profile function and the subsequent success of the roadmap reflects this. An audit done of the impact of the Swaziland Investor Roadmap in 2013 showed that several significant changes were made in Swaziland in order to attract investors. These include: the introduction of an on-line company search; reducing the time needed to incorporate a company to three days; and cutting the time taken to acquire work and residence permits to seven days from 2; and introducing a five-year work and residence permit for investors. In addition, trade licenses are now issued in three days instead of seven; health inspection reports (required for getting a trade license) are now issued within 48 hours; Swaziland Revenue Authority introduced an on-line tax filing system, improving tax compliance; and Parliament approved a number of policies including the Swaziland Investment Policy and the Public-Private Partnership Policy.

In Namibia, the Roadmap has not been successful, as the responsible official has taken a two year sabbatical leave of absence and has not delegated the Roadmap's implementation.

In Lesotho, changes in the investment climate have been attributed to the Roadmap, after an audit was done in August 2013. These improvements include: turnaround time for issuance of entry visas reduced to one day, *subject to security/police clearance*, with residence permits also issued within one day; registering a company reduced to three days; trade licenses issued in one day; cost of single and multiple-entry visas reduced as of end of September 2013; the development of an Immigration Integrated Program aimed at issuing national identity cards, electronic national passports and e-borders which will facilitate access to credit; development of an integrated tax administration program to make tax compliance manageable, including online tax filing and e-payment systems. Significant challenges remain, with police clearance being identified as a key delaying factor to issuing resident permits. It is unclear how SATH can further contribute to ensure the effective implementation of the Investor Roadmap. As in other areas of intervention, SATH needs an independent champion to drive the implementation of interventions as SATH has no embedded technical advisor, nor can it be involved for a prolonged period of time.

Gender

The project has made some progress towards strengthened gender integration in all spheres of SATH's intervention areas. However, final staff training and development of a gender library and tools remain to be done by a recently employed gender official. Gender awareness has been promoted through several workshops for SATH staff. The SPG processes were reviewed in order to ensure that all proposals considered for grants comply with a gender sensitive approach. In July/August 2013, a comprehensive gender audit was done of all SATH's intervention areas. It was found that improvements had been made in mainstreaming gender issues into all aspects of SATH's work, with a third of SATH's staff trained on gender issues. It was, however, found that SATH would benefit from a gender official who can mainstream gender further and who can design manuals and training materials to be used with all stakeholders. The post was only filled after ten months. Work is now finally expected. At present it should be noted that none of the senior staff members and only one project staff member are female. More women are employed at the administrative level. Eleven of the thirty staff that left the SATH over life of the project are women.

In order to be most effective, gender should correspond to individual IR teams, bolstered by the coordination of a full-time gender advisor who is tasked with ensuring technical teams are integrating gender considerations (based on analyses) into project design and activity implementation. Although more relevant for some activities than others, this is crucial in agriculture, textiles and apparel, and in trade facilitation work that touches on cross-border agricultural trade (both informal and formal).

In this way, stronger policy work to underpin the other result area's interventions could be encouraged. Working with existing research and consulting outfits in the region, including Trade Law Centre (TRALAC), South African Institute for International Affairs (SAIIA), Institute for Global Dialogue (IGD), Imani Development and others would be advisable. SATH could coordinate their inputs via a Research Support Workshop and some necessary funding. The Gender Officer should look strongly into expanding training into all the partner organisations, especially in projects in which rural agriculture and financing is of importance.

Enabling Environment

The EE team has continued to review all grant proposals for environmental compliance, which is essentially an administrative task. The Environment Advisor has been reviewing grant proposals in terms of environment compliance and has streamlined the process in order to ensure that this activity comes at the start of the proposal process. SATH's work in general has also been reviewed in order to ensure environmental compliance. Several training activities were completed.

The key technical areas of the EE work --i.e. the work on standards in the region and the investment promotion work as well as the limited trade enabling environment work -- could be taken up within the other key IRs of the SATH. Environmental compliance can be viewed as largely an administrative function. Compliance should be ensured by the administrative and management teams. The EE Team has produced several Roadmaps in Investment and Action Plans in Trade Facilitation that government counterparts can continue to implement without SATH assistance. SATH should actively seek out champions amongst stakeholders that can continue to push for its implementation and for audits against implementation.

The EE team has further equipped, or is expected to still equip, the Standards Authorities in Malawi, Lesotho and Zambia to become the National Enquiry Points. The staff has been trained and software loaded on procured computers. This seems to be a good and sustainable model for the Enquiry Points.

There should, however, be a clearly articulated exit strategy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

If continued on the current very limited basis, where gender and environment are the principal concerns and staffed by only one person, we recommend that EE is eliminated as a separate activity. Gender and environmental compliance are both cross-cutting sectors that do not belong in the enabling environment IR. We recommend that the gender and environmental compliance activities and management be mainstreamed and effectively integrated into the other activities of the project. Gender must be more than just collecting sex-disaggregated data (counting males and females in training) and gender sensitization training. A Gender Advisor or Gender Technical Lead should be a full-time part of project staff, tasked with working with each of the IR teams to integrate gender considerations, conduct analyses, and tailor activities accordingly in the project design phase. S/he should work with the Technical Leads of each IR to ensure adequate treatment of gender differentiation in the activities they undertake.

The Environmental Compliance function should be should be fully incorporated into the responsibilities of each Team Leader to ensure this key aspect is adequately addressed, including in the Strategic Partnership Grants.

Still, the alternative to subsuming the EE's IR activities into other IRs is to develop a much more robust enabling environment component –as with the previous iteration of the Trade Hub (2010-2012)—tasked with undertaking analysis in key targeted areas to support a more *realistically transformational* Trade Hub. With limited resources, analyses on potential or real impact should be strategic and directly supportive of Trade Hub activity design.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK



MID-TERM PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SOUTHERN AFRICA TRADE AND COMPETITIVENESS HUB REGIONAL PROJECT IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Description of the Project to be evaluated

Project name: Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Project

Cooperative Agreement No.: 674-C-00-10-00075-00

Project Dates: September 2010 – September 2015

Implementing Organization: AECOM

Background

The USAID Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Program (the Trade Hub) project implemented by AECOM commenced in September, 2010. The Trade Hub's overarching goal was originally: Increased International Competitiveness, Intra-Regional Trade, and Food Security in the SADC Region. This objective was to be accomplished through the advancement of the regional integration agenda and increased trade capacity of regional value chains in selected sectors. The delivery of targeted technical assistance was expected to help the SADC region, including public sector, the private sector, and civil society organizations, to realize the advantages of greater regional and global trade linkages and export-oriented business development through assistance in eight results areas:

1. Enhanced Trade Liberalization
2. Improved Trade Facilitation in Transit, Customs, and Other Areas
3. Alignment of Regional Agricultural and Other Standards with International Standards
4. Strengthened Regional Capacity for Energy Sector Planning and Cooperation
5. New Trade Linkages Established and Greater Competitiveness in Staple Foods and Other Strategic Value Chains
6. Enhanced Private Sector Capacity to Comply with Regional and International Market Standards, Including Agricultural Standards
7. Increased Use and Availability of Financial Products and Services for Trade and Investment
8. Increased Use and Availability of Trade-Related Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Products

The Trade Hub was initially designed to take an integrated approach to two high-level United States Government (USG) priorities: the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative (GHFSI), which became the Feed the Future (FTF) program and the African Growth and Competitiveness Initiative (AGCI). The AGCI expired in September 2010 and was replaced by the African Competitiveness and Trade

Expansion Initiative (ACTE) which is building trade capacity across sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). ACTE was launched at the AGOA Forum in Lusaka, Zambia in June 2011. The Trade Hub was also designed to act as one of three USG Trade Hubs in Sub-Saharan Africa to increase exports to the U.S. under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) and to provide “Aid-for-Trade” assistance as mandated by USG commitments under the Doha round of negotiations at the World Trade Organization. The total ceiling on the Trade Hub contract including one option year is \$82,610,195. However, the actual obligations during the evaluation period (Oct. 2011 - Sep. 2013) were \$31,714,389 of which \$ 1.8 million is bi-lateral South Africa FTF funds earmarked for grants under contract, or approximately \$10 million per year. The Trade Hub base contract end date is September 2014 with the option year running to September 2015.

The Trade Hub objectives were pursued through the following objectives and intermediate results:

Objective 1: Advancement of the Regional Integration Agenda

IR 1.1: Enhanced Trade Liberalization

Sub-IR 1.1.1: Effective Implementation of the SADC FTA

Sub-IR 1.1.2: Successful Implementation of the Tripartite Summit Agreement

Sub-IR 1.1.3: Increased Capacity of Member States to Engage in Trade Negotiations and Implement Trade Agreements

IR 1.2: Improved Trade Facilitation in Transit, Customs, and Other Areas

Sub-IR 1.2.1: Improved Performance of Trade Corridors and Transit Systems

Sub-IR 1.2.2: Streamlined Customs Procedures

Sub-IR 1.2.3: Increased Investment through Improved Policies and Promotion Efforts

Sub-IR 1.2.4: Greater Trade in Services through Improved Policies

IR 1.3: Alignment of Regional Agricultural and Other Standards with International Standards

IR 1.4: Strengthened Regional Capacity for Energy Sector Planning and Cooperation

Objective 2: Increased Trade Capacity of Regional Value Chains

IR 2.1: New Trade Linkages Established and Greater Competitiveness in Staple Foods and Other Strategic Value Chains

IR 2.2: Enhanced Private Sector Capacity to Comply with Regional and International Market Standards, Including Agricultural Standards

IR 2.3: Increased Use and Availability of Financial Products and Services for Trade and Investment

IR 2.4: Increased Use and Availability of Trade-Related ICT Products

As a result of the significantly lower funding levels (\$10 million per year rather than \$16 million per year), and more particularly because of poor performance, in Nov. 2012, the project was reduced to one objective with 5 IRs, as follows:

Technical Focus: Advancement of the Regional Trade, Investment, & Integration Agenda

IR 1.1: Improved Trade Facilitation

IR 1.2: Greater Competitiveness in Agricultural Value Chains

IR 1.3: Increased Trade & Investment in the Textiles and Apparel Sector

IR 1.4: Strengthened Regulatory Capacity for the Clean Energy Sector

IR 1.5: A Better Enabling Environment

In addition, the region was re-defined, changing from the 15 countries of Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) region to Southern Africa as defined by USAID/AFR which, in practical terms, includes the five Southern Africa Customs Union countries (Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Lesotho) and the three FTF focus countries (Mozambique, Malawi and Zambia). The project

beneficiaries were broadened to include not only SADC but also member state governments and the private sector. The explanation and justification for these changes are detailed in the revised SOW.

Also at this time, the contractor, AECOM, changed its Chief of Party and other key personnel. As a result of reducing the number of components, the number of countries, expanding the beneficiaries, and key personnel changes, the Trade Hub began to dramatically improve its performance.

Project design and implementation approaches/arrangements and key results and associated indicators

Purpose and Audience

This final evaluation report produced by the successful offer shall: 1) use evidence to document the degree to which USAID-funded Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Project through AECOM worked or did not work; 2) Identify best practices, lessons learned, and areas of improvement; and 3) provide recommendations to inform USAID's follow-on, and assess what will be required to achieve existing strategic goals and results. The evaluation will address the following key questions within three key themes related to project's results, management, and promising practices:

Relevance: To what extent is the project likely to be successful in achieving results toward its stated objectives? How does the project address key areas of integration as prioritized by SADC and SACU?

Management: To what extent has the management structure as implemented supported or hindered performance? What are the factors influencing the achievement and non-achievement of the objectives?

Promising Practices: Based on the findings and analysis of the preceding questions, what are the key strategic, programmatic, technical, and managerial features of the project that should be taken into account when implementing a new Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Project in the region?

Sustainability: What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure sustainability of the project achievements and what is the potential for sustaining these benefits in the medium to long term?

Evaluation Design and Methodology:

The evaluation team will use both qualitative and quantitative research methods and tools (e.g. review of logistical efficiency project performance monitoring data such as customs streamlining key "Doing Business" data, design and application impact and outcome assessment questionnaires) that are appropriate for the scope of the project, resources, and audience. A non-experimental evaluation design is preferred for the evaluation. Prior to commencement of the study, the Evaluation Team leader will finalize and submit the evaluation methodology for approval to the COR of this evaluation contract.

Both primary and secondary qualitative and quantitative data will be collected and analyzed for this evaluation. Methodological triangulation will be used to verify the quality of the data and evidence. An illustrative set of possible data collection methods includes the following:

Secondary data collection

A desk review of key relevant documents (see list below) will be completed upon transfer of key documents to the contractor. This will provide the foundation of the final Evaluation Methodology and the initial findings presented in the Team Planning Meeting prior to field work. A Desk Review instrument to codify and organize data from the document review for analysis as per answering the evaluation questions will be utilized. For example, review of information from Joint Border Posts will be undertaken to understand the impacts of the project on reduction in trade barriers. Content analysis of all available secondary data relevant to the evaluation will be undertaken. (See Key Documents list.)

Primary data collection

The evaluation team will conduct interviews (both key informant and individual) and group discussions with staff from the Trade Hub, USAID/Southern Africa, bilateral USAID Missions (particularly EG Officers), other donors and development partners, customs and trade officials, regional trade and transit associations, public and private sector representatives, civil society, commodity exchanges, and other African organizations receiving technical assistance and/or funding from the Trade Hub. Field visits will be made to the Trade Hub and a sample of project sites in the region that will be detailed in the implementation plan along with the appropriate sampling plan for both quantitative and qualitative data collection. These will be finalized once the key list of documents and relevant project information is transferred to the contractor. The implementation plan will be submitted to USAID COR for approval prior to commencement of field work.

Data Analysis Methods

The Evaluation Team will develop a plan for analyzing and triangulating data from various sources to generate credible evidence to address the evaluation questions. Gender will be viewed as a cross-cutting theme to be explored where appropriate throughout answering the evaluation questions. The evaluation team is expected to be responsive to USAID's dual expectations for treating gender appropriately: (a) gathering sex disaggregated data and, (b) identifying gender differential participation in/benefits from aspects of the program where differences on this basis are possible. The data analysis methods will be relevant to the type of data collected and specific to each of the evaluation questions. The implementation plan will discuss potential strengths and limitations of data collection and data analysis methodologies and propose measures for overcoming any limitations.

The implementation plan will be summarized using the matrix shown below:

Evaluation Questions	Indicators to be measured	Data Collection Method	Data Source	Sampling or Selection criteria	Data Analysis Method (s)
Relevance: To what extent is the project likely to be successful in achieving results toward its stated objectives? How does the project address key areas of integration as prioritized by SADC and SACU?					
Management: To what extent has the management structure as implemented supported or hindered performance? What are the factors influencing the achievement and non-achievement of the objectives?					
Promising Practices: Based on the findings and analysis of the preceding questions, what are the key strategic, programmatic, technical, and					

managerial features of the project that should be taken into account when implementing a new Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Project in the region?					
Sustainability: What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure sustainability of the project achievements and what is the potential for sustaining these benefits in the medium to long term.					

Deliverables and Timeline:

Detailed Deliverables/Output Schedule	Due Date
<p><u>Desk Review Report</u> This written review of documentation shared with or otherwise gathered by the evaluation team during their preparation time will summarize existing information on an evaluation question by evaluation question basis, indicating what is already available/known that can be used to answer each question and what information gaps remain with respect to answering each question that the team will need to fill through its field work. <u>A matrix is an appropriate structure for this report</u> (see Desk Review Matrix template in the Dropbox Templates folder). This document will be provided to evaluation team members at the start of the evaluation period and is to be completed, in draft, prior to the start of the Team Planning Meeting (TPM) o/a May 19. The final will be submitted within two days by 5/21/14</p>	<p><i>Draft:</i> 5/19/14</p> <p><i>Final:</i> 5/21/14</p>
<p><u>Team Planning Meeting</u> A Team Planning meeting is scheduled for 5/19 or 5/20 to introduce the evaluation team, discuss logistics, administrative details, and begin to finalize evaluation methodology for the Implementation Plan. The Team Leader will also present preliminary findings by evaluation question based on the desk review to identify remaining gaps to be filled in the field.</p>	<p>5/19/14 or 5/20/14</p>
<p><u>Detailed Evaluation Design Report (Implementation Plan)</u> This document is the core deliverable from the TPM for the evaluation and will include the overall design, specific methods for data collection and analysis the team will use to address the evaluation questions (which should be summarized in a Getting to Answers matrix – template attached). This report must include the team’s schedule/timeline, locations, types of interviewees/sample, and other evaluation design features, along with copies of every data collection instrument the team intends to use (see the SOW Section on Deliverables for a more detailed description of expectations). A written copy of this report is due to MSTAS on 5/28/14 (a template will be provided). The Evaluation Team will meet for the first time in country on 5/30/14 and finalize the Implementation Plan based on the TPM. A final draft of the report is due to USAID on 5/31/14, to be discussed during the first meeting with USAID on 6/2/14.</p>	<p><i>Draft:</i> 5/24/14</p> <p><i>Final:</i> 5/28/14</p>
<p><u>Weekly Status Reports</u> The focus and structure of these brief reports will be on progress toward and impediments to answering each evaluation question. Evidence already assembled and issues the team is facing</p>	<p>6/6/14</p> <p>6/13/14</p>

<p>are to be presented concisely on a question by question basis. Weekly reports will also include updates on the extent to which team activities/progress is in line with, or differs from the task schedule in the approved Work Plan and detailed evaluation design. As an annex to the weekly report the team should also include their progress on the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (FCR) chart. In addition to submitted reports, the team may also be asked to participate in follow-up phone calls or meetings to discuss weekly report. An in-person weekly status report will occur once the Team Leader has arrived back from the Field o/a 6/23/14</p>	6/23/14
<p><u>Preliminary Draft Evaluation Report</u> A draft report, following USAID’s evaluation report template (and based on the outline in Section 14 of the SOW and USAID How To guidance) and a power point version for the Debriefing will be submitted to MSTAS team by COB (SSA time) June 14th. Once approved, this will be shared with USAID/SA’s Regional Economic Growth Office (REGO) by COB on 6/16/14. The Team Leader and other report authors are strongly encouraged to use the evaluation report checklist provided in the TPM (and the Dropbox Templates folder) to review the quality of their report prior to submission. The written report should clearly describe findings, conclusions, and recommendations, fully supported by evidence. Drafts of all other associated products are also required, including focus group transcripts and other data sets as required. Annexes to the evaluation report should include all annexes identified in USAID’s template. All quantitative and qualitative data sets, code books, and transcripts from qualitative data collection exercises such as focus groups are mandatory elements of the team’s draft report submission.</p>	6/16/14
<p><u>Post Field Work Analysis Presentation on Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations</u> This product builds on progress on evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations submitted in Weekly Status Reports and benefits from the team’s post-field work analysis of the data it gathered from existing documentation and the implementation of its planned data collection and analysis methods. This product is to be structured as a PowerPoint presentation as an outline of the team’s answers to each evaluation question, covering Findings on a question by question basis and Conclusions and Recommendations linked to specific questions and/or flowing from findings about several evaluation questions. An oral presentation of the team’s written “outline” summary of the above is also required and will be delivered to USAID (as determined in the TPM). The MSTAS/USAID review of the team’s “outline” of answers to each evaluation question plus conclusions and recommendations will be on the adequacy of the evidence presented and any data gaps the team may need to fill before drafting its report. The team will also present study limitations and any adjustments to what was originally anticipated. A workshop format for this presentation is envisioned, allowing for discussion around key points and highlighting any gaps in evidence or logic. Gaps in data adequacy identified during this briefing may result in further data collection efforts by the team to ensure that all evaluation questions are fully addressed. By its nature the presentation required by this deliverable should serve as the detailed substantive outline for Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations in the draft evaluation the team produces. Completion of this step, including any remedial data collection MSTAS and USAID request, is required before drafting of those sections of the evaluation report commences.</p>	6/18/14
<p><u>Draft Evaluation Report</u> A second draft evaluation report is due within ten days of the debriefing after the Team Leader has departed for the US. USAID will provide comments on the draft report within two weeks of submission.</p>	6/30/2014
<p><u>Final Evaluation Report</u> Based on the provisions of the USAID evaluation policy, a formal and final evaluation report shall be presented to USAID/SA and USAID/AFR/SD. The final report will incorporate the team</p>	o/a 7/24/14

<p>responses to Mission’s comments and suggestions no later than ten days after USAID/SA provides written comments on the team’s draft evaluation report (see above). The Evaluation Report should be formatted in accordance with USAID’s Evaluation Report Template and branding guidelines including USAID’s How to Guide for Preparing Evaluation Reports. The format will include an executive summary, table of contents, list of acronyms, evaluation design and methodology, findings, conclusions, and recommendations and lessons learned. The report will be submitted in English, in both electronic and three bound hard copies. The report must not be more than 40 pages excluding annexes. The report will be disseminated within USAID. A brief summary of this report (the popular version), not exceeding 15 pages, excluding any potentially procurement-sensitive information will be submitted (also electronically, in English) for dissemination among implementing partners and stakeholders. The report should meet standards out-lined in the evaluation policy (see check list attached).The report will also be submitted to the DEC within 10 days of USAID approval of the Final Report. In addition, all data collected by the evaluation shall be provided to USAID in an electronic file in an easily readable format; organized and fully documented for use by those not fully familiar with the project or the evaluation.</p> <p>Teams should self-score the final report against the evaluation report checklist before submitting it to MSTAS.</p>	
--	--

Evaluation Team Composition:

The evaluation team will be composed of a Team Leader (TL) and three local experts from the region. All team members must have relevant prior experience in Africa, familiarity with USAID’s objectives, approaches, and operations and prior evaluation/assessment experience. In addition, individual team members should have the technical qualifications identified for their respective positions.

The TL is ultimately responsible for the overall management of the evaluation team and the completion of all deliverables in accordance with the deliverable schedule. In addition, TL is responsible for coordinating evaluation activities and ensuring the production and completion of an evaluation report in conformance with this scope of work, USAID evaluation policy (specifically Appendix I Criteria, Annex I), and timelines. The TL will also ensure high quality analysis, writing quality, and report integration.

The TL should be an international experienced evaluation expert, with a documented track record of 10 years’ experience in the same. The TL should be familiar with trade and integration issues in Southern Africa and should have substantial experience working with regional economic communities, particularly in Africa.

The other three local experts will include a trade and integration specialist, a customs and trade facilitation specialist, and an agricultural economist, with the potential addition of a research assistant. The three members of the team should be African professionals conversant with regional trade, transit and agriculture issues in eastern and/or southern Africa. In addition, individual team members should have a minimum of a master’s degree in their technical areas of specialization and at least eight years of working experience.

Team Leader: Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Specialist (Key Personnel)

A minimum of a Master’s degree in social sciences, applied economics, statistics or any closely related field.

At least 10 years’ experience working in developing countries in evaluation of donor funded development programs.

Demonstrated knowledge of the methodologies, design, and evaluation process for conducting USAID

mid-term project evaluations in the agribusiness sector.
Excellent understanding of current USAID Evaluation policy
Excellent report writing skills (evidence of prior evaluation reports or published work is a plus)
A 5/5/5 level of English proficiency is required.

Agricultural Economist/Specialist in agricultural value chains and agricultural trade (Key Personnel)

A minimum of a Master's degree or higher in agricultural economics or other relevant field.
At least 8 years' experience working with value chain and agribusiness programs, preferably in Southern and/or Eastern Africa.
Demonstrated skills in critical thinking and analysis, as well as, written and verbal communications skills.
Familiarity with CAADP and USAID's Feed the Future programs
Knowledge of and experience with project design, management & evaluation processes of similar scope and complexity.
A 5/5/5 level of proficiency in English is required

Trade and Integration Expert

Must have a minimum of Master's Degree in trade, investments, economics, or any other closely related field of study. Good knowledge in applied economic analysis.
At least 8 years' experience in international trade
Sound knowledge of regional integration particularly in African Regional Economic Communities.
Familiarity with the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC), the Southern Africa Customs Union (SACU), the East Africa Community (EAC) and the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)
Experience in the evaluation of donor funded projects in Africa.
Sound knowledge of USAID programs and an understanding of the evaluation policy.
Excellent analytical and report writing skills
A 5/5/5 level of proficiency in English is required

Customs and Trade Facilitation Advisor

Must have a minimum of Master's Degree in economics, business management, engineering, or a closely related field;
At least 8 years' experience in trade facilitation and transport at the national, regional and/or international level, preferably in Southern and/or Eastern Africa.
A sound knowledge of and experience with modern trade facilitation tools (coordinated border management, customs connectivity, Single Windows, one-stop border posts, etc.)
Experience in transport planning, policy and customs reform, demonstrated ability to evaluate development reforms in a developing country context;
Experience in customs operations, trade policy and trade facilitation at national, Southern African regional and international levels.
Familiarity with World Trade Organization (WTO) and World Customs Organization (WCO) Conventions on customs and trade facilitation, as well as efforts to harmonize customs and transit procedures in Southern Africa.
Must have participated in evaluation of donor funded development projects, preferable in Africa
Sound knowledge of USAID programs and an understanding of the evaluation policy.
Excellent analytical and report writing skills
A 5/5/5 level of proficiency in English is required

Key Documents:

The Trade Hub contract, including all modifications

The Trade Hub M&E Plan and Indicator Table, including any DQAs completed
 Summarized list of the Trade Hub targets by intervention area (extracted directly from the contract)
 All Contractor Performance Assessment Reports
 The Trade Hub First, Second, and Third Year Work Plan
 The Trade Hub Value Chain Analysis Report
 USAID/Southern Africa Annual Reports (PPR)
 Trade Hub Annual Reports for 2012 and 2013
 USAID/Southern Africa Feed the Future Strategy
 Summary of the SADC *Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan*
 The SADC Trade, Industry, Finance and Investment Trade Thematic Group Strategy
 USAID evaluation policy
 A host of studies already undertaken by the Trade Hub project

Scheduling and Logistics

Work is to be carried out over a period of approximately fourteen weeks beginning in the middle of May 2014 with field work in May/June, continuing through to the last week of July with the submission of the Final Evaluation Report. Actual LOE per team member will constitute 6-8 weeks. Elapsed time for the evaluation is fourteen including periods for USAID comment on the draft and final report. Final evaluation timeline will be determined with the USAID.

Illustrative LOE

Position	Desk Review	TPM	Travel	Field Work	Draft Report	Final Report	Total
Team Leader: M&E Specialist	5	1	3	18	6	5	38
Agricultural Economist /Specialist	3	1	2	18	5	1	30
Trade and Integration Expert	3	1	2	18	5	1	30
Customs and Trade Facilitation Advisor	3	1	2	18	5	1	30
Total LOE	14	4	9	72	21	8	128

Evaluation Logistics and Management

Evaluation Assumptions:

One week *desk review* starting week of May 12-19.

TPM with TL in person and Team Members on Skype on May 19 and 20

(1-2 half days to finalize methodology and present initial findings for the desk review against the Evaluation questions.

- *Field work* will begin in country the week of the 26th (o/a May 28.) Country selection will be finalized as the methodology develops. We have estimated four countries including Botswana and South Africa. It's unclear whether team will travel to Gaborone to the Trade Hub first or to Pretoria to the USAID/Southern Africa Mission for initial meetings.
- Team Leader will *travel* o/a May 28, arrive May 29 and have initial meetings with the Team on May 30 and 31. The Inception Report will be finalized in person with the Team and submitted to USAID on 5/31/14 for discussion and approval during the first meeting on 6/2/14.
- *Data Collection and Analysis* will begin week of June 2 and continue for three weeks.
- *The team will go to Johannesburg/Pretoria first on 5/30.*

- They will travel to Botswana o/a 6/5 until 6/11.
- From there the team will visit one additional country (Zambia/Mozambique/Namibia/Lesotho/Swaziland) o/a 6/11 until 6/15.
- The team will travel back to South Africa on 6/15 for the debriefing and final meetings and leave for home bases on 6/19.
- Preliminary draft report will be submitted to USAID o/a June 16.
- Debrief will occur o/a June 18.
- Team Leader will leave on June 19, arriving to DC on June 20.
- Team Leader will have a debriefing with MSTAS on June 23rd.
- They will submit the *Draft Evaluation Report* taking into consideration the Debriefing within 10 days, by o/a June 30.
- USAID will provide comments within two weeks by o/a July 14.
- The Team will submit the *Final Evaluation Report* within ten days, by o/a July 24.

Evaluation Activity	Total LOE	TL	T/I	Ag.	Cust	Start Date	End/Due Date	May			June				July					
								3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4		
Pre-Field Work																				
Desk Review	14	5	3	3	3	5/12/2014	5/18/2014													
TPM	4	1	1	1	1	5/19/2014	5/20/2014													
Travel	4.5	1.5	1	1	1	5/28/2014	5/29/2014													
Field Work***	72	18	18	18	18	5/30/2014	6/19/2014													
<i>South Africa</i>						5/30/2014	6/5/2014													
<i>Botswana</i>	0					6/5/2014	6/11/2014													
<i>Zambia</i>	0					6/11/2014	6/15/2014													
<i>South Africa</i>	0					6/15/2014	6/19/2014													
Preliminary draft evaluation report	0						6/16/2014													
Debriefing	0						6/18/2014													
Travel	4.5	1.5	1	1	1	6/19/2014	6/20/2014													
Draft Evaluation Report	21	6	5	5	5	6/20/2014	6/30/2014													
USAID provide comments							7/14/2014													
Final Evaluation Report	8	5	1	1	1		7/24/2014													
TOTAL LOE	128	38	30	30	30															

***Country selection is for illustrative purposes only at this time. Final selection will be made during the first week.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Technical Approach

Good background knowledge of the major regional trade issues.

The evaluation team must demonstrate an understanding of the market integration issues in Southern Africa.

The evaluation team must have clear knowledge of current trends in regional policy harmonization and cross border trade in food staples in the region.

Clarity and Readability of the proposal.

The technical proposal should be well documented, easy to read proposal, comprehensive and devoid of grammatical errors.

Well defined proposed methodology for the evaluation.

The evaluation team should propose a scientifically acceptable evaluation method, specifying the type of stakeholders to be interviewed, evaluation tools to be used, data management and analysis procedures. A clear link must be established between how the proposed method will answer specific evaluation questions.

Clearly outlined plan for the evaluation

A well laid plan for execution of the assignment showing how and when each of the proposed tasks will be undertaken.

Key Personnel

Team Leader: Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Specialist

A minimum of a Master's degree in social sciences, applied economics, statistics or any closely related field.

At least 10 years' experience working in developing countries in evaluation of donor funded development programs.

Demonstrated knowledge of the methodologies, design, and evaluation process for conducting USAID mid-term project evaluations in the agribusiness sector.

Excellent understanding of current USAID Evaluation policy

Excellent report writing skills (evidence of prior evaluation reports or published work is a plus)

A 5/5/5 level of English proficiency is required.

Agricultural Economist/Specialist in agricultural value chains and agricultural trade

A minimum of a Master's degree or higher in agricultural economics or other relevant field.

At least 8 years' experience working with value chain and agribusiness programs, preferably in Southern and/or Eastern Africa.

Demonstrated skills in critical thinking and analysis, as well as, written and verbal communications skills.

Familiarity with CAADP and USAID's Feed the Future programs

Knowledge of and experience with project design, management & evaluation processes of similar scope and complexity.

A 5/5/5 level of proficiency in English is required

Past Experience

Evidence of past experience of the key personnel is required.

See CVs

ANNEX II: EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

SUMMARY

The MSTAS team of evaluation consultants consisted of five members, each with expertise in one or more of the focus activities of the Hub: James Fox, Team leader; Stephanie Monschein, Evaluation Specialist; Talitha Bertelsmann-Scott, Trade and Integration Expert; Felix M'mboyi, Agricultural Economist; and David Adolwa, Customs and Trade Facilitation Expert. Team members reviewed project documents and other relevant materials during the latter part of May, 2014, and met in Pretoria on May 29 to finalize the details of the evaluation work plan.

The five members of the primary evaluation team visited X beneficiaries from all project IRs, including the Ministries of Trade and Industry, Revenue Authorities, Bureaus of Standard, and grant recipients to conduct key informant interviews (KIIs) meeting a total of 51 subjects. These interviews were selected based upon KII availability during the evaluation schedule, with a sampling of interviews in Zambia, Namibia, South Africa, Malawi, and Botswana representing all five Intermediate Results. The Team also visited the AECOM SATH office, USAID/Southern Africa. A list of all sites visited and individuals interviewed is contained in Annex VII.

Before fieldwork began, the Evaluation Team had meetings with AECOM's SATH team, AECOM Home Office and USAID representatives in Botswana and Pretoria to shed light on the project and to review the evaluation protocols. Based on these briefings and on a review of project documents, the Evaluation Team finalized the Evaluation work plan originally submitted to USAID prior to arriving in country, and data collection instruments for interviews designed to provide answers to the evaluation questions in the SOW.

Data Collection approaches engaged by the team to respond to the evaluation questions included the following:

- **Desk Review.** The Evaluation Team reviewed project documents sent by AECOM and by USAID, including but not limited to, the SOW and contract, RFP, work plans, internal monitoring reports and evaluations, PMP, quarterly and other periodic reports, related USAID documents, and technical reports completed by the Hub. It also reviewed other donor and institutional reports relevant to the project.
- **Beneficiary and Grantee Site Visits and Observations.** The team visited a sampling of Strategic Partnership Grantees in Malawi, South Africa, and Zambia.
- **Source Africa Site and Event Observations.** Two team members attended the Source Africa event, including panels, event set up, and side-events during which they interviewed beneficiaries, speakers, and organizers, as well
- **SATH Beneficiary Interviews**
- **AECOM Visit**
- **USAID/Pretoria Visit**
- **Trade statistics**

Analysis Methods. The data collected for this report were analyzed through the following methods:

- **Planned/Actual Comparisons.** Comparisons have been made between program descriptions, work plans, PMP targets and periodic performance data to inform examination of SATH performance relative to overall project compliance and to timely fulfillment of proposed activities.
- **Pattern/Content Analysis.** Qualitative data has been examined for patterns and comparisons

made between respondents, institutional levels and sites, and generalizations and conclusions drawn.

- **Trend Analysis.** Patterns have been identified in the data in the way in which change happened over time and with the maturation and development of the project.
- **Response Convergence/Divergence Analysis.** Where the team noted significant divergence in responses, follow-up interviews by phone and email were done to explain divergence in the reporting of facts, perceptions or opinions.
- **Mixed Methods Integration/Findings Synthesis.** Using a mixed methods approach, data from various methods have been integrated to arrive at findings. This synthesis process involved convergence/ divergence analysis for examining data coming from different methods and levels in the system.

The evaluation team used both qualitative and quantitative research methods and tools (e.g. review of logistical efficiency project performance monitoring data such as customs streamlining key “Doing Business” data, design and application impact and outcome assessment questionnaires) that are appropriate for the scope of the project, resources, and audience. Clearly, changes from previous trends suggest possible impact of the project on the trend, but the potential for influences from exogenous factors may overwhelm any actual impact of the project.

Limitations of the Study. The evaluation design relied heavily on two approaches: review of all relevant documentation about the project; and key informant interviews on site in South Africa, Botswana, Namibia, Malawi and Zambia. For the latter, more than fifty interviews were conducted with USAID, current and former Hub staff, partner governments, other international organizations, other development partners, and relevant outside observers. Neither experimental methods nor surveys of beneficiaries were employed, as neither approach was consistent with the limitations of time and effort by the evaluation team. Numerous sources of bias are possible with this approach, including mistakes in recall, biases of interviewees, and failure to identify potential candidates for interview. The team attempted to address these problems by cross-checking informant reports with those of others and with the written record. Further, any mid-term evaluation is based partly on expectations of what will be achieved during the remainder of the project. This cannot be assessed with any certainty by the evaluation team. Finally, the only definitive assessment of any such activity must come after the funding has ended and the consultants have gone on to other activities. This consists of what changes have been sustainably made in the operations of the institutions whose procedures the project sought to change. This will be unknowable until later.

ANNEX III: COMPLETE INCEPTION REPORT WITH DETAILED METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

EVALUATION DESIGN & METHODOLOGY

While the evaluation’s focus will be primarily on the four key evaluation questions, the design of secondary questions should be such that they incorporate clear responses that will provide feedback evidence as to whether or not the set targets in the SATH were achieved. Data collection and analysis methods will be used to obtain and interpret evidence for SATH success.

The MSTAS Evaluation Team’s research indicates that a formal baseline study was conducted at the start of the SATH against performance indicators developed to monitor project performance beyond the activity and output level. Similarly, through the PMP, performance targets were established for the project at these levels. MSTAS therefore anticipates that it will be possible to estimate change over the project period using the baseline situation of “before” the SATH and for characterizing the status of the Trade Hub project beneficiaries’ situations “after” years of SATH implementation. In addition to a comparison of “before” and “after” the team will analyze time series survey data that has been collected over the course of the project.

MSTAS will supplement this overall approach with more detailed approaches for examining each of the four functional levels at which project effects were anticipated.

Table I: Project performance – before and after comparisons

1. Improved Trade Facilitation	Before	After
2. Greater Competitiveness in Agriculture Value Chains		
3. Increased Trade and Investments for Textiles and Apparel		
4. Better Enabling Environment		

The evaluation team will use both qualitative and quantitative research methods and tools (e.g. review of logistical efficiency project performance monitoring data such as customs streamlining key “Doing Business” data, design and application impact and outcome assessment questionnaires) that are appropriate for the scope of the project, resources, and audience. A non-experimental evaluation design is preferred for the evaluation, as experimental seem of little feasibility for the current project. The question of attribution is always the most difficult challenge facing evaluation. Clearly, changes from previous trends suggest possible impact of the project on the trend, but the potential for influences from exogenous factors may overwhelm any actual impact of the project.

Greater potential for clear attribution comes at lower levels. Project leadership statements that the program led to a specific result need to be subjected to KII interview assessments. At this level KIIs need to be questioned about the level of attributability.

Four levels of attribution might be identified from these KIs:

1. This result would not have happened without the intervention of the project
2. This result was substantially affected by the work of the project.
3. This result was significantly affected by the work of the project
4. This result would have happened anyway.

Full attribution can only be given to the first of these four categories, with declining levels of attribution for categories 2 and 3, with no attribution for category 4. Clearly, this is an area where experience and judgment are important.

Gender Aspects

Since USAID places emphasis on improving the status of women throughout Southern African communities, to the greatest extent possible, the team will seek to evaluate program effect on all men and women of all ages who were involved in all aspects of this program, including participation and leadership in meetings, working groups, training and counseling activities, exchanges and delegations. This will enable the evaluation team to propose ways to facilitate women's advancement within the business community, including access to export capacity building and trade development opportunities such as targeted training programs in future USAID programs.

Environmental Compliance Aspects

Although a complete environmental analysis was done for the current Regional Trade Program (SAGCH), the evaluation team will still report on any environmental issues reported during the course of implementation of the SATH program.

DATA COLLECTION

Both primary and secondary qualitative and quantitative data will be collected and analyzed for this evaluation. Methodological triangulation will be used to verify the quality of the data and evidence
Secondary data collection

A desk review of key relevant documents will be completed upon transfer of key documents to the evaluation team. This will provide the foundation of the final Evaluation Methodology and the initial findings presented in the Team Planning Meeting prior to field work. A Desk Review instrument to codify and organize data from the document review for analysis as per answering the evaluation questions will be utilized. For example, review of information from Joint Border Posts will be undertaken to understand the impacts of the project on reduction in trade barriers. Content analysis of all available secondary data relevant to the evaluation will be undertaken.

Primary data collection

The evaluation team will conduct interviews (both key informant and individual) and group discussions with staff from the Trade Hub, USAID/Southern Africa, bilateral USAID Missions (particularly EG Officers), other donors and development partners, customs and trade officials, regional trade and transit associations, public and private sector representatives, civil society, commodity exchanges, and other African organizations receiving technical assistance and/or funding from the Trade Hub. Field visits will be made to the Trade Hub and a sample of project sites in the region that will be detailed in the implementation plan along with the appropriate sampling plan for both quantitative and qualitative data collection. These will be finalized once the key list of documents and relevant project information is transferred to the contractor. The implementation plan will be submitted to USAID COR for approval prior to commencement of field work.

To ensure completeness and validity of the evidence, the evaluation team will use a mix of data collection methods in this evaluation. Table 2 below identifies this range of methods and associates them with the evaluation questions. Additional detail on each method and its application to the evaluation is provided below.

Table 2: Data Collection Methods for the Four Evaluation Questions and Gender

Data Collection Methods	Evaluation Questions
Desk Review	1,2,3,4
Group Discussions	1,2,3,4
Key Informant Interviews	1,2,3,4
Field Visits	1,4
Observation at Site Visits	1,2,4

I. Desk Review

In order to answer Questions 1, 2, 3, 4 and the cross-cutting theme of gender, the team will conduct an in-depth review of documents and records to enable them to build a historical timeline of the program from its inception to the mid-term evaluation. This will include understanding the environment in which the project was initiated, the development of work plans over the years, the implementation and monitoring of activities, achievement of milestones and use of financial resources. Through the process of secondary data collection from various stakeholders the team will develop a holistic view of whether or not the project goal is being achieved, and how the broad range of project stakeholders perceive the outcome of the overall goal.

Documents will be used from various sources including SATH Secretariat in Gaborone, Botswana, USAID, and external resources. An illustrative list of sources is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Illustrative List of Documents and Records to be Reviewed

Source	Documents & Records
SATH Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indicator table ▪ Southern African Development Community (SADC): Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) ▪ Southern African Development Community: Desk Assessment of the Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan. 2002 – 2010 ▪ Southern Africa Trade Hub: Annual Report for the Period October 2012 to September 2013 ▪ Southern Africa Trade Hub: FY 2014 Work Plan. October 2013 to September 2014 ▪ Southern Africa Trade Hub FY 2011 Work Plan ▪ Project Management Plan Indicator Table ▪ Technical Report: Maize Value Chain in the SADC Region ▪ Africa Trade Hubs Export Promotion Evaluation: Evaluation Report

Source	Documents & Records
USAID	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ African Trade Hub Best Practices Review: Building on Successes and Lessons Learned for the Next Generation of Trade Hubs ▪ Amendment of Solicitations/Modification of Contract ▪ Final Report: Trade Competitiveness project (TCP). USAID Global Southern Africa Competitiveness Hub Trade Expansion for Southern Africa II (TESA II) ▪ SOW Comments, Mid-Term Evaluation for the Southern Africa Trade Hub ▪ Regional Development Cooperation Strategy 2011-2016
External	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Southern Africa: FY 2010 Implementation Plan. ▪ SSATP Africa Transport Policy Program

2. Key Informant Interviews (KII) and Group Interviews

In the KIIs we will cover the progress and success or non-success of SATH activities, management structure, sustainability, lessons learned for future programs, interactions and collaboration with key stakeholders, and answers to all evaluation questions 1,2,3, and 4. The team will discuss the extent to which improvements (or lack of improvements) in targeted indicators might be due to project interventions or to other factors. Notwithstanding the many difficult obstacles posed by attribution and the counterfactual, it will be useful to have some idea – even qualitatively -- if the project itself may take responsibility for improvements, or if the improvements (or the lack thereof) are related to other factors.

The information obtained through the different interviews will be categorized according to the SOW evaluation questions outlined earlier, as well as those cross-cutting issues such as gender and environmental protection that must be addressed by the evaluation. Data analysis by the qualitative evaluation team will be facilitated by tabulating the responses to the interview questions by using content analysis to extract findings and to draw conclusions from the tabulated responses. Over the course of the evaluation, the evaluation team anticipates conducting approximately 50 open-ended interviews in Southern African countries of South Africa, Botswana, Namibia, Malawi, and Zambia.

I. Observation at Site Visits

The evaluation team will make objective observations while visiting project sites including border posts, warehouses, and agricultural activities. This exercise will seek to understand to what extent the program has achieved its objectives and the extent to which activities are successful. Five country visits will be carried out covering the Southern Africa region, including:

- South Africa
- Botswana
- Malawi
- Namibia
- Zambia

DATA ANALYSIS

MSTAS will use a variety of analysis methods to enable them to answer the five main evaluation questions and the cross cutting gender question. Analysis methods are matched to evaluation questions as well as to data collection methods shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Analysis methods matched to evaluation questions

Data Analysis Methods	Evaluation Questions
Cross-Tabulations, Frequency Distribution	tbd
Content/Pattern Analysis	1,2,3,4
Comparison Analysis	1
Interpretation Analysis (Observation)	1,2,3,4
Discourse/Narrative Analysis	1,2,3,4
Checklist Review	tbd

The evaluation team will use different methods for data analysis, which are described as follows:

Statistical Analysis This method for analysis will be used as a tool to determine impact attribution. This method will be particularly important for answering some of the key questions and will provide a better understanding of the role SATH played in achieving (or not achieving) the desired outcomes and meeting the program goal.

1. Quantitative Analysis

a. Descriptive statistics:

This method includes cross-tabulations, frequency distribution and data disaggregation by parameters such as gender, age, and location.

2. Qualitative Analysis

b. Content and pattern analysis:

The transcriptions of the interviews and Group Discussions will be analyzed to determine patterns so that comparisons can be made between respondents and sites.

c. Comparison analysis:

The evaluation team will document trends and break segments of the project timeline for “before and after” comparisons to determine how the program has impacted over the project half-life.

d. Interpretation analysis:

This method will use a narrative framework approach to interpret the team’s observations during the field visits to various locations.

e. Discourse/narrative analysis:

This method will be used to analyze the results of the in-depth interviews conducted under the qualitative evaluation.

The table in following Annex I shows the relationships between these analytic methods and the evaluation questions.

Getting to Answers

Program or Project: The Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub

Team Members: Jim Fox, Stephanie Monschein, Felix M'mboyi, Talitha Bertelsmann-Scott, and David Adolwa.

Evaluation Questions	Type of Answer/Evidence Needed (Check one or more, as appropriate)		Methods for Data Collection, e.g., Records, Structured Observation, Key Informant Interviews		Sampling or Selection Approach, (if one is needed)	Data Analysis Methods, e.g., Frequency Distributions, Trend Analysis, Cross-Tabulations, Content Analysis
			Data Source(s)	Method		
1) To what extent is the project likely to be successful in achieving results toward its stated objectives? How does the project address key areas of integration as prioritized by SADC and SACU?		Yes/No	Indicator: 1. inter-regional and International trade. 2. Value of products moving through promoted value chains. 3. Country competitiveness. 4. SADC and SACU key indicators. 5. Cost of border crossings at assisted posts Source: 1. national and ITC trade statistics. 2. Project and assisted association reporting. 3. Africa, World Competitiveness Reports and Doing Business database. 4. SACU and SADC reports and Key interviews	1. Statistical compilation. 2. Data collection. 3. Document review. 4. Document review, KIIs. 5. Data review, visit to border crossing.	N/A	1. Trend analysis, adjusted for extraneous factors. 2. Trend Analysis, KIIs. 3. Trend analysis. 4. Review of reports, KIIs. 5. Trend analysis.
	Y	Description				
	Y	Comparison				
	Y	Explanation				
2) To what extent has the management structure as implemented supported or hindered performance? What are the factors influencing		Yes/No	Indicator: Management effectiveness as indicated by meeting project objectives retaining high-quality staff, assessing the extent to which planned funding was actually	KIIs with current and past staff of SATH, with development partners and with outside observers.	N/A	Team discussions, analyses, document reviews, content and pattern analysis
	Y	Description				
		Comparison				
	Y	Explanation				

Evaluation Questions	Type of Answer/Evidence Needed (Check one or more, as appropriate)		Methods for Data Collection, e.g., Records, Structured Observation, Key Informant Interviews		Sampling or Selection Approach, (if one is needed)	Data Analysis Methods, e.g., Frequency Distributions, Trend Analysis, Cross-Tabulations, Content Analysis
			Data Source(s)	Method		
the achievement and non-achievement of the objectives?			provided. Source: Available reports, financial accounts, and KIIs			
3) Based on the findings and analysis of the preceding questions, what are the key strategic, programmatic, technical, and managerial features of the project that should be taken into account when implementing a new Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Project in the region?		Yes/No	Reports and analyses collected earlier in the evaluation.	KIIs, reports, analyses by team.	N/A	Team discussions, based on materials collected during the earlier stages of the evaluation. Content and pattern analyses
	Y	Description				
		Comparison				
	Y	Explanation				
4) What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure sustainability of the project achievements and what is the potential for sustaining these benefits in the medium to long term?		Yes/No	Extent to which value chains can be expected to be expanding profitably by project end, and developmental state of other development partners.	KIIs and analysis of financial and developmental condition of SATH partners.	N/A	Team discussions and review of relevant documentation. Content analysis
	Y	Description				
		Comparison				

References

Bertelsmann-Scott, Talitha, *What Does the Future Hold for the SACU*, with Tanja Hichert and Peter Draper, SAIIA Occasional Paper No. 63, July 2010.

- SADC. *Desk Assessment of the Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan 2005-2010*.
- SADC. *Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP)*
- SATH. 2011. *FY 2011 Work Plan*
- SATH, *Annual Report for the Period October 2012-September 2013. (Including all the Indicator Tables at the end of the Report.)*
- SATH, *FY 2014 Work Plan: October 2013-September 2014*.
- USAID Southern Africa, 2014. *Mid-Term Performance Evaluation Southern Africa Trade and Competitiveness Hub Regional Project in South Africa*. SOW.
- USAID Southern Africa, 2011, *Regional Development Cooperation Strategy 2011- 2016*.
- USAID, 2009. *Final Report: Trade Competitiveness Project (TCP), USAID Southern Africa Global Competitiveness Hub, Trade Expansion for Southern Africa II (TESAII)*.
- USAID, 2010, *African Trade Hub Best Practices Review*.
- USAID, 2013, *Trade Hubs Export Promotion Evaluation*.
- USG. 2009. *Feed the Future: Southern Africa, FY 2010, Implementation Plan*.
- World Bank, *Doing Business*, various years.
- World Bank, *Logistics Performance Index*, various years.

Interview Protocol for Partners and beneficiaries of SATH

1. Provide a brief description of the purpose of the evaluation.
2. Ask the KII of the extent of his/her involvement with the SATH project
3. Request a description of the interaction of the institution with the SATH project
4. Ask about the quality of the personnel at SATH, or provided by SATH to the institution.
5. Ask about the quality of any training provided by SATH, along with information about subsequent changes in procedures or actions by your institution
6. Ask about whether the project is achieving its intended results (review intended results, as needed with the KII)
7. Provide the detailed basis for your conclusion that the project has or hasn't achieved its intended results.
8. Ask if these results might have been achieved without the project's involvement
9. Ask about your overall impression of the SATH project
10. Ask if your institution favors a longer-term continuation of SATH programs.
11. If the response is affirmative to the previous question, ask what changes you consider desirable in the future.
12. Ask if any activities undertaken by the project will be sustainable after the current phase of the project ends next year.

Interview Protocol for USAID

1. Describe for us your perspective on the changes that have been implemented at SATH.
2. How do you assess the current management of the project?
3. Which activities by the Hub are likely to be sustainable after the end of the current project?
4. Do you think that SATH has provided the proper level of support for SADC and SACU?
5. What changes in SATH would make the most sense in adding value and increasing effectiveness?
6. Overall, what is your judgment of the value of the project?

Interview Protocol for SATH Team Members

1. What do you consider your greatest success at SATH? Your greatest failure?
2. How do you view the roles of SADC and SACU, and what support, if any, should the Hub provide to these institutions?
3. Which organizations have been the most effective partners with the Hub?

4. Which SATH activities should be sustainable by the end of the project, and which will require continued support?

Interview Protocol for SADC

1. Provide a brief description of the purpose of the evaluation.
2. Ask the SADC official of the extent of his/her involvement and with or knowledge of the SATH project
3. Request a description of the interaction of SADC with the SATH project
4. Ask about the quality of the personnel at SATH.
5. Ask about the quality of any training provided by SATH, along with information about subsequent changes in procedures or actions by SADC
6. Ask about whether the project is achieving its intended results
7. Provide the detailed basis for your conclusion that the project has or hasn't achieved its intended results.
8. Ask if these results might have been achieved without the project's involvement.
9. Ask about your overall impression of the SATH project
10. Ask if SADC favors a longer-term continuation of SATH programs.
11. If the response is affirmative to the previous question, ask what changes SADC considers desirable in the future.
12. Ask if any activities undertaken by the project will be sustainable after the current phase of the project ends next year.

Interview Protocol for SACU

Interview Protocol: SATH Mid-term Evaluation

1. Provide a brief description of the purpose of the evaluation.
2. Ask the SACU official of the extent of his/her involvement and with or knowledge of the SATH project
3. Request a description of the interaction of SACU with the SATH project
4. Ask about the quality of the personnel at SATH

5. Ask about the quality of any training provided by SATH, along with information about subsequent changes in procedures or actions by SACU

6. Ask about whether the project is achieving its intended results

7. Provide the detailed basis for your conclusion that the project has or hasn't achieved its intended results.

8. Ask if these results might have been achieved without the project's involvement.

9. Ask about your overall impression of the SATH project

10. Ask if SACU favors a longer-term continuation of SATH programs

11. If the response is affirmative to the previous question, ask what changes SACU considers desirable in the future

12. Ask if any activities undertaken by the project will be sustainable after the current phase of the project ends next year.

ANNEX: LIST OF POTENTIAL INTERVIEWS and CONTACT INFORMATION from SATH COP

IR1. TRADE FACILITATION

City/Country	Project	Contact Person/Address and Contacts	Summary Status Of Project	Expected Outcomes	Hotels to Stay
Lilongwe Malawi	National Single Window	Christina Chatima Director MIT chatimachristina@yahoo.com Tel: +265 999 900 680	Project being launched in July 2014 Advisor to be embedded in country Communications Strategy commencing development	Engagement with SATH to date including study tour, document drafting for EOI/RFP/TOR's Proposed Work Schedule	Crossroads Hotel
Blantyre Malawi	National Single Window	Shadric Namalomba Commissioner Exports MRA snamalomba@mra.mw +265 888 959 600	Advisor to be embedded in country for NSW Technical training in Project Management underway by July	Engagement with SATH to date including: Work Schedule and activity development Embedding of SATH advisor	Protea Ryalls Hotel
Windhoek Namibia	National Single Window; Customs Connectivity; Trade Repository	Bevan Simataa Commissioner Namibia Customs & Excise (NCE) bevan.simataa@gov.mof.na	Customs Connectivity to cease Advisor to be embedded in country for Trade Repository and NSW Technical training in Project Management underway by August 2014	Engagement with SATH to date including: • Work Schedule and activity development • Embedding of SATH advisor	Kalahari Sands Hotel
Windhoek Namibia	National Single Window	Patricia Liswaniso Deputy Director – Trade Promotion Namibia Ministry of Trade 145C Korner St. Trade Policy House PB 13340	Communications Strategy commencing development Advisor to be embedded in country	Engagement with SATH to date including • Trade Repository • document drafting for TOR's • Proposed Work Schedule • Customs Connectivity	Kalahari Sands Hotel

IR2: AGRICULTURAL VALUE CHAINS

City Country	Project	Contact person/address and contact	Summery status of project	Expected Outcome	Hotels
South Africa					
Howick	Maize hybrid seed in Malawi and Mozambique	Capstone seed Phillip Taylor Tel : +27 33 3304474 Cell +27 826529000 Email philip@capstoneseeds.com	Last milestone to be completed by June Seed technician support including field visits	Increased availability of maize hybrid seeds in Malawi and Mozambique	Any in Durban

Tokai	Groundnuts for high-end export markets	CASS Gordon Guthrie Mobile: +27 82 491 0782 Phone: +27 33 394 4432 Fax: +27 86 295 0124 Skype: gordonguthrie	Installation and commissioning of groundnut cleaning, sorting and grading equipment	Zambia (Jungle Beat) able to sell/export improved quality of groundnuts	
Cape-town	Agri-tech expo Zambia	Spintelligent David Ashdown T: +27 (0)21 700 3516 M: +27 (0)605 062 922 E: david.ashdown@clarionevents.com E: david.ashdown@spintelligent.com	The AgriTech Expo has been done	Small-scale and emergent farmers make use of new technologies	
Malawi					
Lilongwe	Maize hybrid seed in Malawi and Mozambique	Felix Jumbe, Peacock seeds	Peacock seeds has produced over 240 tonnes of hybrid seed this year	Increased availability of maize hybrid seeds in Malawi and Mozambique	
Lilongwe	Aflatoxin removal in groundnuts for processing	Afri-nut: Tim de Borde' (MD) tdeborde@exagrisafrica.com Lisbon Qoma (production Manager) lisbon@afri nut.com	Executed a training workshop to transfer simple grading and sorting technology for aflatoxin removal in groundnuts before processing into consumer products. To do impact assessment	Reduced aflatoxin levels in peanuts products produced by Afri-nut and other processors in Malawi	
	Improved grain storage management	ACE, Kristian Schach Moller, CEO. kmoller@aceafrika.org , +265 (0) 1710204, +265 (0)999346890	Trained warehouse managers and foremen on grain management techniques	Reduces grain losses in warehouses, and improved grain standards	
	Warehouse receipt system development	ACE, Kristian Schach Moller, CEO. kmoller@aceafrika.org , +265 (0) 1710204, +265 (0)999346890	Established contract based Warehouse Receipting system in Malawi to improve market access and stable process for smallholder farmers	Improved markets for smallholder farmers Increased storage capacity	
Zambia					
Lusaka	Groundnuts for high-end export markets	Pieter Nieuwoudt Jungle Beat Limited Plot 8071, off Katanga Road Chinika Light Industrial Area, Lusaka Landline: 0211 846 962	Installation and commissioning of groundnut cleaning, sorting and grading equipment	Zambia (Jungle Beat) able to sell/export improved quality of groundnuts	

		Cell: 097 634 5338 lynette@junglebeatzm.com junglezambia@wol.co.za			
Lusaka	Establishment of smallholder grain deport in Zambia	Afgri Joof Pistorius joof@afgri.com.zm Tel:+260211273757-62 Mobile +260965872082	The Deport has been installed	Farmers are able to sell their maize and soya at better prices at new depot	
Lusaka	Smallholder soya bean expansion program in Zambia	NWK Graham Chilimina Tel: +260 21 125 9200/07/08, Graham.chilimina@nwkzambia.com	Last milestone to be completed by June NWK procures soy from contracted farmers	Small-scale farmers able to grow soya beans as an out grower crop	
Chipata	Aflatoxin removal in groundnuts for processing	COMACO John Power (CEO) Manda Hill Lusaka, Zambia Tel: +260-211-226082,286909 Mobile: 097-8062024 jpower@itswild.org Joshua Shonga jshonga@itswild.org +260 976694024	Executed a training workshop to transfer simple grading and sorting technology for aflatoxin removal in groundnuts before processing into consumer products, and for household use To do impact assessment	Reduced aflatoxin levels in peanuts products produced by Afri-nut and other processors in Malawi Equip farmers with a simple technology to reduce aflatoxin levels in food they eat.	
	Improved grain storage management	ISTT, Mungule Chikoye, Director. chikoyem@istt.ac.zm	Trained warehouse managers and foremen on grain management techniques	Reduces grain losses in warehouses, and improved grain standards	
IR3: TEXTILES AND APPAREL					
Source Africa 2014					
IR4: CLEAN ENERGY					
City/Country	Project	Contact Person/Address and Contacts	Summary Status of Project	Expected Outcomes	Recommended Hotels to Stay
Windhoek/NA MIBIA	RERA Clean Energy Regulation Capacity Building.	Mr. Elijah Sichone, Executive Secretary, Regional Electricity Regulators Association of Southern Africa (RERA) +264-81-2271110 ecsichone@rerasadc.com	1) Six regional training workshops completed; 2) Institutionalization of energy regulation training for RERA in progress.	1) Increased capacity to regulate clean energy in the region; 2) sustainable regional regulatory capacity build established.	Kalahari Sands; Country Club.
Gaborone/BOT	SADC Energy	Mr. Odala Matupa, Programme	Study tour of the energy institutions the	1) Improved coordination of regional	Lansmore, Gaborone

SWANA	Capacity Building	Officer - Power, SADC, +267 72925671, omatupa@sadc.int	Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) by SADC's Energy institutions (SADC energy, RERA and SAPP)	renewable energy projects. 2) Strengthened capacity to coordinate regional power projects.	Sun, Grand Palm
Mbabane/SWAZILAND	Renewable Energy and Independent Power Producer (IPP) policy development.	Mr. Henry Shongwe, Director, Department of Energy, T:+268 76063615, shongweh@gmail.com.	1) First draft policy submitted to Swaziland for national stakeholder comments; 2) Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment of RE & IPP policy in progress.	1) National RE &IPP Policy; 2) Enabling policy environment for increased IPP investment in electricity supply industry;3) Increased energy security.	Swazi Spar Sun Hotel
Mbabane/SWAZILAND	Review of Cost of Supply Study of Swaziland Electricity Supply Industry	Mr. Vusi Mkhumane, CEO, Swaziland Energy Regulatory Authority, T: +26824042123;mkhumane@sera.org.sz	Project completed with presentation to consultative workshop of public and private sector stakeholders of Swaziland.	1) increased knowledge of SERA about Electricity Supply Industry of Swaziland; 2) Increased SERA technical capacity to regulate the Electricity Supply Industry.	Swazi Spar Sun Hotel; Summerfield.
	Grid Code Development.	Mr. Vusi Mkhumane, CEO, Swaziland Energy Regulatory Authority, T: +26824042123;mkhumane@sera.org.sz	Discussions between Trade Hub and SERA on developing Grid Code have started.	Strengthened SERA capacity to regulate Swaziland Electricity Supply Industry.	Swazi Spar Sun Hotel; Summerfield.
Lusaka/ZAMBIA	Renewable Energy Feed In Tariff Policy	Mr. C. L. Mulenga, Acting Director, Department of Energy:+260 977659818, clmulenga@mewd.gov.zm	Policy development is in progress.	Enabling policy environment for increased Clean Energy Investment.	Pamodzi, Radisson Blu
Lusaka/ZAMBIA	Avoided Cost Tariff development	Mr A. Mwila Director – Energy Regulation Energy Regulation Board T: +260 211258844 amwila@erb.org.zm	Capacity Building to start in June 2014.	An avoided cost tariff to respond to private sector IPPs while the REFIT policy is being developed	Pamodzi, Radisson Blu
Lusaka/ZAMBIA	Guidelines Development for Private sector financing	Geoffrey Musonda Chief Executive Officer Rural Electrification Authority GMusonda@rea.org.zm T: +260977601630	Advert for Consultant issued and responses received	1) Increased private sector investment in rural electrification projects; 2) Enabling environment for REA partnership with Private sector power producers in rural electrification projects.	Pamodzi, Radisson Blu

ANNEX IV: SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR AG VC

Agriculture Value Chains IR: Statistical Tables

Table 1: Strategic Partnership Grants Pipeline

Grantee	Committed	Country	Amount	Description
Obligated				
CASS	12/1/2012	Zambia	100,000	Provision of groundnut sorting/grading equipment/export
CAPSTONE	9/27/2012	Malawi	100,000	Introduction of new hybrid maize variety to Malawi
AFGRI	12/7/2012	Zambia	100,000	Installation and operation of 15,000 MT of grain storage
SAGM	12/1/2012	Zambia	100,000	Groundnut seed provision and outgrowing/export
NWK	5/22/2013	Zambia	100,000	Soy seed provision and outgrowing
SAGL	9/30/2013	Zambia	100,000	Commercial lab service accreditation
Submitted				
IKURU	not approved	Mozambique	100,000	Groundnut handling and processing for export
SENWES	not approved	Malawi	100,000	Finance and production tech for small holders

Source : SATH Annual Report for the Period October 2012 – September 2013. (Page 17). **NOT**

ES:

- Zambia has the bulk of SPGs resources because it has advanced its agriculture activities in aligning private sector and farmers towards commercialized agriculture.
- Malawi has also developed advanced commercial agriculture enterprise through establishment of first WRS which has seen an increase in grain production and marketing intra region and out of the SADC region to further markets
- Mozambique has been slow in commercialized grain farming because the government still interferes in grain markets and this has complicated the progress in WRS and PPPs.

Table 2: Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training

Type of individual	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
Producers	0	6	30	13
People in government	53	60	0	6
People in private sector firms	55	70	21	45
People in civil society	14	6	2	9
Totals	122	142	53	73
Sex				
Male	93	83	43	57
Female	29	59	10	16

Source: PMP, SATH Annual Report Oct 2012 – Sept 2013

NOTES:

- Gender mainstreaming was observed in the capacity building program to the ratio of: Male 276 Female 114 to get to a total of 390 trained beneficiaries
- The PMP project target for the year was 615 participants in the training program but it achieved a training total of 390 (63%) participants and had a negative variance of 37%.

Table 3: Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers' organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance

Type of individual	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
Private enterprises (for profit)	43	36	14	18
Producers organizations	8	3	24	1
Water users associations	0	0	0	0
Women's groups	1	0	0	0
Trade and business associations	0	6	5	0
Community-based organizations (CBOs)	2	3	3	7
Totals	54	48	46	26

Source: PMP, SATH Annual Report Oct 2012 – Sept 2013

NOTES:

- Gender mainstreaming was observed in the capacity building program to the ratio of: Male 276 Female 114 to get to a total of 390 trained beneficiaries
- The PMP project target for training relevant stakeholders was 73 participants while the actual achievement was 174 participants making it 238% and with a positive variance of 138%. This was a remarkable success in the program.

Table 4: Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation

Type of individual	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
	\$108,500	\$121,050	\$1,800,000	\$431,600

Source: PMP, SATH Annual Report Oct 2012 – Sept 2013

NOTES:

- The PMP target for the value of private sector investment in the agriculture sector leveraged by FtF was \$540,000 while the actual value achieved in the same period was \$ 2,464,950. This was a highly significant achievement at the rate of 456% with a positive variance of 356%.
- Most of this result is explained by the number of SPGs that were signed between SATH and the private sector which in turn stimulated additional investment venture capital in the sector.

Table 5: New technologies or management practices

Phase Of Development	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
Phase 1 Number of new technologies or management practices under research as a result of USG assistance	0	0	0	0
Phase 2 Number of new technologies or management practices under field testing as a result of USG assistance	0	1	0	0
Phase 3 Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance	3	1	0	7

Source: PMP, SATH Annual Report Oct 2012 – Sept 2013

NOTES:

- The target number of new technologies that were to be developed under phases 1, 2 and 3 was 10, however, the project achieved a higher actual value of 12 new technologies at 120% with a positive variance of 20%.

- This was mostly achieved in Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique with technology transfer coming from South Africa that had more advanced farming and agro-processing practices.

Table 6: Number of PPPs formed as a result of FTF assistance

	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
	3	3	2	4

Source: PMP, SATH Annual Report Oct 2012 – Sept 2013

NOTES:

- The projected target for new public-private sector partnerships that would be formed was 15, while the actual partnerships formed was 12 achieving an 80% performance. The variance in this case was negative 20% which was modest when compared to actual results.
- The explanation given under this case was the slow negotiation process in Zambia and Mozambique which however is progressing well to date.

Table 7: Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans

	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
	0	0	\$1,800,000	\$200,876

Source: PMP, SATH Annual Report Oct 2012 – Sept 2013

NOTES:

- Within the period, the PMP targeted USD 0.6 million in value of agricultural and rural loans that would be advanced to the AVC, however, the actual result achieved was much higher at USD 2,0 million that represented a 333% increase in the credit facility with a positive variance of 233%.
- The project over achievement was significant

Table 8: Total increase in installed storage capacity

	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
	0	0	0	15,000 MT

Source: PMP, SATH Annual Report Oct 2012 – Sept 2013

NOTES:

- The project PMP planned to achieve a target of 15,000 MT of installed storage capacity for cereals in the project countries. This was achieved in precision at 100% with no variance.
- This achievement was important because farmers in Malawi and Zambia were especially vulnerable to price manipulation by middlemen and with these structures constructed deep into the rural areas, farmers were assured of market and a stable price that was more competitive.

Table 9: Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case:

Stage/level	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
Stage 1: Analyzed				
Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public consultation				
Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decreed				
Stage 4: Passed/approved	0	2	2	0
Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun				

Source: PMP, SATH Annual Report Oct 2012 – Sept 2013

NOTES:

- According to the PMP the target number of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures that were to be developed was 4, and the actual number of these instruments that were actually passed was four with no variance.
- This achievement was significant because it had a positive connotation on how AVC players would play in an enabling environment that stimulated agricultural activity at all levels along the value chain.

Case Studies of SATH Successful Engagements

Case I: Making the Grade: USAID Training Program Protects Crops

USAID Southern Africa Trade Hub trains warehouse managers to help reduce severe grain losses in region

Fifteen to twenty percent of grain that goes into storage in Southern Africa is ruined before it can be used, leaving approximately 1.3 million tons of product damaged and un-suitable for human consumption or export every year. This represents almost US\$270 million in lost value annually. In addition, a significant amount of grain produced in the region is never graded, meaning that grain of varying qualities is blended without distinction, which lowers the overall price of the grain and prevents export. The USAID Southern Africa Trade Hub is partnering with local organizations in Malawi, Zambia and Mozambique to address these significant losses with a series of grain management trainings. The trainings cover grain grading and standards, storage management and pest prevention. Rigorous 12-day residential courses target employees from certified warehouse receipts facilities, government, private traders, feed and grain mills, and other grain processors. The in-depth training includes technical and hands-on demonstrations of sampling, sample preparation, weighing and calculation of percentage, moisture determination, sieving and cleanliness. Students are taken through group exercises where they practice the grading and sampling themselves, and they visit grain warehouses to see what other players in the industry are doing. Daily progress tests are given to each trainee to evaluate information absorption, and a written examination is required at the end of the course before certification is granted. Sixty to seventy percent of attendees are receiving grain training for the first time. Frank Kadzakumanja, a structured trade officer with the Agricultural Commodity Exchange (ACE) attended the first training in Malawi and explains the significance of the course: “The biggest challenge in warehouse management is balancing workload and prioritizing tasks. The other main challenge is keeping up with technology changes, finding time to read literature and staying up to date with new technologies. After the training, I have acquired more knowledge on the ground as well as literature that will help ensure all required procedures are completed and on time.” The Trade Hub’s support for grain grading training is an integral part of establishing the Warehouse Receipt System (WRS), which enables the creation of certified warehouse receipts storage facilities affiliated with ACE and with the Auction Holdings Commodity Exchange (AHCX). WRS allows farmers to store grain and sell when prices are favorable, using their warehouse receipt as collateral for inputs and other expenses in the meantime. Warehouses must meet accreditation standards to comply with insurance requirements and to access bank financing. Without accurate grading, a warehouse receipts system cannot function, as the entire system rests on a guarantee of definite quality and quantity. Gloria Liwewe described the training course as “an eye opener.” As a warehouse manager, it is Gloria’s job to in-take product and decide how to store it. After completing 12 days of intense study, she can now ensure that any commodity flowing out of her warehouse is of high quality and able to conform to export standards. Because Gloria has completed the course, her warehouse can now function as a certified warehouse receipt storage facility, enabling farmers’ access to finance and the benefits of the WRS. On a personal level, Gloria cites aflatoxin mitigation practices as a special priority due to the toxins’ link to breast and cervical cancer in Malawi. Gloria also believes that completing the course will help her face the challenges of being one of the few women of her position in the industry: “Knowledge is power. With the skills I have learned from this training I will be able to perform the tasks that men in this industry usually do.” *Source: SATH Annual Report for the Period October 2012 – September 2013. (Page 46).*

Case 2: USAID Grants Accelerate Peanut Trade from Zambia
Exporting to South Africa will increase farmer profits and improve standard of living

USAID's Southern Africa Trade Hub is facilitating powerful partnerships between South African and Zambian peanut companies with its Strategic Partnership Grants program. Two grants for new cleaning, sorting and grading equipment and improved seed material have enabled Zambian company Jungle Beat to tackle the problem of aflatoxin contamination and access the lucrative export market for peanuts. Due to domestic market issues, peanut production in South Africa has declined significantly in the last ten years: from 140,000 to 65,000 tons per year. This situation has led South African companies to look to their neighbors in the region for supply. With its ideal climate and traditional knowledge of pea-nuts, Zambia could make up South Africa's shortfall all on its own. But due to high levels of aflatoxin contamination, all developed markets have been closed to Zambian peanuts and the approximately 500,000 households that grow them. It was Zambia's peanut potential that first attracted Peter Nieuwoudt to Zambia to set up Jungle Beat and make peanut butter for the local market. When Nieuwoudt first started the company, he drove around the country in his truck searching for farmers to be part of Jungle Beat's grower network, pitching a tent in any village where he found himself when the sun went down. Today Jungle Beat buys groundnuts from and provides extension support to 11,000 small farmers. With the equipment, seed and market linkages facilitated through the Strategic Partnership grants, Jungle Beat will be capable of cleaning, sorting and grading four tons of ground-nuts per hour at the Lusaka factory—enough for Jungle Beat to increase its purchase of groundnuts from small-scale farmers by up to 10,000 tons per season. Already in the 2013 harvest season, Jungle Beat has sourced a \$1.8 million USD working capital loan from a local bank (with support from the USAID DCA) which is enabling the company to increase purchases from approximately 2,700 metric tons last year to an estimated 7,000 metric tons this year. The sorting and grading line has been installed, and Jungle Beat's South African partner Central African Seed Services (CASS) is preparing to receive their first shipments. But the planting season won't wait. Now with the expectation of receiving clean, aflatoxin-compliant nuts, South Africa Groundnut Marketing is sending 40 tons of high quality seed to be given to 800 of Jungle Beat's small holder suppliers—and everyone is expecting big things. *Source: SATH Annual Report for the Period October 2012 – September 2013. (Page 48)*

Case 3: Bringing Better Seed to Malawi

Quality seed improves drought resistance for Malawi's crucial corn crop

The USAID Southern Africa Trade Hub provided a grant of US\$100,000 to Capstone Seeds SA (PTY) to accelerate commercial access to drought-tolerant hybrid maize seed in Malawi. Capstone, an independent South African seed company, entered into a joint venture with Peacock Enterprises Ltd of Malawi to multiply and market "CAP9001" in Malawi. This variety was developed specifically with the needs of the region in mind, to address productivity and maximize yield potential in small scale, rain-fed, drought-vulnerable farming systems. Approximately 80 metric tons of certified hybrid seed maize were produced through this grant project. Research into improved seed varieties, especially drought-tolerant ones, is vital for improving food security in the Southern African environment; CAP9001 has been approved by the Drought Tolerant Maize for Africa Initiative (DTMA) of the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT). However, DTMA cites the lack of multiplication and commercial distribution as the "greatest obstacle" for getting seed to farmers, which is exactly the challenge this grant addresses. The grant not only supported the production of 80 metric tons of new hybrid seed in Malawi, but also paired independent seed companies in South Africa and Malawi to bring new seed products to the market effectively. Through the grant, Peacock Seeds was supported to purchase parent seed and receive technical assistance in best practices for seed production operations. Both parties stress the importance of a strong local seed industry to bring competition and varied products to the market. Capstone Seed Director, Philip Taylor, explains, "It is very important that this grant supports two independent seed companies. Real competition and innovation will only come from stronger local seed producers, and a more competitive seed market ultimately benefits the farmers of Malawi." Peacock Seeds marketed the seed directly to small holders in 10 kg packs, targeting approximately 8,000 farmers in the first year. But the first year is just the start. As Director of Peacock Enterprises, Felix Jumbe, says, "This partnership means that the variety will now be consistently available to the farming community. We hope to increase our outreach through our dealer network which currently numbers 15. Demand is increasing and we are confident that small-scale farmers will achieve the yield potential for our variety. Now working with a credible seed company from South Africa and distributing certified seed on the market, Peacock is happy to be part of Malawi's agriculture development." *Source: SATH Annual Report for the Period October 2012 – September 2013. (Page 51)*

Agriculture IR Overview of Outputs

TRAINING OUTPUTS: In quarter 1 of year 4, soy bean extension training to 606 farmers was undertaken as well as 75 metric tons of certified soy seed and 75 metric tons of fertilizer was supplied to farmers by a local commercial company as part of a contract growing agreement;

In quarter 2 of year 4, 9 peacock staff and contract farmers received training for maintenance of seed quality and prolonged seed shelf life.

In quarter 2 of year 4, 10 commercial grain storage owners (grain millers, feed mills, exporters) representing 85,000 tons of privately owned storage, two Food Reserve Agency operators representing 700,000 tons of national grain storage capacity received training in grain grading and storage management

In quarter 2 of year 4, 45 groundnut processors and local organizations receiving training on scalable (commercial/household) aflatoxin mitigation technology

In year 3, the AVC team developed and rolled out a rigorous 12 day training program focusing on grain grading, trade standards and storage management across the region;

In year 3, the project sponsored five trainings workshops (two in Malawi, two in Zambia and one in Mozambique) in which 83 trainees from 46 storage operators across the region, representing an estimated 350,000 MT of storage capacity, have been trained;

In year 2 the Trade Hub was instrumental in organizing the first Grain Indaba in Zimbabwe in November 2011. The Trade Hub identified regional role players and USAID Zimbabwe funded their attendance. The Trade Hub's input focused on the how value chain participants should work together to create solutions to challenges. New links were established between Grain Millers Association of Zimbabwe members, the South African Grain Silo Industry and Farm Secure, a South African company specializing in contract growing.

In year 2, the Trade Hub met with ZAMACE, and reviewed the objectives of the organization, as well as its potential for expansion to cover regional trade in cereals and oilseeds. ZAMACE is currently not functioning effectively as it is awaiting the passing of a new legislation that will provide a new mandate and authority to certify grain storage facilities.

Developing the Regional Warehouse Bond Product

In year 3, the AVC team supported African Trade Insurance (ATI) to develop a warehouse bond product to provide risk mitigation services to lenders; The proposed ATI warehouse bond will insure deposit at certified, covered facilities, reducing lender risk, and following a Trade Hub supported market assessment in Malawi, ATI submitted the concept to its board in Quarter 3 and received approval to develop a specific product. In the coming year, the AVC team will further support ATI to develop the bond product and a price quotation based on specific operators in Malawi and Zambia

1.4 The project has improved standards and quality in the SADC region as follows:

Introduced Best Practice in Groundnut Handling and Procurement

In quarter 2 of year 4, the AVC team organized two trainings in Zambia on aflatoxin removal in groundnuts for processing. 24 factory processors attended the first training and 21 farmer trainers and lead farmers attended the second training.

In quarter 2 of year 4, the team also organized a grain management training in Zambia from March 10 - 21, hosted by ISTT in Lusaka, with the following results: 31 participants, from ten commercial organizations, the Food Reserve Agency and two association groups of which nine were women; 22 out of 31 (70 %) received accredited competency certificates in basic grain management and storage; to date the training has certified 110 participants from the three FtF focal countries.

During year 3, in partnership with Twin Trading, the AVC team supported the commercial groundnut sector through development and training on a best practice guide for aflatoxin mitigation in groundnut procurement and storage; The "Aflatoxin Road show" across Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia reached 63 industry participants, representing producers, producer organizations, traders, processors, NGO projects, researchers and regulators; Year-end follow up with participants suggests that there is general agreement on the efficacy of suggested practices

During year 2, the Trade Hub participated in the high level policy dialogue and the 4th technical meeting of the regional Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) subcommittee in Malawi to understand the harmonization of seed trade and how harmonization could impact the implementation of the Trade Hub's programs. The meeting resulted in a requirement to address farm saved seed practices at the producer level to impact aflatoxin control and to enhance the trade of certified seed as a mitigation strategy. At the same time, the meeting strengthened regional cooperation on aflatoxin monitoring and management issues affecting private sector trade in agricultural commodities.

Enhanced the Training in Groundnut Blanching and Grading

The Trade Hub's strategy has been to move downstream with the aflatoxin interventions – complementing multiple bi-lateral, farmer-level trainings and focusing on supporting increased intra-regional trade in aflatoxin compliant nuts;

In quarter four of year 3, the AVC team began the first regional training on processing techniques (roasting, de-shelling, and visual inspection) to remove aflatoxin from the commercial supply chain; In Malawi, 43 trainees from 17 organizations attended the training. One training workshop was held for SME processors (e.g. peanut butter, therapeutic foods, snacks), and one training was held for village-level processors to demonstrate techniques on a different scale and with different equipment

In quarter 2 of year 4, the AVC team facilitated a meeting of national seed associations from the SADC region in Tunis during the African Seed Trade Association Congress this quarter. At this meeting, the members agreed to formalize a regional steering committee under the African Seed Traders Association (AFSTA) comprised of national seed associations from Zambia, Malawi, South Africa, Tanzania and Zimbabwe. Objectives of the committee would be to: Advocate for and support effective domestication of harmonized seed protocol regulations in SADC member states; Promote regional industry development through capacity building of private industry and national regulatory bodies (particularly in areas of SPS, variety testing, release and certification); Coordinate industry engagement with the SADC Seed Centre.

In quarter 2, the AVC team developed and advanced a number of important grant concepts. In February, the project presented five grant concepts to a joint meeting of USAID and the South African Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries in Pretoria. All the concepts were accepted and proposal development is proceeding. The AVC team has completed pre-award screening and environmental assessment of the concepts and is currently in the final stages of proposal development, finalizing activities and cost-sharing with potential grantees.

In quarter 1 of yearX, the AVC team completed discussions with a wide range of seed industry players to establish the basis for a regional body which will spearhead industry engagement on the recently enacted SADC seed regulation harmonization protocol. The Trade Hub has invited the SADC Seed Center to participate in the meeting to ensure that proposed activities are feasible and supported by SADC.

In quarter 1 of year 4, the AVC team also began working with SANSOR on the development of an on-line seed market information platform which will collect, analyze, and report seed market information on a regional basis. This platform will allow for greatly improved accuracy and timeliness of seed market information, providing timely data on market size and trends by crop, seed type and distribution channels.

In year 3, the AVC team was able to develop concrete agreements with the Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions (SACAU) to support specific market information products for their regional members.

In year 2, the Trade Hub secured initial agreement to collaborate with Musika in Zambia on efforts to expand seed trade with the Zambia Seed Traders Association (ZASTA). Musika focuses its interventions on the agricultural input and output markets and service markets in rural and agricultural finance markets.

In year 2, the Trade Hub carried out an initial field visit to Zambia to attend the Agri Business Congress in Lusaka, hosted by the Zambia National Farmers Union (ZNFU) and to meet with local stakeholders. The visit was also to create platforms to network with seed companies, research institutions and other seed industry stakeholders to improve their effectiveness in meeting the needs of producers.

ANNEX V: FINAL LIST OF INTERVIEWS

LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED – AGRICULTURE VALUE CHAINS			
Name and Title	Organization	Contact cellphone	Email address
SOUTH AFRICA			
Brian Lever, Chairman,	South African National Seed Organisation (SANSOR)	Tel: +27 11 762 5261 Fax: +27 11 762 4111 Cell: +27 87 251 5631	brian@advanceseed.com
Mr Johnson Bungu, Marketing Advisor	Southern Africa Confederation of Agricultural Unions [SACAU]	Tel: +27 12 644 0808 Fax: +27 12 664 8386	jbungu@sacau.org
Dr Greenwell Matchaya, ReSAKSS Coordinator, Southern Africa	Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS)	+27 12 845 9100	g.matchaya@cgiar.org
Sibusiso Nhlengethwa, Research Officer, Statistics	Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS)	+27 72 884 7649	s.nhlengethwa@cgiar.org
Thokozani Dlamini, Communication Officer	Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS)	+27 82 990 4308	t.dlamini@cgiar.org
Gordon Guthrie, Managing Partner, CASS	Central Africa Seed Services [CASS]	+27 82 308 9102 +27 21 712 4388 Fax: +27 86 239 0694	nutman@absamail.co.za
Graham C. Guthrie, Executive Director, CASS & NUtri-food Africa	Central Africa Seed Services [CASS]	+27 82 308 9102 +27 21 712 4388 Fax: +27 86 239 0694	graham@nutradeafrica.com
Neill Jackson, Managing Director, NOSA Agriculture Services	Central Africa Seed Services [CASS]	+27 82 308 9102 +27 21 712 4388 Fax: +27 86 239 0694	neil.jackson@nosaagri.com
BOTSWANA			
Dr Elsie Meintjies [Senior Programme Officer – TBT]	Sothorn Africa Development Community [SADC]	+267 395 1863 ext 1664	emeintjies@sadc.int
Beedeeanan Hulman [Senior Programme Officer – Livestock]	Sothorn Africa Development Community [SADC]	+267 395 1863 ext 6090	bhulman@sadc.int
Chiluba Mwape [Programme Officer – SPS Quality Infrastructure]	Sothorn Africa Development Community [SADC]	+267 395 1863 ext 1909	cnmwape@sadc.int

Bentry P. Chaura [<i>Senior Programme Officer-Food Security</i>]	Sothern Africa Development Community [SADC]	+267 395 1863 ext 1965	bchaura@sadc.int
Craig Dunlop – Cereals Value Chain Specialist	Southern Africa Trade Hub [SATH]	Tel: +267 3900884 Fax: +267 3901027 Cell: +267 72 330870	cdunlop@satradehub.org
Kevin Kabunda - Private Sector Engagement Specialist	Southern Africa Trade Hub [SATH]	Tel: +267 3900884 Fax: +267 3901027	kkabunda@satradehub.org
John James – Chief of Party	Southern Africa Trade Hub [SATH]	Tel: +267 3900884 Fax: +267 3901027	jjames@satradehub.org
Gerrit Struyf –Agriculture Value Chains Manager	Southern Africa Trade Hub [SATH]	Tel: +267 3900884 Fax: +267 3901027 Cell: +267 72 330870	gstruyf@satradehub.org
ZAMBIA			
John C. Power, Chief Executive Officer, COMACO	Community Markets for Conservation - COMACO	+260 211 226 082 Cell: +260 978 062 024	jpower@itswild.org
Peter Nleuwoudt, Managing Director	Jungle Beat Limited, Lusaka, Zambia	+260 211 846 962 Cell: +260 978 537 322	junglezambia@wol.co.za junglebeat@junglebeatzm.com
Catherine Lwando-Tembo, <i>Forestry & Climate Change Specialist</i>	United States Agency for International development [USAID], Zambia Mission	+260 211 357000 ext 7359 +260 979 324 932	ctembo@usaid.gov
Dr. Anna Toness, <i>Director of the Economic Growth Team</i>	United States Agency for International development [USAID], Zambia Mission	+260 211 357000 ext 7359 +260 979 324 932	atoness@usaid.gov
Graham Chilimina, Yield Program Manager	NWK Agri-Services: Small Holder Soya Bean Expansion Program in Zambia	+260 21 252 900 ext. 132 +260 21 125 2424	graham.chilimina@nwkzambia.com
Joof Pistorius, Grain Marketing Manager	AFGRI Corporation Limited	+260 211 273 759/60/61/62/63 Fax: +260 211 273 763 +260 965 872 082	joof@afgri.com.zam
MALAWI			
Kristian Moller Chief Executive Officer	Agriculture Commodity Exchange for Africa	+265 999 346 896	kmoller@aceafrica.org
Lisbon Qoma	AfriNut	+265 881 246540	Lisbon@afriNut.com

LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED: Textiles and Apparel, General, Energy, Trade Facilitation

Name and Title	Organization	Contact phone	Email address
----------------	--------------	---------------	---------------

WASHINGTON, DC			
Dawn Riebeling, Project Manager	AECOM		Dawn.Riebeling@aecom.com
Jennifer Kovolski, Technical	AECOM		Jennifer.Kivolski@aecom.com
Nikita Salgaonkar, Project Manager	AECOM		Nikita.Salgaonkar@aecom.com
Robert Kirk, Former COP	Formerly with the SATH		
Rick Gurley, Regional Trade Advisor	USAID/Southern Africa		rgurley@usaid.gov
SOUTH AFRICA			
Bob Berg Senior Sales Manager	SourcingMagic	310-857-7568	bberg@magiconline.com
Mokhethi Shelile Head, Investment Promotion	Lesotho National Development Corporation	+266 22 312012	shelile@indc.org.ls
David Ashdown Managing Director	Spintelligent, Clarion Events	+27 21 700 3516	David.ashdown@clarionevents.com
Matthew Stern	DNA Consulting	+27 82 885 8895	Matthew.stern@dnaeconomics.com
Barney Curtis, Executive Director	Federation of East and Southern African Road Transport Associations	+27 83 386 8202	barney@fesarta.org
Phindile Baleni Chairman	Regional Energy Regulators Association	+27 12 401 4600	Phindile.baleni@nersa.org.za
Stephen Lamar Executive VP	American Apparel and Footwear Association	800-520-2262	slamar@wewear.org
Don Greenberg AVC Advisor	East Africa Trade Hub	+254 733 411 703	dgreenberg@eatradehub.org
BOTSWANA			
Alex Flippov Director Clean energy	SATH	+267 390 0884	aflippov@satradehub.org
Romance Sampa Energy Advisor	SATH	+267 390 1027	rsampa@satradehub.org
Reginald Selelo Executive Director, Business Facilitation	Botswana Investment and Trade Centre	+267 717 14187	selelor@bitc.co.bw
NAMIBIA			
Johnny Smith CEO	Wavis Bay Corridor Group	+264 61 251 669	johnny@wbcg.com.na
Mark Bennett Apparel Advisor	Southern Africa Customs Union		
Bevan Simataa	Namibia Customs and Excise		Bevan.simataa@gov.mof.na

Commissioner			
Uazapi Maendo Deputy Director, Support Services	Namibia Customs and Excise	+264 61 209 2651	Uazapi.maendo@gov.mof.na
Yusuf Daya Deputy Director, Trade Facilitation	Southern Africa Customs Union	+264 61 295 8023	Yusuf.day@sacu.int

LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED: General, Enabling Environment, Gender

Name and Title	Organization	Contact cellphone	Email address
BOTSWANA			
Cosmas Mamhunze AGOA, Trade and Investment Specialist	SATH	+267 72 330 885	cmamhunze@satradehub.org
Brian Glancy Team Leader – Trade Facilitation Team	SATH	+267 7233 0891	bglancy@satradehub.org
Craig Dunlop Cereals Value Chain Specialist	SATH	+267 723 30884	cdunlop@satradehub.org
Kevin Kabunda Private Sector Engagement Specialist	SATH	+267 723 30870	kkabunde@satradehub.org
Mohamed Abou iiana Senior Textiles/Apparel Advisor	SATH	+267 72 891 043	mabouiana@satradehub.org
Ranga Munyaradzi Senior Customs Expert	SATH	+267 723 308 78	rmunyaradzi@satradehub.org
John James Chief of Party	SATH	+267 721 227 35	jjames@satradehub.org
George Makore Enabling Environment Director	SATH	+267 7233 0877	gmakore@satradehub.org
Willie Shumba Senior Programme Officer, Customs	SADC	+267 7341 9651	wshumba@sadc.int
Kirsten Focken SADC Promotion of Economic Integration and Trade (ProSPECT)	GIZ	+267 72 119 277	Kirsten.focken@giz.de
Matthias Bresser SADC Promotion of Economic Integration and Trade (ProSPECT)	GIZ	+267 72 118 654	matthias.bresser@giz.de
ZAMBIA			

Chiti Mulenga Deputy Head Secretariat	Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry	+260 964 748 760	cmulenga@mcti.gov.zm
Sunday Chikoti Chief Economist	Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry	+260 973 017 956	shikoti@mcti.gov.zm
Alfred Mwila Director Economic Regulation	Energy Regulation Board	+260 977 826525	amwila@erb.org.zm
Benny Kangwa Bwalya Financial Analyst	Energy Regulation Board	+260 977 504 052	bbwalya@erb.org.zm
Margaret Lungu Standards Development Manager	Zambia Bureau of Standards	+260 955 751969	mlungu@zabs.org.zm
MALAWI			
Agnes Katsonga Phiri Commissioner of Customs and Excise – Imports	Malawi Revenue Authority	+265 888 952 109	akatsonga@mra.mw
Shadric Namalomba Commissioner of Customs and Excise – Exports	Malawi Revenue Authority	+265 888 959 600	snamalomba@mra.mw
Willy Muyila Deputy Director General	Malawi Bureau of Standards	+265 888 104 514	willymuyila@mbsmw.org
LESOTHO			
Bokang Montsi National EIF Project Coordinator	Lesotho Ministry of Trade, Industry, Cooperatives and Marketing	+266 62007517/6	montsi_thulo@hotmail.com