



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



Final Performance Evaluation

Agribusiness Linkages Global Development Alliance, *Developing Egypt's Agribusiness Industry*

[July 14, 2016]

This publication was produced at the request of the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared independently by BLUE Consulting Ltd: Dr. Mohamed A. Sherif Omran, M&E Expert/ Activity Leader; Dr. David Schroder, Agribusiness Expert/ Editor; Dr. Hamdi Salem, Agriculture Economist/ Team Leader; Dr. Ayman Shelaby, Agricultural Economist; Dr. Alaa El-Beltagy, Food Processing Expert; Ms. Shaymaa M. Omran, Economic Analyst.



FINAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Agribusiness Linkages Global Development Alliance,

Developing Egypt's Agribusiness Industry

July 14, 2016

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

Contents

ACRONYMS.....	V
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VI
EVALUATION PURPOSE & EVALUATION QUESTIONS	1
PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	3
EVALUATION METHODS & LIMITATIONS	7
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	7
<i>Sample size</i>	8
LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION REPORT	9
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS	11
DESK-REVIEW FINDINGS	11
FIELD SURVEY FINDINGS.....	13
<i>Question One: What objectives/ targets were met towards AERI’s highest level results?</i>	13
<i>Question Two: What are the lessons learned from the program’s implementation that USAID/Egypt can take into consideration for future similar programs</i>	20
<i>Question Three: In what ways were stakeholder partnerships formed during the project (from design to the end of implementation)? What are areas for improvement?</i>	23
<i>Question Four: To what extent were the projects able to build capacity of the beneficiaries according to the project design?</i>	26
<i>Question Five: How have the projects developed measures to enhance women’s participation in their respective sectors?</i>	32
<i>Question Six: To what extent were systems and processes for sustainability, institutionalized, or adopted, by the associations (beyond June 2013)?</i>	35
<i>Question Seven: To what extent did the implementing partners monitor and evaluate the outcomes and impacts of the activities supported by the project? a. How did ACDI/VOCA adjust the implementation to address findings?</i>	37
RECOMMENDATIONS	38
ANNEXES.....	40
ANNEX I: EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW)	41
ANNEX II: EVALUATION METHODS.....	55
ANNEX III: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS	59

Tables

TABLE 1: BENEFICIARIES AND OTHER STOCKHOLDERS TO BE INTERVIEWED THROUGH GROUP AND/ OR ONE-TO-ONE INTERVIEWS	7
TABLE 2: NUMBER OF BENEFICIARIES WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS AND THE ONE-TO-ONE INTERVIEWS.....	8
TABLE 3: SAMPLE SIZE AND DISTRIBUTION	8
TABLE 4: ANALYTICAL TABLES: GDA – SOS & IRS	11
TABLE 5: GENDER AND EDUCATION DISTRIBUTION.....	16
TABLE 6: HOLDING AREAS AND TOMATO AREAS AS PERCENTAGE OF THE HOLDING AREAS	17
TABLE 7: DID THE PRODUCTIVITY INCREASED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?	17
TABLE 8: REASONS OF PRODUCTIVITY INCREASED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT	17
TABLE 9: DID THE PROJECT IMPROVE THE CLEANING, GRADING AND HANDLING SYSTEMS?.....	18
TABLE 10: HOW DO THE BENEFICIARIES VALUE PROJECT SUPPORT PROVIDED?	21
TABLE 11: EFFECT OF THE PROJECT ON THE ASSOCIATION IMPROVEMENT	25
TABLE 12: PROJECT SUPPORT TO THE ASSOCIATIONS	28
TABLE 13: SOURCE OF SEEDLINGS BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER PROJECT	29
TABLE 14: DID THE PROJECT IMPROVE THE AGRICULTURE SYSTEMS?	29
TABLE 15: MARKETING PROBLEMS BEFORE AND DURING PROJECT.....	30
TABLE 16: WOMEN CONTRIBUTION TO THE AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.....	33
TABLE 17: IMPACT OF THE PROJECT ON THE WOMEN’S INCOME	34
TABLE 18: WHAT ARE THE SUSTAINED ACTIVITIES AFTER THE END OF THE PROJECT?	36
TABLE 19: DID ACIDI/VOCA MONITOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION?.....	38
TABLE 20: SOURCE AND METHOD OF ANALYSIS FOR THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	56
TABLE 21: DATA COLLECTION TOOLS – QUESTIONNAIRES	60

ACRONYMS

AERI	Agricultural Exports and Rural Incomes
ALEB	Agriculture-Led Export Businesses
ASBA	Assiut Businessmen's Association
ATUT	Agricultural Technology Utilization and Transfer
AUC	American University in Cairo
CD	Country Director
CFI	Cairo Food Industries
COO	Chief Operations Officer
DDC	Desert Development Center
EU	European Union
EurepGAP	Euro-Retailer Produce Working Group Good Agricultural Practices
GDA	Global Development Alliance
GAP	Good Agricultural Practices
GOE	Government of Egypt
IMC	Industrial Modernization Center
LE	Egyptian Pounds (LE 5.68 = \$1)
MoALR	Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MT	Metric tons
OD	Organizational Development
P & J	Paste and Juice Company
PBDAC	Principal Bank for Development and Agricultural Credit
SOW	Statement of Work
US	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this final performance evaluation is to assist the USAID Mission and USAID Washington in reaching decisions related to:

- The *effectiveness* of the current approach to strengthen the food processing industry, the livelihoods of small farmers, and the capacity building;
- The *types of mechanisms/ approaches* the Mission should use in any future assistance to the sector (specifically the GDA); and
- The nature and scope of possible future projects in the sector based on *lessons learned* from the current projects.

The evaluation questions are as follow:

1. What objectives/ targets were met towards AERI's highest level results?
2. What are the lessons learned from the program's implementation that USAID/Egypt can take into consideration for future similar programs?
3. In what ways were stakeholder partnerships formed during the projects (from design to the end of implementation)? What are areas for improvement?
4. To what extent were the projects able to build capacity of the beneficiaries according to the project design?
5. How have the projects developed measures to enhance women's participation in their respective sectors?
6. To what extent were systems and processes for sustainability, institutionalized, or adopted, by the associations (beyond June 2013)?
7. To what extent did the implementing partners monitor and evaluate the outcomes and impacts of the activities supported by the project? How did ACDI/VOCA adjust the implementation to address findings?

The Agribusiness Linkages Global Development Alliance (GDA)¹, which began in March 2008, whereby USAID, the H.J. Heinz Company (HEINZ) and ACDI/VOCA, along with local partners teamed up to support the development of the agricultural sector in Egypt.

¹ USAID provided funding for the GDA under a cooperative agreement with ACDI/VOCA number 263-A-00-08-00013-00 and signed a Memorandum of Understanding with H.J. Heinz Company.

ACDI/VOCA was the principal implementing partner of the GDA, and used the value chain approach to link farmers with plots of ten or less feddans² into production groups to benefit from improved marketing opportunities and economies of scale.

The GDA assisted farmers to improve productivity by introducing new, high value varieties; integrating technology (e.g., soil and water analyses; formulating fertilizers and pesticide regimens; mechanization including sub-soiling, leveling, bed listing, etc.) into their operations; and applying better agronomic methods and farming practices, such as improved irrigation methods and post-harvest handling. The GDA's targeted areas for intervention were Luxor; Qena; Esna and Aswan in Upper Egypt; and Nubaria in North Egypt. Production groups were introduced to forward type contracting methods used by HEINZ. The forward contracting method generally committed farmers to supply participating local food processors with at least 50% of their total production of processing tomatoes. They were able to sell the remainder of their crop in the local market to take advantage of any upward change in the price of tomatoes, which has been historically volatile in Egypt. Alternate crops were of equal importance to this GDA success. While growing tomatoes using a forward contract approach with HEINZ and other participating local food processors, this would enable small-scale farmers to stabilize their income. In addition, farmers were assisted by the project to grow high value horticultural crops for export and/or high-end local markets thereby increasing their marketing opportunities and income potential.

During January 2011, as the economic and political situation in Egypt deteriorated, many farmers were unable to procure the necessary inputs such as pesticides or to visit their farms to irrigate their crops over-ripened in the fields because laborers were unwilling or unable to harvest the crops, and crop yields were substantially reduced. Farmers faced the 2011/12 crop season with insufficient liquidity to work their farms. In response to this situation, USAID expanded the scope of the GDA, in particular the ACDI/VOCA cooperative agreement, to provide additional support through an input in-kind grant program for smallholder farmers and managed by selected associations. This allowed 2,811 farmers to cultivate more than 10,400 feddans of tomatoes as they received seedlings, fertilizers and/or pesticides through a special grant type voucher program that was initiated in year 4 of the project. In addition, the GDA project was granted an additional six month extension to allow selected associations to manage the in-kind grant activity for farmers to reduce some of the constraints in the tomato value chain

² A Feddan is 4,200 square meters and a hectare is equal to 10,000 square meters.

that hinder farmers' access to quality inputs and high value markets. Also, three associations in Aswan received six fully equipped greenhouse tunnels to cultivate seedlings, and a group of three associations in Luxor received a collection center with cold trucks, pre-cooling and a cold storage facility. This work was completed under consecutive project extensions of ACDI/VOCA's cooperative agreement during the period from October 2012 to March 2013, and the final extension, which ran through June 2013.

The goal of this USAID project was to integrate 3,000 farmers into a sustainable and competitive high-value horticultural value chain anchored by HEINZ in the governorates of Sohag, Qena, Luxor, and Aswan in Upper Egypt; El Minya and Assiut in Middle Egypt; Beni Suef, Giza, and Fayoum in Northern Upper Egypt; and the Nubaria area in Lower Egypt. The planned results were to:

- Increase smallholder production of processing varieties of tomatoes to 2,000 tons of tomatoes per day by year 3, and 4,000 tons per day by year 5, with attainment of each benchmark triggering a total of around \$40 million in investments by Americana (private sector processor) in processing facilities and facility upgrades.
- Increase annual per capita incomes from tomatoes of participating smallholder farmers by an average of \$921 (LE 5,321) for 3,000 farmers by year 5 in 10,000 feddans.

In addition, the GDA objectives during the extension period were to ensure the delivery of the in-kind grants to beneficiaries and to ensure sustainable sources of income for beneficiaries. The ultimate goal of the GDA was to contribute to sustainable rural development throughout Egypt by enhancing the capacity of smallholder farmers to profitably serve as reliable suppliers of high-value horticulture to processors and other buyers. The GDA project operated through four components towards achieving its ultimate goal: Component 1: Organizing smallholder production and farm management; Component 2: Organizing smallholder marketing and sales; Component 3: Strengthening business/logistics services; and Component 4: Immediate impact and emergency grants.

This performance evaluation employed qualitative and quantitative methods to answer USAID's evaluation questions. The mixed-methods approach combined a desk review with key interviews with implementers, focus group discussions, site visits, and a quantitative survey with GDA beneficiaries. Six associations/cooperatives within three governorates (two from each governorate), and 58 farmer beneficiaries were interviewed individually. The team conducted a total of six focus group discussions with farmers. The focus groups engaged a total of 92 individuals (75 male, 17 female). BLUE Consulting also designed and administered a quantitative survey targeting key project

stakeholders (4 vendors, 7 processors, 6 NGOs (associations/cooperatives), 5 greenhouse owners, 19 field representatives, 9 master trainers, and 8 government officials), primarily to obtain their views and perceptions concerning various measures of agricultural productivity resulting from GDA activities and support provided.

Based on the desk review the evaluation team was able to determine the end of project targets and achievements for each of the strategic objectives and results. After the team conducted their field survey and focus group meetings; they were able to verify the results reported by ACDI/VOCA. Remarkably, the team agreed with most of ACDI/VOCA's reported results as verified by the evaluation team.

The GDA project collaborated with several selected vendors (agribusiness firms) for the purpose of supplying quality production inputs to smallholders. A majority of the vendors (four out of six) stated that the project assisted them in developing activities that increased their sale of inputs for the new plant varieties being promoted under the GDA. The project provided various types of assistance and support to greenhouse owners and operators to expand quality seed production, new tomato varieties, and services to farmers. The greenhouses were mainly used as nurseries and none of them were used for commercial tomato production. Most of the greenhouse owners (three out of five) who participated in the GDA project expanded the number and area of their greenhouses during implementation of the GDA compared to the number and area before the project began. Also, four out of the five owners interviewed indicated that their production costs were reduced by 25% to 50% due to better management of their inputs, especially in the use of fertilizers and pesticides.

The main problem for tomato production, identified by the growers in the three governorates (through the focus group meetings), was plant diseases especially the "**Tuta Absoluta**" pest. The GDA project assisted growers in solving this problem by providing appropriate pesticides and using appropriate application methods. Pesticides were provided to farmers in the form of a voucher (subsidy) to participating farmers, encouraging them to adopt the use of appropriate pesticides as stated by all interviewees.

In accordance with the GDA's overall objectives, the GDA project assisted growers in improving productivity through adopting good agricultural practices (GAP). As a result of the above-improved best practices adopted, it was reported through all focus groups that grower's productivity per feddan increased by approximately 25% to 30%. Not only did productivity increase, growers reported that their cost per unit (ton) of production decreased by approximately 20% to 25%.

In general, the project was successful in contributing to the Agricultural Exports and Rural Income Project's³ highest-level results under which the GDA was authorized.

The overall technical support provided by the GDA project has been reported to be significant and positive in increasing productivity and farmer incomes. However, the marketing support provided was not enough and GDA project participants indicated the assistance provided to them was inadequate in addressing their immediate marketing problems, especially in Aswan and Luxor project areas.

Partnership between the GDA project and stakeholders and between stakeholders themselves were formed during the project from year one through year five, but none of the partnerships were formed during the design and planning period for the GDA project. Vendors, greenhouse owners, processors and farmers indicated they were not engaged in the early planning of the GDA activities and they were decision-takers rather than decision-makers. NGOs associations were relatively more engaged in the design and planning of the GDA activities during implementation.

Business relationship between vendors (input providers) and greenhouse owners and between greenhouse owners and farmers were established and are relatively sustainable. Some of the association NGOs that participated in the project have continued and maintained a relationship with other stakeholders and developed new linkages that were based on their previous project experience.

As for capacity building, the vendors interviewed reported different types and levels of support provided to them by the GDA project including: training and information, established linkages and contracts between food processors and growers, and growers with greenhouses vendors. ACDI/VOCA screened and contracted several greenhouses to serve as key nurseries for GDA project target areas. All nurseries participated in the GDA activities received technical and training support from ACDI/VOCA building greenhouse nursery's staff and management capacity, which included the establishment and effective management of the greenhouse, introducing new plant varieties, improved irrigation systems and management, appropriate use and application of fertilizers, pest management and control programs, and producing quality seedlings. 100% of the sample in Behira and Luxor governorates believed that the GDA project did improve the agricultural system in their governorate. 94% of the interviewed beneficiaries in Aswan

³ See project background

also believed that the project improved their agricultural system. The beneficiaries, who said yes, believed that the GDA project improved the irrigation system (15%), fertilizer programs (25%), new varieties (20%), pest management (24%), and improved seedlings (16%).

Referring to the capacity building of the associations, two (2) greenhouses were established for the Alhekma Association in Wadi Alnokra - Aswan to expand growers' access to new quality seedlings thereby reducing their need to travel long distance to obtain quality seedling. The Women's Association in Luxor, as a result of GDA assistance, contracted other food processors and exporters to supply onions after the project period ended. Also, the GDA project supported the establishment of a cooling facility in Isna, which now serves three associations in generating revenue and expanded services to their members. No formal financial support (farm credit or loans) was offered to any of the beneficiaries and stakeholders except for providing a voucher program (in-kind subsidy) for farmers to adopt production inputs such as quality seedlings, fertilizers, and pesticides.

All greenhouse owners interviewed reported up to 50% to 90% of personnel in nurseries were female and most of them received training through the GDA project.

Only a few females were interviewed outside of the women from the Women Association in Luxor. The focus group meeting participants emphasized the role of females in crop cultivation as significant but limited to several practices such as harvesting and packaging of tomatoes, and sometimes, transplanting of seedlings as reported throughout the five focus groups. These practices generally represent 25% to 50% of the required labor, as they are labor-intensive operations. The GDA project impact on women's incomes reported positive or neutral. Food processing is an attractive employment area for female labor. Four processors interviewed stated that female laborers represent from 12%-50% of total labor force in the different food processing phases. The engagements of females in associations' activities were very limited as reported by four association officials who were interviewed.

Sustainable relationships between vendors (input providers), associations and greenhouse owners have been maintained through the GDA project. Agricultural practices adopted by greenhouse owners and farmers are still being applied. Activities initiated by the associations NGOs during the project period are mostly functioning. The associations in Behira and Luxor went further to extend their activities to other crops, after the GDA project ended. Grower relationship with processors through forward contracting was not sustainable.

ACDI/VOCA was reported to do monitoring of its activities offered by the project to beneficiaries and stakeholders, in particular the technical support and training provided. Evaluation of the GDA project activities implemented by ACDI/VOCA was not verified through the evaluation team's field visits and interviews, however; it was verified from the desk review of ACDI/VOCA's annual and final report. ACDI/VOCA regularly collected data every year to evaluate project achievements, reported on indicators and measured progress against the GDA project baseline and planned target levels.

EVALUATION PURPOSE & EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The purpose of this assignment is to conduct an evaluation of the Global Development Alliance (GDA) with HEINZ implemented by ACDI/VOCA under the cooperative agreement (award #: 263-A-00-08-00013). The GDA project began in March 2008 and ended June 2013.

This evaluation will serve a dual purpose: 1) learn to what extent the GDA project objectives and goals, at all result levels, have been achieved; and 2) to inform the design of future projects, particularly using the GDA approach⁴, working in the tomato or rotational crop value chains.

The evaluation used quantitative and qualitative data and was based on the perception of the stakeholders (i.e. farmers, private sector processors, greenhouse operators, traders, input suppliers, associations, etc.) and relevant staff of the Ministry of Agriculture, occurring approximately three years after the GDA implementation period ended. Also the evaluation collected feedback on GDA project achievements, how it was implemented, and stakeholders and beneficiaries' value and perception of what results were actually achieved.

The seven main evaluation questions are as follow:

1. What objectives/targets were met towards AERI's highest level results?
2. What are the lessons learned from the program's implementation that USAID/Egypt can take into consideration for future similar programs?
3. In what ways were stakeholder partnerships formed during the project (from design to the end of implementation)? What are areas for improvement?
4. To what extent was the project able to build capacity of the beneficiaries according to the project design?
5. How have the project developed measures to enhance women's participation in their respective sectors?

⁴ Global Development Alliance (GDA) --A GDA is a partnership involving USAID and the private sector where the partners work together to develop and implement activities that leverage and apply our respective assets and expertise to advance core business interests, achieve USAID's development objectives, and increase the sustainable impact of USAID's development investments. GDAs mobilize at least \$1 in resources from private sector partners for every \$1 USAID contributes.

6. To what extent were systems and processes for sustainability, institutionalized, or adopted, by the associations (beyond June 2013)?
7. To what extent did the implementing partner monitor and evaluate the outcomes and impacts of the activities supported by the project? How did ACDI/VOCA adjust the implementation to address findings?

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Agribusiness Linkages Global Development Alliance (GDA) project was authorized to contribute to the Economic Growth Objective and the Agriculture Program Area of the AERI project through providing support for agricultural trade expansion, small-scale producers and producer and marketing associations to increase private sector competitiveness.

The Agribusiness Linkage GDA Goal was: to contribute to sustainable rural development throughout Egypt by enhancing the capacity of smallholder farmers to profitably serve as reliable suppliers of high-value horticulture to processors and other buyers by integrating 3,000 farmers into a sustainable and competitive high-value horticultural value chain anchored by HEINZ in the governorates of Sohag, Qena, Luxor, and Aswan in Upper Egypt; El Minya and Assiut in Middle Egypt; Beni Suef, Giza and Fayoum in Northern Upper Egypt; and the Nubaria area in lower Egypt. Intended planned results were:

- Increase smallholder production of processing varieties of tomatoes to 2,000 tons of tomatoes per day by year 3, and 4,000 tons per day by year 5, with attainment of each benchmark triggering a total of around \$40 million in investments by Americana (private sector processor) in processing facilities and facility upgrades.
- Increase annual per capita incomes from tomatoes of participating smallholder farmers by an average of \$921 (LE 5,321) for 3,000 farmers by year 5 in 10,000 feddans.

The Strategic Objectives were:

- Strengthened tomato processing sector as measured by increased production of processing tomato varieties in Egypt and increased tomato processing sector supply.
- Annual per capita incomes from tomatoes increased by an average of \$921 (LE 5,231) for 3,000 participating smallholder farmers by Year 5 in 10,000 feddans.

The GDA initially was designed to have three components, and in 2011, a fourth component was added. The four components and the intermediate results are as follows:

Component 1: Organizing smallholder production and farm management

Intermediate Result 1.1: Improved utilization or implementation of new agricultural technology and techniques

IR 1.1.1: 85% of smallholders adopting new technology or techniques

IR 1.1.2: 60% of smallholders utilizing new seed varieties for tomatoes & alternative crops

Intermediate Result 1.2: Improved yields (increase in MT of tomatoes harvested per feddan)

IR 1.2.1: Tomato yield increasing from an average of 12-15 MT per feddan to more than 30 MT per feddan

IR 1.2.2: 20% decrease in crop spoilage & losses as a result of improved harvest & post-harvest practices

Intermediate Result 1.3: Improved return on investment for smallholders

IR 1.3.1: 20% decrease in production costs (as a percentage of revenue)

Component 2: Organizing smallholder marketing and sales

Intermediate Result 2.1: Strengthened producer-buyer linkages

IR 2.1.1: 40% of all crops (tomatoes and alternate crops) sold into processing or exporting channels (contingent on market prices)

Component 3: Strengthening business/logistics services

Intermediate Result 3.1: Improved production of hybrid seedlings

IR 3.1.1: 60% increase in survivability rate of seedlings in the greenhouse and in the field

IR 3.1.2: 20% increase in income for greenhouses from the sale of seedlings

Intermediate Result 3.2: Improved application of pesticides

IR 3.2.2: 500 applicators/ operators trained prior to MoALR qualification and licensing

Component 4: Immediate impact emergency grants.

Intermediate Result 4.1: Improved farmers' access to quality inputs

IR 4.1.1: 75% of participating farmers receiving vouchers upon attending relevant training

Intermediate Result 4.2: Strengthen Associations' capacity to manage distribution of agricultural inputs to members

IR 4.2.1: Three associations manage distribution of the inputs to the farmers in year 4 and 8 associations in year 5.

Intermediate Result 4.3: Strengthened Supply Chain Linkages

IR 4.3.1: 3 processors participate in the grants component in year 4, 5 processors in year 5, and 2 processors develop proposals for USAID in year 4.

Project Modifications

In April 2010, USAID/Egypt conducted a Rapid Assessment of the project. In response, the Year 3 Work Plan for the GDA was modified by geographical area concentration, as were the two strategic objectives for the project. Going forward, GDA project activities focused primarily on production groups in the South (Esna, approaching it from the North in Qena and from the South in Aswan) and in the North (Nubaria production region). Also, ACDI/VOCA closed their field office in Minya; however, given their working relationship with the World Food Program, ACDI/VOCA continued to support farmer production groups in Beni-Suef due to their willing cooperation to work under forward price contracts with selected food processors from the industrial cities located in the North..

This geographical refocus reduced the number of feddans and farmers enrolled in the project. Thus, ACDI/VOCA amended the first strategic objective of the project to:

1. Strengthened tomato processing sector as measured by:
 - a. Increased production of processing tomato varieties in Egypt
 - b. Increased tomato processing sector supply (and raw tomato demand)

Additionally, in order to reach the objective of 10,000 feddans of processing tomatoes under production by year 5, no more than 3,000 farmers could be enrolled in the project. Therefore, the second objective was amended and changed to:

2. Annual per capita incomes from tomatoes increased by an average of \$921 (LE 5,231 during an exchange rate of 5.7 EGP/dollar) for 3,000 participating smallholder farmers by Year 5 in 10,000 feddans.

No-cost Extension

In September 2012, ACDI/VOCA was granted a six- month, no-cost extension (October 2012 - March 2013). During this time, ACDI/VOCA completed the summer 2012 season in Nubaria (North Egypt), where 3,000 feddans of tomato were under production, and the crop was harvested from June through August. In southern Egypt, farmers grew approximately 3,000 feddans of sesame as their summer crop, and it was harvested in September and October. ACDI/VOCA continued to provide these farmers with technical assistance and training as well as marketing support until the harvests was completed. Additionally, in March 2013, ACDI/VOCA was granted an additional three-month no-cost extension (March 2013-June 2013). During this time ACDI/VOCA provided grants to associations to establish greenhouses, a collection center, two cold trucks and three field coolers. With respect to the approved extension, the result framework was further

modified to include an additional strategic objective and two additional intermediate results and sub-intermediate results as follows:

Strategic Objective: Enhanced the capacity of Upper Egypt associations to serve the farming communities in the areas of marketing, forward contracting and access to inputs.

The two Intermediate results that contribute to the achievement of the SO are:

Intermediate Result 5: Enhanced capacity of associations to provide effective, beneficial services to their members and to develop rural communities. This IR 5 had four sub-levels IRs.

Intermediate Result 6: Reinforced information that has been transferred to farmers throughout the GDA project in order to assure sustainability. This IR had two sub-levels IRs.

EVALUATION METHODS & LIMITATIONS

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation approach being used to evaluate the GDA activity authorized under the AERI project is based on using: 1) project records and secondary data, and information from available project documentation; and 2) primary data and information collected through questionnaires using one-to-one interviews and targeted focus groups to collect stakeholder perceptions concerning GDA project performance and results achieved. Table 1 summarizes which groups participated in the focus group meetings and which groups were interviewed individually. The survey questionnaires included different types of questions to insure that the evaluation team received correct and accurate information. For example, the evaluation team asked the same question to different stakeholders as well as similar questions which were worded differently to effectively triangulate stakeholder responses (identify a data point from different angles) concerning targeted data and information. All the questions and expected answers in all the questionnaires were coded to easily identify the observations during the analysis phase.

Table 1: Beneficiaries and other stockholders to be interviewed through group and/ or one-to-one interviews

Group	GDA	Focus Group meeting	One-to-one interviews
I	Private sector processors, greenhouse operators, traders, input suppliers		√
II	Farmers/Association Members	√	√
III	Association Staff		√
IV	Relevant staff of the Ministry of Agriculture		√

Notes: Group II was interviewed through group meetings and a selected number of them were interviewed individually after the group meeting to respond to a larger set of questions.

The evaluation team performed a desk review of core project documents, as the first step, to extract the achievements and impacts from project implementation. The team reviewed official ACIDI/VOCA work plans, progress reports, mid-term reviews and the end of project report. The Agribusiness Linkages GDA achievements were well identified and recorded. The second step was to design appropriate questionnaires (data collection tools – see Annex III) to collect primary data on perceptions from project beneficiaries and stakeholders concerning project achievements and results.

Table 21 in Annex III has a column entitled “**Evaluation Question**” and each question in the different questionnaires has a value from 1 to 7. In some cases, a question may

have two values. This means the answer provided a response to parts of two evaluation questions. The evaluation questions are provided in Annex III at the end of Table 21.

Sample size

The sample size that was proposed in the SOW was 3% of the beneficiaries of the GDA project in each governorate. The evaluation team proposed an increase in the number of the farmers' beneficiaries that were interviewed using the focus group meeting method. This permitted a larger number of participants to be interviewed within a shorter time period and without adding additional costs. This was an appropriate solution to reducing potential sample bias due to a small sample size.

Table 2 includes the number of farmers' beneficiaries that attended the focus group meetings and those who participated in the one-to-one interviews. The study team increased the number of farmers met from 64 to 117 farmers.

Table 2: Number of Beneficiaries who participated in the Focus Group Meetings and the One-to-One Interviews

Governorate	Number of beneficiaries			Total
	Only One-to-One	Both Interviews and FG	Only FG	
Behira (Nubaria)	8	11	11	30
Aswan	6	13	20	39
Luxor	11	9	28	48
Total	25	33	59	117

Table 3 includes the sample size that was used to collect the required information to analyze the analytical table and to answer the above mentioned evaluation questions.

The evaluation team was able to individually interview 58 growers, as well as, 92 growers in farmer group meetings, which increased the number of farmer beneficiaries that were individually interviewed and the overall sample size. Also, the team interviewed 13 farmers (control group) who did not participate in the project. These interviews were in addition to the 58 stakeholders, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Sample Size and Distribution

Governorate/ Location	Beneficiaries			Other stakeholders interviewed						
	Individual Interviews	Group Meetings	Control Group	Vendors	Processors	NGOs	Greenhouse	Field Representatives	Master Trainers	Government Officials
Aswan	19	33	7			2	1	2		2
Luxor	20	37	3			2	3	9		2
Behira (Nubaria)	19	22	3			2	1	8		2
Great Cairo				4	7				9	2
Total	58	92	13	4	7	6	5	19	9	8

Limitations of the Evaluation Report

The GDA project as well as the ACDI/VOCA's cooperative agreement ended in June 2013, i.e. approximately three years ago. Given the elapsed time of three years in which this performance evaluation is being conducted, project beneficiaries interviewed may not recall the specific details of the Agribusiness Linkages GDA project. This caused some difficulty in arranging the meetings with stakeholders and obtaining accurate and specific information.

This assignment started on July 26, 2015, as scheduled. The team started with a desk review and BLUE Consulting submitted a letter to the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MoALR) requesting to start the fieldwork with the Agricultural Directorates and Agricultural Cooperatives in Behira (Nubaria), Aswan and Luxor governorates. The Ministry of Agriculture had to approve the meetings with its affiliated Directorates in the targeted governorates. Unfortunately due to the excessive time required to obtain the government's approval, the work had to be stopped on October 11, 2015 for approximately four months until the Government of Egypt (GOE) approved the proposed field visits to the agricultural directorates and cooperatives. The work resumed on February 12, 2016.

This evaluation faced a number of other challenges and limitations. The limitations discussed below are limitations to the evaluation and should not be considered as limitations of the GDA project.

- Due to miscommunication with ACDI/VOCA staff during the early implementation of this evaluation, BLUE Consulting team was not able to obtain a complete list of beneficiaries from ACDI/VOCA. This proved a challenge when determining how to identify project beneficiaries to participate in the field surveys. The evaluation team worked with selected farmer associations and cooperatives to draw a sample of beneficiaries from their records. ACDI/VOCA provided the evaluation team with a complete list of vendors, processors, field representatives (who received training under the project), master trainers, and greenhouse owners, which was used to select a random sample of beneficiaries/stakeholders.
- Selection bias—the survey sample was drawn by relying on the association records to identify project farmer beneficiaries, which could introduce selection bias. Selection bias is an inherent risk when implementers or project participants help to facilitate contact with project beneficiaries, as they may select the most active, responsive, or engaged beneficiaries, meaning that the evaluation team may only hear from key informants who report positive experiences. During the first meeting of the evaluation team in Nubaria we informed the Cooperative staff on how to select a random sample from their list of farmers. The evaluation team

conveyed the same information to the other associations/cooperatives in Aswan and Luxor to reduce the effect of the sample selection bias. Meanwhile, the evaluation team performed a total of six focus group meetings (11-19 beneficiaries in each group meeting), which represented one focus group meeting held in each selected association/cooperative. The focus group meeting allowed for open discussion and consensus on questions, thereby minimizing anticipated sample selection bias.

- Recall the end of the project—given that the project activities ended three years prior to the evaluation team’s fieldwork, some key informants could have provided inaccurate or incomplete recollection about GDA activities and experiences. Because beneficiaries, in particular farmers, do not normally keep written farm records, they only gave their best estimates of historical crop sales and incomes, and therefore are only an approximation of their true values.
- Also, the sample size, which is relatively small, statistical inferences, should be drawn carefully from the survey findings.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Desk-review findings

As indicated in the report methodology, the evaluation work started with a desk review of available GDA documents. Based on the review of documents, the following table summarizes the project goal, strategic objectives and intermediate results, targeted results, documented achievements as amended, and the evaluation team's remarks and comments.

Table 4: Analytical Tables: GDA – SOs & IRs⁵

#	Objective or Indicator	End of Project Target	End of Project Achievement	Evaluation Team's Remarks and Comments
O1	Volume of processing tomatoes cultivated and available to the industry	3,000 MT per day	4,713 MT per day	The team agrees with end of project achievement, a 57 percent increased above end of project target based on tomatoes cultivated and available to the industry reported in project documents. What could not be verified is the percent provided by project participant growers due to the small number of growers interviewed through the field survey, which occurred three years after project ended. Also, the project only worked with a small number of food processors and they could not provide data concerning their daily tonnage amounts in the interviews.
O2	Average net income from tomatoes per feddan increased	\$1,091	\$3,007 winter \$1,189 summer	These are the project documented 2011/2012 numbers appear reasonable. The 5 years average numbers were not reported. The team agrees, to the 2011/2012 numbers as the average yield reported by interviewees were reported to be high. Although the prices were down due to contracts problems and issues between farmers and processors.
IR 1.1.1	Percentage of participating smallholders adopting new technology or techniques	85%	100%	The team agrees to this percentage rate based on project documents and interviewees responses concerning adopting GAP provided through the project.
IR 1.1.2a	Percentage of smallholders using new seed varieties for tomatoes	90%	100%	The team agrees to this percentage reported in 2011/2012 seasons, as the seedlings were provided (for free) by ACDI/VOCA to participating farmers.
IR	Percentage of	55%	50%	The team interviewed only 3 farmers who

⁵ The objective and indicators are based on the project final report

#	Objective or Indicator	End of Project Target	End of Project Achievement	Evaluation Team's Remarks and Comments
1.1.2b	smallholders using new seed varieties for alternative crops			cultivated alternate crops. The team could not verify the achievement percentage and agree with end of project estimated reported in project documents.
IR 1.1.3	Reduced pesticide residuals on crops	NA	100% of samples tested below MRLs, with 50% showing no residues	The evaluation team agrees with the achievement of reduced pesticide use by farmers through the results of the one to one meetings with the vendors and farmers, and the focus group meetings with growers (farmers).
IR 1.2.1	Average yield per feddan for tomatoes	30+ MT per feddan	28.3 MT per feddan	The team agrees with project end of project achievement, based on one to one and focus groups discussions concerning yield achievements with project participants.
IR 1.2.2	Decrease in tomato crop spoilage and losses as a result of improved harvest and post-harvest practices	20% decrease in losses		Losses, according to the interviewees were not reduced by the percentage reported in project documentation, as most of interviewees reported no assistance provided from the project in post-harvest practices. Also, the waiting time outside the processors (during delivery) spoiled a large amount of delivered tomatoes and the factory rejected them.
IR 1.3.1	Change in average per feddan production cost of tomatoes as a percentage of total sales	20% decrease from baseline	45% decrease from baseline (2012 value: production costs represent 47% of total sales)	Interviewees reported a decrease in production costs due to the reduced usage of nitrogen fertilizers. Unfortunately the evaluation team could not verify the estimate provided in project documents based on interviews held.
IR 2.1.1	Percentage of all crops (tomatoes and alternate crops) sold into processing or exporting channels (contingent on market prices)	40%	22% of tomato crop and 100% of the sesame crop sold to processors or exporters during final GDA crop season, (Summer 2012)	Only Behira farmers supplied tomatoes to processors, therefore, the team could not verify the percentage reported, as it requires official records to be provided by processors, which they did not provide to the evaluation team. The team could not verify this achievement reported in project documents for the sesame crop. The sesame crop has to be processed and farmers do not store sesame for long period, therefore the estimates provided in project documents are likely correct.
IR 3.1.1	Survivability rate of seedlings in the nurseries	95%	94.5%	The team agrees to this percentage estimate provided by project documents and verified based on greenhouse owners interviewed.
IR 3.1.2	Increase in income for nurseries from the sale of seedlings	4.1 LE net return per tray	4.59 LE net return per tray	The team agrees to this value due to the reduced quantity of fertilizers used reported by a majority of greenhouse owners that were interviewed.
IR 3.3.1	Percentage of farmers having access to credit (in the forms of value	50%	100%	The team could not verify this achievement as no one of the interviewees reported they received any facilitation assistance offered by ACDI staff to access new finance. Further

#	Objective or Indicator	End of Project Target	End of Project Achievement	Evaluation Team's Remarks and Comments
	chain financing, loans or grants)			analysis would need to be done to verify this estimate.
IR 4.2.1	Number of associations that managed the distribution of in-kind grants to farmers	11 associations	15 associations	The team received a list of 12 associations provided which in-kind grants to farmers. The team selected a sample of six associations to be interviewed.
IR 4.3.1a	Number of processors participating in the grants component.	5 processors	6 processors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFI-Heinz • P&J • Al Ain • Al Kanana • Expert • Green Valley 	The team could only meet with seven processors out of a list of twenty (20) firms obtained from ACDI/VOCA; the interviewed firms are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFI-Heinz • P&J • Al Ain • ICAPP • Wadi Foods • Agrofood • Special Foods Industry International

Source: Agribusiness Linkages Global Development Alliance, Final Report dated February 23, 2014; and the findings of the evaluation analysis in 2016.

Field survey findings

It should be mentioned that the AERI project was designed to achieve the following high level results; small and medium size farms would increase the volume and value of production, especially horticultural products, through improved crop selection, and improvements in production and post-harvest technologies.

The data collection and analysis were designed to answer the seven evaluation questions, as per the SOW. Follows are the findings, and conclusion for each of the evaluation seven questions.

Question One: What objectives/ targets were met towards AERI's highest level results?

Findings

The findings in this section will cover the responses from the beneficiaries and stakeholders concerning the first evaluation question.

Vendors

The GDA program collaborated with several selected vendors (agribusiness firms) for the purpose of supplying quality production inputs to small holders. The evaluation team interviewed six vendors (including seeds producers). A majority of the vendors

(four out of six) stated that the project assisted them in developing activities that increased their sale of seeds and introduced new plant varieties. Also, the project trained technical advisors in the Nubaria Association for Marketing of Fruits and Vegetables. However, the remaining two vendors didn't receive any assistance for the development of their companies' activities. The seed providers (vendors), which participated in the project, indicated that they experienced increased germination ratios of seeds provided to the greenhouses.

The GDA project changed farmer's management and use of the traditionally-used pesticides to low residual pesticides, which helped in increasing productivity, quality and the quantities supplied to processors as stated by three out of four suppliers. Smaller quantities of pesticides were used by farmers, which reduced production costs and increased farm income of participated farmers, as stated by three vendors. They (vendors) indicated that increased farmer income was likely due to increased crop productivity. Responses of the vendors were based on the ongoing relationship between them, the greenhouse owners and the farmers during the project period. These vendors recognized the project efforts in helping farmers understand the value and use of appropriate pesticides and in particular using good agricultural practices.

Greenhouse Owners

The GDA project provided various types of assistance and support to greenhouse owners and operators to expand quality seed production and services to farmers. The greenhouses were mainly used as nurseries and none of them were used for commercial tomato production. Five greenhouse owners were interviewed. Most of the greenhouse owners (three out of five) who participated in the project expanded the number and area of their greenhouses during the project compared to the number and area before the project. The primary reason for this was the increased number of participating farmers and their demand for new seedlings. However, there were some greenhouse owners who decided not to expand their greenhouse operations due to their limited financing and management capacity. Fortunately, none of the greenhouse owners decreased their number of nurseries during or after the project period, as they benefited from project technical assistance and training.

Two of the greenhouse owners, who participated in the project, faced some production problems before the project including but not limited to soil salinity and soil fungus infections. The project provided technical assistance to help owners solve these problems and other technical problems. Two of the interviewed greenhouse owners reported that their greenhouse productivity increased due to improved seedling germination and the technical assistance provided by the project to solve the previously mentioned problems. The other three greenhouse owners reported no changes in their greenhouses' operations or productivity. Also, four owners out the five interviewed indicated that their production costs were reduced by 25% to 50% due to better management of their inputs, especially in the use of fertilizers.

Most of the greenhouses owners interviewed indicated that they gained new customers that lead to increased sales and business revenues, which was due to the technical and training assistance provided to them.

Growers (farmers)

Focus group meetings

The main problem for tomato production, stated by the growers in the three governorates through the focus groups, was plant diseases especially the "**Tuta Absoluta**" pest. The project assisted growers in solving this problem by providing appropriate pesticides. This was provided to farmers in the form of a voucher (subsidy) to participating farmers, encouraging them to adopt the use of appropriate pesticides as stated by all interviewees.

Another problem mentioned, critically, by Aswan growers was the shortage of improved seedlings and, accordingly, growers had to buy them from nurseries located in Isna District, which is a long distance from the project target areas. The GDA project, in the case of Alhekma Association in Wadi Alnokra, provided support for establishing two greenhouses that produced improved seedlings, which reduced the needs for the farmers to travel long distances to buy quality seedlings from Isna. Also, the GDA project, trained the staff of the association on the management and production of seedlings.

In accordance with the GDA's overall objectives, the GDA project assisted growers in improving productivity through adopting good agricultural practices (GAP), as agreed by most of the focus groups' participants, such as:

- Adjusting the planting periods,
- Improving land preparation before cultivation,
- Using improved cultivation methods,
- Improve the irrigation systems, including water management,
- Using fertilizers effectively through better application, amounts, and types,
- Planting new varieties that improved yields and resistant to diseases,
- Using pest control methods and proper disposal of pesticide materials,
- Improving access to better seedlings from participating nurseries, and
- Using technical support.

As a result of the above-improved best practices adopted, it was reported through all focus groups that grower's productivity per feddan increased by approximately 25% to 30%. Not only did productivity increase, growers reported that their cost per unit (ton) of production decreased by approximately 20% to 25%. This was due primarily to changes in the application and better use of fertilizers and increased productivity thereby reducing costs per unit, as reported by project beneficiaries.

As for the marketing side, growers traditionally sell their production to local traders and wholesale traders located in local wholesale markets while a few growers, in Luxor, normally sold their tomato production to exporters before the project began. This situation remained the same during the project period for Luxor. In Behira, the growers' production of Alhoda and Alshohada Associations were sold to the HEINZ processing operation, as HEINZ was committed to accepting all supplied quantities of tomatoes under the GDA. Other food processors were reported to have procured some tomatoes from growers, but there were problems with the associations and the forward contracts issued with growers that were not resolved.

Individual interviews

Table 5 includes gender and education description of the beneficiary sample and a control group. The beneficiary sample consisted of 58 beneficiaries and the control group consisted of 13 individuals who did not participate in the project. Majority of the beneficiaries were male and had university or technical educations. It was not easy to interview the women due to their small representation in the group discussions in most of the associations except for the Women Association in Luxor. Also, most of the participants of the control group knew nothing about the project, or had the chance to be part of the project. Under the control group, there were no female participants that attended the focus group discussions.

Table 5: Gender and education distribution

Governorate	Gender		Education				
	Male	Female	University	Technical	Secondary School	Read & write	Illiterate
Behira (Nubaria)	100%	0%	32%	42%	5%	10%	11%
Aswan	100%	0%	17%	50%	6%	10%	17%
Luxor	85%	15%	24%	38%	0%	14%	24%
Total with project	95%	5%	24%	43%	3%	13%	17%
Total Control Group	100%	0%	18%	18%	0%	46%	18%

Source: Study Survey 2016

Table 6 includes tomato areas as percentage of the holding areas in the three governorates for beneficiaries and the control group. The table shows that the project increased the area of tomato cultivation for the beneficiaries of the project in the three governorates (especially in Luxor), meanwhile, the percent of the control group declined slightly from 27% to 23% after the project ended. Unfortunately, the percent of tomato area, which increased during the project time period, dropped after the project ended. As reported by beneficiaries interviewed, this was due to the drop in prices they experienced in marketing their crop as well as the increased costs of production they incurred, after the project ended its support, leading to a reduction in planted acreage.

Table 6: Holding areas and tomato areas as percentage of the holding areas

Governorate	Holding	Tomato Area (%)		
	Area (fd)	Before	Within	After
Behira (Nubaria)	176.7	27%	39%	29%
Aswan	111.5	30%	49%	35%
Luxor	122.5	39%	85%	41%
Total with project	410.7	31%	55%	34%
Total Control Group	260.8	27%	20%	23%

Source: Study Survey 2016

Table 7 includes the responses of 52 farmers who answered the questions about increased productivity, as a result of the project. In the three governorates, 90% of the interviewed beneficiaries reported that their productivity increased by about 37%.

Table 7: Did the productivity increased as a result of the project?

Governorate	% of Number of Beneficiaries reported productivity:			% of Change of productivity as a result of the project		
	Increased	No Change	Decreased	Increased	No Change	Decreased
Behira (Nubaria)	94%	6%	0%	27%	0%	n/a
Aswan	80%	20%	0%	50%	0%	n/a
Luxor	95%	5%	0%	38%	0%	n/a
Total with project	90%	10%	0%	37%	0%	n/a

Source: Study Survey 2016

Table 8 includes the responses of 47 farmers who reported that farm productivity was increased as a result of the project. The causes of increased productivity were adoption of better varieties (37%), improved irrigation system (20%), better fertilizer use and management (36%), marketing system improved (0%), and other reasons (6%) such as technical assistance provided, better pest control management used, changing the timing of production, etc.

Table 8: Reasons of productivity increased as a result of the project

Governorate	Variety Changes	Irrigation System Improved	Fertilizer System Improved	Marketing System Improved	Others
Behira (Nubaria)	34%	25%	39%	0%	2%
Aswan	43%	11%	32%	0%	14%
Luxor	37%	22%	37%	0%	4%
Total with project	37%	20%	36%	0%	6%

Source: Study Survey 2016

Table 9 shows the percent of beneficiaries who responded to the following two questions: *"Did the project improve the cleaning, grading and handling systems?"* and *"Did post-harvest losses decrease?"* as well as reducing the percentage of crop losses, as a result of project interventions. The majority of beneficiaries in the three governorates stated that the project did not effectively improve the cleaning, grading and handling system. Only an average of 24% of the beneficiaries in the three

governorates indicated that the project improved their post-harvest levels. The beneficiaries, who said yes, believe that the percentage of crop losses they experienced improved by percent ranged from 5% to 7% in the three governorates.

Table 9: Did the project improve the cleaning, grading and handling systems?

Governorate	Cleaning, grading and handling system were improved		Did post-harvest losses decrease?		% of losses reduced (improvement)
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Behira (Nubaria)	47%	53%	37%	63%	5%
Aswan	24%	76%	23%	77%	5%
Luxor	15%	85%	15%	85%	7%
Total with project	28%	72%	24%	76%	5%

Source: Study Survey 2016

Processors

The project collaborated with several food processors during the GDA project period. Seven processors were interviewed; one of them didn't exist before the project started and established his processing firm in 2009, during the project period. Food processors who participated in GDA project activities traditionally purchased their raw material from producers through forward contracts (two processors), intermediary traders (five processors), wholesale markets (two processors), and/ or from their own farms (one processor). During the project period the food processors interviewed continued to purchase their raw material from the same sources and some of them expanded their forward contracts with existing growers as well as established new links with other growers. One of the processors was expecting the project to work with growers to expand organic tomato production; however, he mentioned that the project didn't succeed in helping the expansion of organic raw material, to meet his planned needs.

The project did succeed in establishing new links between food processors and some association and, accordingly, made quality and timely raw materials more available to food processors especially through the Nubaria associations. In some other cases, the project provided information to processors about new varieties, areas and growers of specific raw materials.

As for the quality of raw material provided during the project period, three of the food processors interviewed mentioned the improved quality of raw material through the planting of better varieties for processing and the use of post-harvest practices (sorting and grading). However, there were two processors that mentioned they experienced no changes in the quality of raw material they received.

As for the quality of raw materials received after the project period different responses were recorded by food processors interviewed such as:

- Majority of the food processors believed the situation is much better than before the project, as growers implemented project recommendations that improved product quality and increased production, and
- A few food processors stated that the project didn't succeed as well in sustaining growers' attitudes towards increasing production and quality.

As for the capacity of the food processing firms participating in the GDA project, two different opinions were stated.

- Increased capacity for small-scale processing firms was achieved due to establishing new contracts with growers and associations during the first year of the project as stated by three food processors, and
- Other food processors stated that they didn't expand their processing capacity due to inadequate quantity supplied by growers. For example, one food processor mentioned specifically that the quantities supplied by small-scale growers were too small of an amount compared to his processing requirements; therefore he did not invest in expanding his operation.

Associations' Staff

All the five associations' officials interviewed mentioned that several training programs were conducted by the project for participating association for their board members and staff. Training programs included strategic planning, organization and managing meetings effectively, budgeting and developing new income sources. It was reported that GDA project activities offered improved association's management system and increased the skills and capacity of their staff, as reported by the interviewees.

Conclusions

It should be mentioned that the AERI project was designed to achieve the following:

- For small and medium size farms, they would increase their volume and value of production, especially horticultural products, through improved crop selection, and improvements in production and post-harvest technologies. To achieve this result, the GDA project provided assistance to targeted agribusiness vendors and greenhouse owners where vendors increased their sale of seeds and introduced new plant varieties through farm demonstration and extension activities, while greenhouses (nurseries) expanded their activities and experienced increased germination ratios, increased survival ratios, and higher sales. The GDA project was able to contribute to AERI's achievement of planned highest-level results.
- As for growers, they received technical assistance, which led to increased farm productivity per feddan by 25% to 30% and reduced the cost per unit (ton) of production by 20% to 25%. Area cultivated with tomatoes increased and new technologies (mainly new seeds' varieties, cultivation methods, irrigation

methods and proper pest control techniques) were adopted during the project period.

- As for processors, responses about the changes in quality of raw material received after the project period varied from one interviewee to another. Small-scale processors in general expanded their capacity due to project assistance and increased availability and timeliness of quality raw material.
- Associations that participated in the project received training, which led to building their staff and board members' capacity and improved their work conditions.
- In general, the project was successful in contributing to the achievement of AERI's highest-level results as farm production increased and good agriculture practices adopted by farmers.

Question Two: What are the lessons learned from the program's implementation that USAID/Egypt can take into consideration for future similar programs

Findings

The findings in this section will cover the responses of beneficiaries and stakeholders to the second evaluation question.

Vendors

The vendors interviewed provided different opinions with regard to support provided by the project. Responses varied from enough support as reported by three vendors, enough to some extent as reported by one vendor, and not enough as reported by two vendors. Issues to be considered in future projects by USAID as mentioned by the vendors interviewed include:

- Develop the know-how, that is strengthen skills and capacities, rather than provide financial support,
- Support a wide range of crops versus focusing on just one crop,
- Extend the project areas to include other regions,
- Introduce new machinery and equipment,
- Assist firms in increasing their production efficiency in the project areas, and
- Offer training to different stakeholders.

Greenhouse Owners

The support provided by the project to greenhouse owners was enough (reported by three owners) or enough to some extent (reported by two owners). Owners stated the following issues to be considered in future projects by USAID:

- Increase and extend the level of technical support to project participants, and
- Provide more assistance in marketing of farm production.

Growers (farmers)

Focus groups

The support provided by the project to growers was stated by the growers through the focus groups to be enough or enough to some extent. Growers have identified the following issues should be considered in future projects by USAID:

- Pay more attention to marketing, as it affects the success of the project significantly,
- Extend the implementation period to more than one year (two years in some areas) as most of the beneficiaries consider that the project period is the period when the project provided in-kind grants to growers,
- Support processing firms within the project areas and assist processors to effectively communicate to growers which varieties to cultivate for processing and increase cultivated areas,
- Matchmaking growers with processors in target areas to reduce transportation costs,
- Differentiate the crops supported to include more crops,
- Ensure the sustainability of the project activities,
- Engage growers in developing farm production plans and participate in project activities more, and
- Ensure seriousness of participating growers.

Despite the above mentioned issues, the overall technical and training support provided by the project has been reported to be significant and positive in increasing productivity and farmer incomes. However, the marketing support provided was not enough and project participants indicated the assistance provided to be inadequate, especially in Aswan and Luxor project areas.

Individual interviews

Table 10 includes the opinions of the project beneficiaries about the sufficiency of the project support. Sixty percent (60%) of the interviewed beneficiaries in Luxor felt that the project support was sufficient, in Nubaria the percent was 53%, and in Aswan the percent was 40%.

Table 10: How do the beneficiaries value project support provided?

Governorate	Project Support		
	Sufficient	Neutral	Insufficient
Behira (Nubaria)	53%	24%	23%
Aswan	40%	47%	13%
Luxor	60%	30%	10%
Total with project	52%	33%	15%

Source: Study Survey 2016

The beneficiaries interviewed who felt that project support was insufficient provided as to why they felt this and provided their suggestions: new projects should give more attention to improving the marketing system, provide support for harvest mechanization, improve the irrigation system, increase farmer training, improve the linkages between processors and associations, establish new factories in the production zones, increase the length of support under the project, improve project sustainability, and engage the beneficiaries early on in the project design and implementation. These above suggestions may seem biased but they do provide information about beneficiaries' ideas for where new project designs should be focused to address their needs.

BLUE Consulting suggest that the donors should apply the participatory approach in designing new projects in order to identify beneficiary constraints and challenges to improving their incomes and livelihoods, which is a standard best practice proposed by development agencies. Based on beneficiaries interviewed they felt this didn't happen adequately to their expectation and that future agriculture project designs should try to be more inclusive in assessing and understanding project beneficiary needs.

Processors

Most of the food processors interviewed believe that the support provided by the project to growers was enough, as reported by three processors. However, the project didn't ensure sustainability after the project ended, as reported by two processors interviewed.

Processors interviewed believe that it would be better if future USAID projects consider the following issues:

- Introduce the project in a better ways to help project stakeholders/participants understand project objectives and the role of the associations and growers,
- Provide financial support to growers through the associations,
- Promote the use of the proper pesticides and fertilizers use and application,
- Introduce new machinery to growers,
- Extend better technical assistance and know-how (knowledge) to growers,
- Engage stakeholders in designing the project, and
- Improve the selection criteria of association to choose experienced and appropriate associations,

Associations' Staff

The NGOs officials interviewed have stated different opinions with regard to support provided by the project to participating associations and project growers. Responses varied from enough support (reported by three interviewees), enough to some extent

and not enough (reported by one interviewee). Suggested issues to be considered in future projects by USAID should include:

- Contracting with different processors to avoid the long waiting time while supplying the production to processing firms,
- Providing more technical and training support to associations to strengthen capacity building, build trust, and provide in-kind support to ensure new and sustainable income sources for the associations to sustain association services, and
- Assisting Associations to pay more attention to marketing issues of growers.

Conclusions

Several main conclusions have been extracted throughout the interviews and focus group meetings;

- The technical support provided by the project was highly appreciated by the different actors along the value chain and significantly increased farmer production and reduced production costs at the farm level.
- The marketing activities provided by the project were not “adequate enough” to meet the increased production that occurred through the technical and training support provided.
- The engagement of the beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design of project activities was not adequate to ensure sustainability of the GDA project activities.
- The absence of the harmony between Associations and Food Processors was due to bad past experience and lack of trust, which made it difficult to sustain GDA project activities, in particular contracts to supply crops to processors.

Question Three: In what ways were stakeholder partnerships formed during the project (from design to the end of implementation)? What are areas for improvement?

Findings

This section will cover the responses of beneficiaries and stakeholders to the third evaluation question.

Vendors

Going into the GDA project, vendors were considered key stakeholders, and were one of the most critical local impediments to growers providing increased production of raw material and providing a consistent supply of raw materials to processors. Vendors interviewed reported different years when the project was introduced to them, in 2008 the project was introduced to two vendors, and in 2009 two other vendors were added. In 2011 and 2013 one new vendor was added each year for a total of six vendors that were participating as local partners (stakeholders) in the

project. Four of them started to collaborate with the project immediately and the others two collaborated later.

Unfortunately, the vendors indicated they were not engaged in the planning and design, and or involved in implementation decisions of the project. Areas of collaboration were limited to supplying improved tomato' seeds, fertilizers and pesticides, as directed by the project. Input suppliers identified by the project were input suppliers that provided quality inputs and unadulterated. The project provided farmers with the names of several qualified fertilizer suppliers (meaning their fertilizers were tested by the project) as well as agrochemical providers that were registered for use in Egypt for tomatoes and other crops. Farmers established new relationships and access to creditable input suppliers that contributed to their improved production they experienced.

Greenhouse Owners

Greenhouse owners were also considered major stakeholders in the project, as they were the main source for providing quality seedlings and new varieties to farmers. The project provided technical assistance and or training to approximately 56 seedling nurseries countrywide introducing improved tomato seedling varieties and providing best practices and management for tomato seedling production and seedling survival methods. Greenhouse nurseries established new and better relationships with growers forming new stakeholder relationships. All six-greenhouse owners interviewed indicated that they were approach by the project during its implementation and not during project design.

Also, greenhouse owners reported that the partnership during the implementation phase was primarily limited to contracting greenhouses to provide new seedlings according to the project standards. The project organized some advocacy seminars or workshops to better introduce the project to greenhouse owners and managers, as reported by four owners. However, they were not engaged in early project management design or implementation. Engaging greenhouse owners and or managers into project design could be a major area of improvement to forming effective long-term partnership and leveraging funding from owners to support services to growers. This should be considered in future projects.

Growers (farmers)

Focus groups

During the focus group discussions, growers interviewed discussed their participation in the project, especially receiving training and technical support. The GDA project assisted growers in establishing new and stronger relationships with input vendors, and greenhouse growers through trainings on GAP, on-farm demonstrations, and information offered through the project. One major comment growers reported was their lack of involvement during the planning period, as mentioned in all the growers'

focus groups. Focus group participants reported that partnerships established with other stakeholders during the implementation phase were weak and growers were decision-takers rather than decision-makers.

Furthermore, all growers in the focus group indicated that they were engaged in the project activities for only one crop season. They were not engaged in the project design or its management. The evaluation team believes that engaging growers early on into the project design is a major area to improve participant buy-in and ensuring an effective partnership with growers.

Individual interviews

Table 11 shows that all the six (6) associations visited in the three governorates were established before the project started. Almost half of the interviewed beneficiaries believe that the project did not improve their association. Almost one-third of the beneficiaries believe that the project did improve their associations. They believe that the project improved their associations by providing training, technical assistance, and establishing a greenhouse in Koum-Omboo to provide quality seedling to their members.

Table 11: Effect of the project on the association improvement

Governorate	Existence of Association		Did the project improved the Association		
	Before Project	After Project	Yes	No	Do not know
Behira (Nubaria)	100%	0%	21%	47%	32%
Aswan	100%	0%	35%	53%	12%
Luxor	100%	0%	35%	45%	20%
Total with project	100%	0%	30%	48%	21%

Source: Study Survey 2016

Processors

Processors traditionally obtained their raw material from producers through contracts (two processors), intermediary traders (five processors), wholesale markets (two processors), and/or from their own farms (one processor). The project developed partnerships, in Behira and Luxor, between associations and processors through grower forward contracts to supply farm production to processing firms. The partnership established in Behira was reported to be successful while the partnership established in Luxor wasn't completed. Partnerships were not sustainable and often didn't meet the conditions established by both sides. The evaluation team could not find any successful and/ or sustainable partnership with processors established by the project, after the project ended.

Associations' Staff

Most of association staff interviewed reported that they were, somehow, engaged in the planning of project activities as reported by three officials. For example, the in-kind support provided by the project to growers was initially suggested by the Nubaria Association for Marketing of Fruits and Vegetables – Behira. There were two other associations that were not engaged in the planning of the project activities or provided an explanation as to why they were not involved.

Conclusions

- Partnerships between the beneficiaries and stakeholders and between stakeholders themselves were formed during the project from year one through year five, but none of the partnerships were formed during the design and planning period for the project.
- Vendors, greenhouse owners, processors and farmers were not engaged in the planning of the project activities and were decision-takers rather than decision-makers. Associations were relatively more engaged in the design and planning of the project activities.
- Relationship between vendors (seeds providers) and greenhouse owners and between greenhouse owners and farmers were established and are relatively sustainable. Some of the NGOs participated in the project have continued and maintained a relationship with other stakeholders and developed new linkages that were based on their previous project experience.

Question Four: To what extent were the projects able to build capacity of the beneficiaries according to the project design?

Findings

This section will cover the responses of beneficiaries and stakeholders to the fourth evaluation question.

Vendors

All vendors interviewed reported different types and levels of support that was provided to them by the project including: training and information, linkage and contracts with processors, growers and greenhouses. For example, vendor capacity, knowledge and services were strengthened in providing appropriate types of inputs to support new seedling varieties being introduced such as the appropriate type of fertilizer and amount required; appropriate types of chemical and pest control to use; and effective ways vendor staff and agents extend information to farmers and coordinate with processors.

Greenhouse Owners

The project screened and contracted several greenhouses to serve as key nurseries for the target areas. All nurseries participated in the project activities received technical support by the project building staff and management capacity, which included the establishment and effective management of the greenhouse, introducing new plant varieties, improved irrigation systems and management, appropriate use and application of fertilizers, pest management and control programs, and producing quality seedlings.

Technical information and/or training on planting seeds, irrigation, fertilizing, pest control and hardening of seedlings were delivered to greenhouse staff through training. The contracted greenhouses were the only source for improved seedlings during the project period. Most of the greenhouses (three out of five) expanded their operations either during or shortly after the project and remain the primary source for improved seedlings after the project ended. Greenhouse owners indicated the project did not offer any financial facilitation or support to them.

Field Representatives

The sample size of field representatives who received training from the project was 19 field representative, i.e. eight from Nubaria, two from Aswan, and nine from Luxor. All of them indicated that the training they received was very useful and successful in strengthening their skills. Trainings offered were on topics such as water and soil analyses; fertilization and irrigation, integrated pest management; and Global Gap measure. Also, the field representatives indicated that they continued to answer questions asked by farmers on a voluntary base after the project ended.

Master Trainers

The sample size of the master trainers interviewed was nine trainers. The nine trainers interviewed indicated that their capacity and knowledge was increased due to project training. Master trainers, around 54, who were hired under the project and trained by industry experts to serve as Master Trainers, who trained pesticide operators and applicators in meeting HeinzGAP and GlobalGAP licensing and product requirements, as well as in extending best practices for pest management. They received requests from the project sites asking for consultation on a voluntary base. They have answered these requests positively without charging any fees but they have not been able to continue providing these services without a fee.

Growers (farmers)

Focus groups

The interviewed farmers, through the focus group meetings, reported no financial facilitation was offered by the project to their associations for their members. The

only financial support delivered to farmers was provided through in-kind subsidy such as providing seedlings, fertilizers, and pesticides, as reported by all the focus group participants. The project changed growers' attitudes to accept hardened seedlings, which was not acceptable before the project; however, greenhouse owners reported that this attitude didn't continue for long time after the project ended.

Focus groups participants indicated that the project provided extension services, information and training to farmers. The technical support provided, as stated throughout all focus groups, proved to achieve good results in promoting good agricultural practices through changes in growers' irrigation systems, introducing new fertilizing materials and application methods, introducing effective pest control approaches and provided improved seedlings based on selected varieties.

During project implementation, farmers indicated they were faced by deep price fluctuations in local markets and experienced a high percentage of harvest losses due to poor post-harvest practices. As reported in the focus group, post-harvest losses were not improved except in one case where losses were reduced by 5%.

Individual interviews

Table 12 shows that on average 64% percent of the beneficiaries believed that the project provided support to their association versus 36% who believed that the project did not support their association in the three governorates. The type of support provided was reported to be 100% in-kind support (training and technical assistance) in Behira and Luxor while in Aswan only 75% of beneficiaries reported receiving in-kind support.

Table 12: Project support to the associations

Governorate	Did the project provide support to the association?		If yes, the support was		
	Yes	No	In-kind	Financial	Others
Behira (Nubaria)	68%	32%	100%	0%	0%
Aswan	53%	47%	75%	0%	25%
Luxor	70%	30%	100%	0%	0%
Average Total with project	64%	36%	92%	0%	8%

Source: Study Survey 2016

However, based on project documents in year three, ACDI/VOCA was reported to have provided some targeted assistance in collaboration with a specific business association and their members in Assiut. The association developed a loan mechanism for smallholder farmers with included a loan period of six months at 16 percent interest that was guaranteed by either the Assiut Businessmen's Association or participating food processors. In general, the project did not appear to have a focus on helping farmers' access finance, based on the focus group members' recollection in the three Governorates sampled.

Table 13 describes the source of seedlings in the three governorates before, during and after the project period. It shows that the source of the majority of seedlings before the project was from private sector nurseries and a small amount was from self-nurseries⁶. During the project period more than 79% of the seedlings were from the nurseries that participated in project. After the project period, about 41% of the seedlings were from the private sector nurseries and 39% from greenhouses, which participated in the project. Also, about 5% of the seedlings were produced by self-nurseries and 14% stopped producing tomato seedlings after the project ended.

Table 13: Source of seedlings before, during and after project

Governorate	Before Project		During project			After project			
	PS Nursery	Self-Nursery	PS Nursery	Participate d Nursery	Self-Nursery	PS Nursery	Participate d Nursery	Self-Nursery	Stopped producing tomato
Behira (Nubaria)	100%	0%	21%	79%	0%	39%	44%	0%	17%
Aswan	63%	37%	5%	95%	0%	53%	18%	18%	12%
Luxor	95%	5%	5%	95%	0%	33%	52%	0%	14%
Total with project	86%	14%	10%	90%	0%	41%	39%	5%	14%

Source: Study Survey 2016

Table 14 describes the effect of the project on the agricultural system, in particular the tomato crop in the three governorates sampled. 100% of the sample in Behira and Luxor governorates believed that the project did improve the agricultural system in their governorate. 94% of the interviewed beneficiaries in Aswan also believed that the project improved their agricultural system. The beneficiaries, who said yes, believed that the project improved the irrigation system (15%), fertilizer programs (25%), new varieties (20%), pest management (24%), and improved seedlings (16%).

Table 14: Did the project improve the agriculture systems?

Governorate	The project improved agriculture systems		If yes, How?				
	Yes	No	Irrigation System	Fertilizer programs	New varieties	Pest Management	Improved Seedlings
Behira (Nubaria)	100%	0%	12%	25%	21%	25%	18%
Aswan	94%	6%	18%	26%	16%	24%	16%
Luxor	100%	0%	16%	25%	22%	23%	14%
Total with project	98%	2%	15%	25%	20%	24%	16%

Source: Study Survey 2016

⁶ Self-nurseries are type of nurseries that were common in the past where a farmer establish open nursery (not under greenhouse conditions) within his/her own farm for the purpose of producing seedlings for his/her use.

Table 15 includes questions about the marketing problems before project and if the project resolved the problems. The situation was different in the three governorates. In Nubaria, 72% of the project beneficiaries stated that they faced marketing problems before the project period. However, 69% of them stated that the project assisted them in resolving these marketing problems through contracts with CFI-Heinz. The remaining 31% (contracted with other processors other than CFI-Heinz) stated that the project did not assist them and they still owed the contracted processor money until now.

In Aswan 63% of the project beneficiaries stated that they faced marketing problems before the project period. The project did not assist them in resolving their marketing problems due to the long distance between the farmer's field and markets; lack of farm contracting; or price fluctuations.

In Luxor, 45% of the project beneficiaries stated that they faced marketing problems before the project period while 8% stated that the project assisted them in resolving these problems. The marketing problems were described as price fluctuations, lack of contract farming, etc.

Table 15: Marketing problems before and during project

Governorate	Did you face problem in marketing your crop before the project?		Did the project assisted in resolving it?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Behira (Nubaria)	72%	28%	69%	31%
Aswan	63%	37%	0%	100%
Luxor	45%	55%	8%	92%
Total with project	60%	40%	25%	75%

Source: Study Survey 2016

Processors

The capacity building activities offered by the project to participating processors were limited where only two processors reported that their staff received technical training by the project. Other interviewed processors, in the sampled governorates, indicated they didn't receive any training or capacity building support for their staff. Also, the project didn't offer any financial or credit facilitation support to any of the participating processors.

Associations' Staff

The Associations interviewed reported that they received the following types of support:

- Two (2) greenhouses were established for the Alhekma Association in Wadi Alnkra - Aswan to provide grower access to new quality seedlings thereby reducing their need to travel long distance to find quality seedling.
- The project provided some furniture for the Women Association in Luxor.
- The Women Association in Luxor, as a result of project assistance, contracted other processors and exporters to supply onions after the project period ended.
- The project established cooling facility in Isna that serves three associations.

Other associations in the three governorates did not receive any financial or in-kind material support or equipment. All the associations were offered selected training for their board members and staff. Training programs included strategic planning, accounting, proposal writing, organizing effective meetings and budgeting. Approximately 50% to 100% of interviewed associations' staff attended at least one training programs offered by the project. The training programs offered were reported to be effective and improved association performance.

Conclusions

- Capacity building was an effective and significant component of the GDA project. Vendors received training through the project. Greenhouses were offered technical and training support for their staff to operate and improve greenhouse operations, which led to, in most of the cases, expanding the level of sales and creating greater trust between the growers and the greenhouse owners.
- Master Trainers were hired to provide training to different categories supporting farmer services such as chemical and pest operators and applicators. Field representatives were trained and appear to be still offering consultations to beneficiaries, on a voluntary basis.
- Growers' attitudes and behaviors have changed significantly through the adoption of good agriculture practices extended by the project.
- No capacity building activities were offered to farmers regarding post-harvest practices and measures to reduce harvest losses, as planned by the project, in particular in the sampled governorates.
- No formal financial support (farm credit or loans) was offered to any of the beneficiaries and stakeholders except providing in-kind subsidy such as seedlings, fertilizers, and pesticides to farmers.
- Associations received support by the project either in the form of training programs for their staff and board members or in the form of grants.

Associations were not well prepared to develop or support marketing activities for their members.

- Women, in particular, working in greenhouse nurseries received valuable training by the project.

Question Five: How have the projects developed measures to enhance women's participation in their respective sectors?

Findings

This section will cover the responses of beneficiaries and stakeholders to the fifth evaluation question.

Greenhouse Owners

Nurseries require extensive utilization of female labor. All greenhouse owners interviewed reported up to 50% to 90% of personnel in nurseries were female, working mainly in planting seeds. All interviewees reported that most of female labor in the nurseries received training through the project. Training programs included planting of seeds, safe use of pesticides, and safety in the work environment. Also, only one of the five greenhouse owners stated that the GDA project helped in improving women's incomes. The other four greenhouse owners were unable to indicate any improvements in women's incomes due to project interventions.

Growers (farmers)

Focus groups

Only nine females were interviewed in the Women Association in Luxor. The role of females in crop cultivation is significant but limited to several practices such as harvesting and packaging of tomatoes, and sometimes, transplanting of seedlings as reported throughout the focus group meetings. These practices generally represent 25% to 50% of the required labor, as they are labor intensive operations. Some land owners (graduates) in Nubaria operate and cultivate their own land (one case). Focus group members did not identify any project activities that increased proven women's participation in agricultural activities. The impact of the project on increasing women's incomes was somewhat neutral (three cases) to positive (two cases), as reported by interviewees. In two cases, the GDA project did have a positive impact on increasing women's incomes by 20% to 25%. The females interviewed in Luxor Association attended training programs that were conducted by the project. These training programs included land preparation and housekeeping.

Individual interviews

Table 16 reports on the three questions related to women's contribution or the critical role they perform in the agricultural activities as reported by project beneficiaries (54 beneficiaries) and a control group (who did not participate in the

project – 7 farmers). Out of the beneficiaries interviewed, 5% were women (15% were Luxor beneficiaries and belong to the women association). 72% of the sample of the beneficiaries in Behira and 65% of the sample of the beneficiaries in Luxor reported that women contributed to agricultural activities. Only 25% of the sample of the beneficiaries in Aswan reported that women contributed to agricultural activities. The total sample average of the three governorates is about 56% for project beneficiaries who reported that they believed women contributed to agriculture activities versus 44 percent who responded that they believed women did not contribute to agriculture activities during the GDA project period. The control group's total average was similar to the project beneficiaries in both cases, 57% indicated yes, and 43% indicated no.

The contribution of women in agricultural activities in Behira and Luxor were higher than Aswan. Even though, in the three governorates, the beneficiaries believed that women received less training opportunities and support from the project than what men received. They also believed that women's contributions were slightly improved after the project period ended, i.e. from 17% to 21%.

Table 16: Women contribution to the agricultural activities

Governorate	Do women contribute to Agricultural Activities?*		Did women receive training?		Women contribution**	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Before	After
Behira (Nubaria)	72%	28%	39%	61%	21%	23%
Aswan	25%	75%	31%	69%	12%	13%
Luxor	65%	35%	45%	55%	18%	24%
Total with project	56%	44%	39%	61%	17%	21%
Total Control Group	57%	43%	n/a	n/a	25%	n/a

Source: Study Survey 2016

* The percent represents the number of interviews who said yes and who said no.

** The percent represents the average contribution of women in agricultural activities.

Table 17 includes the impact of the GDA project on the women's incomes. All interviewed beneficiaries reported positive or neutral impact of the project activities on the women's incomes, and no one reported a negative impact. An average of 81% of the GDA project beneficiaries reported that the project had a neutral impact on the women incomes in the three governorates. In Behira and Aswan, project beneficiaries believed that women incomes increased by 25% while project beneficiaries in Luxor believed that women incomes increased by 43%. Project beneficiaries stated that the increase in income is mostly due to the expansion in the number and area of greenhouse nurseries, which employ more female labor.

Table 17: Impact of the project on the women's income

Governorate	Percent of Sample Reporting			Impact of the project on women incomes (%)		
	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Positive	Neutral	Negative
Behira (Nubaria)	22%	78%	0%	25%	0%	n/a
Aswan	18%	82%	0%	25%	0%	n/a
Luxor	16%	84%	0%	43%	0%	n/a
Total with project	19%	81%	0%	31%	0%	n/a

Source: Study Survey 2016

Processors

Food processing is also an attractive employment area for female labor. Four processors interviewed stated that 12% to 50% female labor was used in various food processing phases. Food processors offer a high level of skilled work for female labor, which is often dedicated to the sorting and grading and cleaning of raw material purchased from growers. Only one company reported to have 0% of female labor employed. In addition, only one of the four companies reported to having a female manager. The impact of the project on women's incomes is reported to be slightly positive, as reported by four interviewees and neutral as reported by other two interviewees. Proposed options to increase women's incomes or employment opportunities are: increasing their skills to effectively perform higher level food processing jobs and responsibilities; increasing the size and capacity of processing firms; and or have processors focus more on horticultural crops that require extensive post-harvest practices, such as sorting and grading of produce harvested.

Associations' Staff

Engagement of females in associations' activities was very limited as reported by four officials. Only the Women Association in Luxor reported to have 50% female staff. The project had no impact on increasing the level of female participation in association activities as reported by four associations.

Conclusions

- A limited number of females were interviewed, as most of them came from the Women Association in Luxor. Nurseries and processing firms were the

firms that employed the highest level of female labor. Females represent up to 90% of nurseries' labor and up to 50% of processing firms' labor.

- Women received some training in several topics through project activities. As for their contribution to agriculture, females were reported to contribute more in the tomato harvesting process than other crops. The contribution women made to agriculture activities in Behira and Luxor were reported to be higher than in Aswan. The contributions women made to agriculture activities didn't significantly increase after the project ended. However, the project's impact on their incomes was reported by beneficiaries to be mostly neutral.
- Engagement of females in associations' activities was very limited except within the Women Association in Luxor where female staff represents 50% of the total staff number.

Question Six: To what extent were systems and processes for sustainability, institutionalized, or adopted, by the associations (beyond June 2013)?

Findings

This section will cover the responses of beneficiaries and stakeholders to the sixth evaluation question.

Vendors

Vendors interviewed (three vendors) indicated they collaborated with the project during the project period till the end of the project through supplying quality inputs to growers. Two vendors reported that they collaborated with the project only once. The collaboration stopped after the project ended except with the partner association, where some vendors still supplied quality seeds to some associations for their members and greenhouse owners.

Greenhouse Owners

All the participating greenhouses still apply some of the technical improvements provided by the project, such as planting timing, seed density and seeding practices, and improved irrigation methods. One of the greenhouses is still operating although under a different owner. No financial or in-kind subsidies were provided to greenhouses during the project period.

Growers (farmers)

Focus groups

All the participating associations, in the sampled governorates, were established prior to the start of the project. The project has been engaged in strengthening capacity of three of the associations, especially those in Aswan and Luxor through:

- Establishing two greenhouses in Wadi Alnokra – Aswan. However, the greenhouses were closed during the evaluation team visit.
- Cooling system in Armant - Luxor. The system is shared with other two associations and is working effectively.
- The Women Association has developed contracts with other processors and exporters and continues to do so after the project ended.
- Production practices such as using high yield varieties, cultivation methods and irrigation systems are still being applied by the participating growers.

Individual interviews

Table 18 summarizes the most sustained activities of the project, after the project ended. Production methods were the highest at 46%, and then followed by improved varieties at 39%.

Table 18: What are the sustained activities after the end of the project?

Governorate	Improved Varieties	Packaging Methods	Production Methods	Training	Mechanization
Behira (Nubaria)	39%	0%	44%	11%	6%
Aswan	35%	6%	47%	9%	3%
Luxor	43%	0%	45%	10%	2%
Total with project	39%	2%	46%	10%	4%

Source: Study Survey 2016

Processors

Most of the interviewed food processors (four processors) reported irregular supply of raw materials provided by farmers except during the crop season 2011/2012. As that year was only one year before the project ended; linkages established during this period were not strong enough to ensure sustainability. Also, Processors' forward contracts with growers were not renewed after the project ended, as reported by all interviewees.

Associations' Staff

The NGOs interviewed stated the following issues:

- The activities that were based on grants provided were not currently functioning except for the cooling system located in Luxor, where the system belongs to three associations and project supported activities were followed by other donor projects supporting the same associations. Meanwhile, the non-functioning activities faced several problems related to poor management and operating costs no being covered.
- The project didn't create any sources of sustainable income for the associations except, the above mentioned cooling system ignoring the non-functioning facilities.

- The Women Association in Luxor, as a result of the project, contracted other processors and exporters to supply onions, after the project ended.

Conclusions

- Sustainable relationship between vendors (seeds providers), associations and greenhouse owners were maintained through the project.
- Agricultural practices adopted by greenhouse owners and farmers during the project are still being applied.
- Activities initiated by the NGOs during the project period are mostly functioning. Some NGOs (in Behira and Luxor) went further to extend their activities to other crops, after the project ended.
- Growers' relationships with the food processors that were established through forward price contracts were not sustainable after the GDA project ended. The project didn't help NGOs create sustainable sources of income for farmer associations.

Question Seven: To what extent did the implementing partners monitor and evaluate the outcomes and impacts of the activities supported by the project? **a. How did ACIDI/VOCA adjust the implementation to address findings?**

Findings

This section will cover the responses of beneficiaries and stakeholders to the seventh evaluation question.

Greenhouses' owners

All interviewed greenhouse owners reported that ACIDI/VOCA consultants provided regular technical support to contracted greenhouses.

Growers (farmers)

Focus groups

All participants, in the focus groups, indicated that they recalled regular visits by ACIDI/VOCA consultants/volunteers to the field that provided technical assistance and support to project beneficiaries.

Individual interviews

Table 19 includes the knowledge of project beneficiaries about ACIDI/VOCA's monitoring of the GDA project. In the three governorates 58% of the project beneficiaries stated that they knew that ACIDI/VOCA was in a very close relation with the beneficiaries during the implementation, 40% of the beneficiaries did not know

and only one person in Luxor said that there was inadequate monitoring of the project. BLUE team believes that ACDI/VOCA has done a good job as the evaluation team realized the significant effort made by ACDI/VOCA staff in effectively monitoring the field activities.

Table 19: Did ACDI/VOCA monitor project Implementation?

Governorate	ACDI/VOCA monitored project implementation		
	Yes	No	Do not know
Behira (Nubaria)	56%	0%	44%
Aswan	63%	0%	37%
Luxor	55%	5%	40%
Total with project	58%	2%	40%

Source: Study Survey 2016

Associations' Staff

All the interviewed NGOs staff reported regular visits to field for providing technical assistance to growers and other beneficiaries by ACDI/VOCA consultants and staff.

Conclusions

- ACDI/VOCA was reported to do effective monitoring of its activities mentioned by project beneficiaries and stakeholders, in particular the technical support and training provided. As per the project final report; ACDI/VOCA developed a database for the purpose of collecting and analyzing data. The database included information about farmers, crops produced, land profile (incl. traceability codes, results and water and soil analyses, etc.), production groups (associations), buyers/processors, greenhouse nurseries, specialists/consultants, suppliers (e.g., pesticides, agricultural machinery, irrigation equipment, etc.), training/events, loans, forward contracts, and seasonal data. The evaluation team believes that ACDI/VOCA has done adequate monitoring of project activities.
- Evaluation of the project activities was not verified through the team's field visits or interviews, however; the team verified project results from the desk review of annual and final reports of the GDA project. ACDI/VOCA regularly collected data every year to evaluate project achievements, reported on indicators and measured progress against the project baseline and planned target levels. Also, an impact survey was completed at mid-term which provided the team with performance information

Recommendations

Follows are some recommendations based on the findings of the report:

- Advocate the project goals, objectives and planned results to a wider range of beneficiaries during early phases of project design and definitely during project start-up and implementation. This would build greater ownership of

project interventions and results with stakeholders and beneficiaries, and contribute to the sustainability of services and practices promoted.

- USAID funded projects are recommended to conduct a series of workshops with potential beneficiaries and stakeholders before the project work plan is set in order to choose and engage the highly motivated beneficiaries and/or stakeholders to buy into the work plan of the project thereby ensuring significant participation and project sustainability.
- Marketing specialists should work closely with beneficiaries and stakeholders to execute contracts issued through the selection of serious and committed beneficiaries and stakeholders. The newly issued law for Contract Farming should be addressed when working with beneficiaries and stakeholders to execute the contracts issued as it strongly guarantees the execution of contracts.
- Make sure the staff of the collaborating stakeholders (associations/NGOs and Processors) is harmonized in order to smooth the process of supplying the raw material to processors.
- To ensure sustainability of selected project activities, projects should include stakeholders early on in project design and implementation work, thereby establishing a win-win situation between project implementers and stakeholders. This can be done through holding workshops and annual project meetings with stakeholders and beneficiaries on proposed work-plans, involving project stakeholders in implementation work, collecting positive and negative feedback on project activities, and working with stakeholders on sustainability plans to ensure selected activities supported by a project will be continued with local partners.
- Wherever appropriate, training activities should involve husband-and-wife teams in order to increase male support for women's activities.
- Associations and beneficiaries should cost-share in the sponsoring of training programs. A recommended approach is having beneficiaries pay an increasing fee-overtime for training provided to them.
- The project should pay more attention to post-harvest losses as it affects the overall achievements of the project in particular farm income.
- Female-oriented activities should be income generating activities to ensure that women incomes will increase.
- Partner Associations should be selected based on their past experience. Criteria might include; proven sustainable activities from previous projects implemented through USAID and/or other donors, proven high women participation in the Association activities and highly motivated staff of the associations.

Annexes

ANNEX I: EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW)

End of Project Performance Evaluation of USAID/Egypt:

(a) Agriculture Exports and Rural Incomes (AERI) Bilateral Projects

(b) HEINZ Global Development Alliance and Value Chain Training

A. PURPOSE

The purpose of this solicitation is to conduct an evaluation of the following two projects under the Agricultural Exports and Rural Incomes (AERI) bilateral agreement #263-0285:

1. Global Development Alliance (GDA) cooperative agreement (award #: 263-A-00-08-00013) with Heinz. The GDA with HEINZ is implemented by ACDI/VOCA. It began in February 2008 and ended June 2013.
2. Value Chain Training Project (VCT) cooperative agreement (award#: 263-A-00-08-00030-00) is implemented by Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA). It began on September 2003 and ended June 2013.

The evaluation will serve a dual purpose: 1) learn to what extent the GDA and VCT projects objectives and goals, at all result levels, have been achieved; and 2) to inform the design of future projects, particularly using the GDA approach, working in the tomato or rotational crop value chains, and with agriculture technical schools. The performance evaluation will use both quantitative and qualitative data, and be based on the perceptions of the stakeholders (farmers, private sector processors, greenhouse operators, traders, input suppliers, associations, agriculture technical school students, teachers, headmasters, and parents, private sector commercial farms, and relevant Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Education staff), and will collect feedback on what the projects have achieved, how they were implemented, their value and perception to the stakeholders and what results actually occurred.

B. BACKGROUND

1. Development Context Agriculture is the largest employer of all economic sectors in Egypt, providing more than 28% of total employment, 45% of total female employment, and more than 56% of all jobs in rural areas in Upper Egypt. It is without question the most important source of income and employment to the rural poor, and spillovers from productivity improvements in the rural sector create benefits for urban areas as well, in terms of cheaper food, better infrastructure, and reduced pressure from urban migration. A recent study by the World Bank and Central Agency for Public Mobilization (CAPMAS), an Egyptian statistical agency, found that agriculture was the main engine of poverty reduction, despite its lower-than-average growth rate. USAID's agricultural programs in the most recent strategic stage have focused on demand-driven horticultural production, innovative post-harvest and marketing technologies, and increased productivity of staple food crops, agricultural biotechnology, and institutional linkages. All of these efforts have helped to bring about a more open, competitive marketing system and to foster sustainable

agricultural growth. While most of the distortions that previously kept the agricultural sector from reaching its full potential have been lifted, the private agricultural sector in Egypt is still not fully market driven. Additional structural changes and human resource development are needed to accelerate transformation of the sector. Transformation of the smallholder farmer sector is critical if agriculture is to reach its full potential. The vast majority of Egyptian smallholder farmers follow traditional cropping patterns that have been used for decades and remain focused on local food crop production. In recent years, substantial USAID/Egypt resources have been allocated toward increasing the volume of high value horticultural crop production for both local markets and export under the AERI Program.

The transformation of the agricultural sector also requires that small farmers improve their skills and knowledge in farming, while larger commercial farm managers find skilled farm labor to operate their farms. To meet the challenge of smallholder transformation and the growing need for highly skilled farm laborers, the delivery of relevant, practical, market-driven agricultural education in secondary schools is a requirement.

2. Intended Results

AERI

The goals of the Activity Approval Document Amendment 6 of AERI (under which both the VCT and Heinz-GDA projects are authorized) were to contribute to the Economic Growth Objective, Agriculture Program area and also to the Investing in People Objective, Education Program area. AERI was to provide support for agricultural trade expansion, small-scale producers and producer and marketing associations to increase private sector competitiveness.

The projects were also to support agricultural technical schools and international linkages between Egyptian and U.S. agribusiness firms and research institutions for enhanced technology transfer and commercialization of research products. It was anticipated that AERI would achieve the following results:

- Small and medium size farms would increase the volume and value of production, especially horticultural products, through improved crop selection, and improvements in production and post-harvest technologies.
- Agricultural Technical School (ATS) will improve their teaching methodologies, curriculum, and equipment, and introduce new career counseling and internship programs for the benefit of their students.

Heinz GDA

The goal of this USAID project was to integrate 3,000 farmers into a sustainable and competitive high-value horticultural value chain anchored by HEINZ in the governorates of Sohag, Qena, Luxor and Aswan in Upper Egypt , El Minya and Assiut in Middle Egypt, Beni Suef, Giza and Fayoum in Northern Upper Egypt and the Nubaria area in lower Egypt. The results were intended to be:

- Increase smallholder production of processing varieties of tomatoes to 2,000 tons of tomatoes per day by year 3, and 4,000 tons per day by year 5, with attainment of each benchmark triggering a total of around \$40 million in investments by Americana (private sector processor) in processing facilities and facility upgrades.
- Increase annual per capita incomes from tomatoes of participating smallholder farmers by an average of \$921 (LE 5,321) for 3,000 farmers by year 5 in 10,000 feddans.

VCT Project

Through USAID funding, MUCIA strengthened the institutional capacities of Agriculture Technical Schools (ATSs), improved the educational environment, introduced new educational technology, enhanced the experiential learning programs, linked ATS students with the private sector, and developed agricultural leadership for ATS students. The target results were:

- Qualifying 25 ATSs to receive accreditation.
- Securing 7,000 job opportunities in the Delta and Upper Egypt for youth.
- Developing 57 curricula in 6 technical areas to meet labor market needs.
- Establishing 5 career centers to link ATS students and graduates with the private sector.
- Developing an agricultural leadership, career, and personal development program to enhance career success, personal growth and leadership skills (Future Farmers of Egypt Club).

3. Approach and Implementation

Heinz GDA

In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the GDA, the expectations from HEINZ and ACDI/VOCA were as follows:

Heinz:

- Supplies key technical expertise, through its Global Technology Team. The company will provide its technology package and Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) to ensure that the greenhouse nursery operations being established through the AERI horticultural grant function effectively. HEINZ will supply the seeds to these nurseries, which will produce the processed tomato seedlings for sale and distribution to contract farmers.
- Anticipates supplying more than \$1 million in direct technical assistance and training in tomato production through its Global Technology Team during the five-year life of the project.
- During the second year of the project (October 2009), Cairo Food Industries (CFI), a HEINZ affiliated Egyptian private sector company, will make an investment of about \$6 million in a new facility rather than up-date and modernize capacity at the CFI. During the third year, an additional Egyptian company, Americana, will make another investment of \$6 million to expand the green-field facility.

- Through CFI, HEINZ also plans to set aside almost \$43 million to fund the forward contracts for purchasing tomatoes for processing from Egyptian smallholders. Considering 80 percent of this amount as a contribution to the project, HEINZ is committed to making more than \$36 million available over a period of 5 years (2008-2012).
- CFI will process the tomatoes that it purchases and will sell the processed tomato product to HEINZ for use in its food products. By sourcing 75 percent of its tomatoes from Upper Egypt, CFI is expected to be able to process tomatoes for up to eight months per year.

ACDI/VOCA

- Provide training and technical assistance, as well as offer centralized marketing services for all participating small holder farmers.
- The satellite offices will oversee demonstration farms, check on the demonstration plots and verify the agricultural practices of participating farmers
- Explore new market opportunities for tomatoes and crops grown in rotation with tomatoes, facilitate links with buyers, assist producer groups in obtaining forward contracts, develop and manage the training and technical assistance plan, facilitate access to credit for growers.
- ACDI/VOCA will field 15 highly-qualified volunteer consultants over the 5-year life of the project, providing an in-kind contribution of \$125,225.
- Provide additional financial support worth an estimated \$5 million from the Industrial Modernization Center (IMC). IMC's contribution will cover the cost of demonstration farms, field trials, irrigation systems and similar infrastructure, GAP certification.

VCT Project

The VCT Project was designed with the following expectations:

- **Strengthening the institutional capacity of 117 ATSs**

This component aimed to build the school capacity and raise ATS performance. In order to carry out this goal, improvement of school management was targeted through providing training to school managers and assisting staff while selecting model schools to get accreditation by the GOE to serve as role models for other schools. The focus was on linking schools with their local society through establishing an advisory committee in every school, which had local community leaders, parents, and business people as members. The role of these committees was to improve the training programs within schools and to support schools in providing a better community service. In addition, schools were supplied with computer equipment and teachers were trained to use the equipment and teach basic Microsoft computer skills to their students. This was a skill set that was lacking in graduates. Moreover, ATS teachers were taught to help their students refine their entrepreneurial skills so as to be capable of preparing feasibility studies, and implement their own small-scale projects. Finally, an additional five career centers were established to link the private sector with ATS schools. A tracking system was created through a data base served as a durable connection between a school and its graduates.

- **Develop new, market-responsive curricula and education programs**

This component underlined the improvement of education and learning styles. To enhance the educational environment, the ATS curricula were transformed into PowerPoint presentations for lesson plans, to make them more comprehensible to students and more clearly and consistently taught. Also, curricula development was executed in cooperation with business people; faculty staff and MOE representatives (teachers and supervisors) where curricula could better meet labor market needs. Furthermore, performance efficiency of teachers and supervisors was raised by using modern strategies of active learning to elevate student engagement in the educational process. Also planned were developing skill sheets as a tool of experiential learning to train students to comprehend the technical parts of various disciplines. In addition, technical support was provided to teachers to train students on advanced cultivation approaches, and MOU agreements were formed with international companies, such as Pioneer and Syngenta.

- **Develop an Agricultural Leadership Program (Future Farmers of Egypt FFE) and establish and continue supporting the Supervised Agricultural Internship Program (SIP)**

This component aimed to increase the interpersonal skills along with the technical skills of ATS students, with the ultimate goal of increasing employability. To achieve its goal, VCT project worked on three axes. The first axis was the Future Farmers of Egypt program (FFE), which concentrated on building the interpersonal skills of ATS students; mainly leadership, communications, problem-solving, time-managing, event-organizing and plan-designing-and implementing skills. The second axis considered elevating the technical skills of ATS students through establishing a link

between ATSs and the agribusiness sector. This linkage assisted ATS students to adapt to real-work environment and use up-to-date technology, leading them to successfully compete in the labor market. Thirdly, the VCT introduced employment fairs as a new concept in ATSs. This activity linked human resource departments of the private sector with ATSs, aiming to increase employability rates of ATS senior students and graduates.

4. Project Modifications

Heinz GDA

Year 3 and 4

In April 2010, USAID/Egypt conducted a Rapid Assessment of the project. In response, the Year 3 Work Plan for the GDA was modified by geographical area concentration, as were the two strategic objectives for the project. Going forward, project activities focused primarily on production groups in the South (Esna, approaching it from the North in Qena and from the South in Aswan) and in the North (Nubaria production region). Also, ACDI/VOCA closed the field office in Minya; however, given their working relationship with World Food Program they continued to support production groups in Beni Suef due to their willing cooperation to work under forward contracts and demand from processors from the industrial cities in the North.

This geographical refocus reduced the number of feddans/farmers enrolled in the project. Thus, ACDI VOCA amended the first strategic objective for the project to:

1. Strengthened tomato processing sector as measured by:
 - a. Increased production of processing tomato varieties in Egypt
 - b. Increased tomato processing sector supply (and raw tomato demand)

Additionally, in order to reach the objective of 10,000 feddans of processing tomatoes under production by year 5, no more than 3,000 farmers could be enrolled in the project. Therefore, the second objective was changed to:

2. Annual per capita incomes from tomatoes increased by an average of \$921 (LE 5,231 during an exchange rate of 5.7EGP/dollar) for 3,000 participating smallholder farmers by Year 5 in 10,000 feddans.

No-cost Extension

In September 2012, ACDI/VOCA was granted a six month, no-cost extension (October 2012 - March 2013). During this time, ACDI/VOCA completed the summer 2012 season in Nubaria (north Egypt), where 3,000 feddans of tomato were under production, and the crop was harvested from June through August. In southern Egypt, farmers grew approximately 3,000 feddans of sesame as their summer crop, and it was harvested in September and October. ACDI/VOCA is continuing to provide these farmers with technical assistance and training as well as marketing support until the harvests have been completed. Additionally, in March 2013, ACDI/VOCA was granted an additional three month no-cost extension (March 2013-June 2013). During this time they are providing grants to associations to establish greenhouses, a collection center, two cold trucks and three field coolers.

VCT Project

In March 2011, USAID modified the VCT Project implemented through MUCIA, to add two elements to the project. The first was to prepare rural youth for employment in agricultural value chains by continuing to support the 54 Agricultural Technical Schools (ATs) in Upper Egypt and Sinai and by expanding activities to include the 63 ATs in the Delta. Under the previous VCT Project, USAID was only supporting the 54

ATSs in Upper Egypt and Sinai. However, many ATSs were still in need of additional support to strengthen their capacity to improve curricula and internship programs and to build sustainable partnerships with the agri-business community. For example, previous to the amendment, no enhancement programs were initiated in the Delta to assist ATSs prepare rural students for employment and successful careers. The majority of ATS graduates over the last 10 years were either not working in agriculture or were unemployed. At the same time, most commercial farms and food processing companies reported that ATS graduates lack the skills required to start a career in global agriculture. This lack of employable skills was a direct result of serious problems facing the 63 Delta ATSs. The Delta ATS educational programs were not responsive to the needs of the job market, and little attention was given to problem-solving and communication skills. In addition, these students had very few resources for “hands-on” training and almost no opportunities existed for practical training on commercial farms.

Secondly, the VCT Program was to strengthen the export capacity of small-scale farmers (SSFs) to participate in selected horticulture and livestock export market and food processing value chains by building effective partnerships with export commercial farms and food processors, thereby increasing their income. During the past decade, efforts to help SSFs participate in exporting high value horticultural crops and livestock products to global markets had limited success. The inability of SSFs, who control more than 80 percent of the agricultural land, to meet international standards, and the lack of basic cold chain facilities and logistics capacity, were major challenges to Egypt’s ability to effectively reduce rural poverty. Strengthening the SSFs’ export and processing capacity in selected horticulture and livestock value chains, including cold storage facilities and SSFs’ logistics, was to increase rural income and alleviate poverty.

5. Existing Data

During the evaluation, the following documents will be available to the team upon arrival in Cairo and in the USAID/Egypt Office of Economic Growth:

- Annual work plans for each project
- Annual PMPs for each project
- Baseline survey of each project
- Mid-term evaluation of HEINZ GDA
- Skills gap analysis by MUCIA
- Regional GDA evaluation
- Quarterly reports of each project
- Annual reports of each project
- PERSUAP final report
- USAID Evaluation Report Checklist
- Any other HEINZ GDA or VCT documents or international data/reports

C. EVALUATION RATIONAL

1. Evaluation Purpose

The VCT and HEINZ GDA projects ended June 2013. This evaluation will assist the Mission and Washington in reaching decisions related to: 1) the effectiveness of the current approach to strengthen the food processing industry, the livelihoods of small farmers, and the capacity building of the ATS system; 2) the types of mechanisms/approaches the Mission should use in any future assistance to the sector (specifically the GDA); and 3) the nature and scope of possible future projects in the sector based on lessons learned from the current projects.

The Mission anticipates as a deliverable for this evaluation, a two-part report. The first section should focus on an evaluation of GDA-Heinz activities from 2008-2013 and the VCT activities from 2003-2013, and the second section should focus on recommendations for the Mission's future activities. Technical recommendations within this paper will feed into future project designs and descriptions. The paper shall also recommend optimal procurement options for the Mission's consideration.

2. Audience and Intended Users

The audiences of the evaluation report will be the USAID/Egypt Mission, specifically the agriculture team, the Bureau for Food Security, the GDA Office, and implementing partners and Heinz. An Executive Summary and recommendations will be provided to the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR) and Ministry of Education (MOE). USAID will use the report to inform future strategies and to share lessons learned with other stakeholders; ACDI/VOCA and MUCIA will learn about their strengths and weaknesses; and MALR and MOE will learn how to better benefit from ACDI/VOCA and MUCIA technical assistance. It is expected that Heinz, MUCIA and the small holder farmers will have the opportunity to discuss how the GDA and VCT assisted them and how these types of project could better assist them in the future.

Evaluation Questions for both Projects in Order of Importance

1. What objectives/targets were met towards AERI's highest level results?
2. What are the lessons learned from the program's implementation that USAID/Egypt can take into consideration for future similar programs?
3. In what ways were stakeholder partnerships formed during the projects (from design to the end of implementation)?
 - a. What are areas for improvement?
4. To what extent were the projects able to build capacity of the beneficiaries according to the project design?
5. How have the projects developed measures to enhance women's participation in their respective sectors?
6. To what extent were systems and processes for sustainability, institutionalized, or adopted, by the associations (beyond June 2013)?
7. To what extent did the implementing partners monitor and evaluate the outcomes and impacts of the activities supported by the project?
 - a. How did ACDI/VOCA adjust the implementation to address findings?

D. EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

1. Evaluation Design

This is a performance evaluation and is intended to focus on how the Heinz-GDA and VCT project have been implemented, what they have achieved, whether expected results have occurred according to the projects' design and in relation to the development hypothesis, whether the projects were cost-effective, and how activities are perceived, valued, and sustained. Evaluators will use a mix of quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methods to generate answers.

2. Data Collection Methods

The Evaluation Team should consider a range of possible methods and approaches for collecting and analyzing the information, which is required to assess the evaluation objectives. The evaluation team shall share data collection tools with USAID for review, feedback and/or discussion with sufficient time for USAID's review before they are applied in the field. The survey tools should draw upon both subjective and objective input of the programs' stakeholders and should be disaggregated to the relevant level along the value chain. Illustrative disaggregation and program areas for the surveys of the respective clients should consider geographical coverage, type of crops, participation time at the program, gender, processing facility type, size of businesses and schools, and other factors, as applicable. The data collection methodology will include a mix of tools appropriate to the evaluation questions and include document review, in-depth interview with the key stakeholders, and focus group discussions with beneficiaries and a control group that has not participated on the project but are farmers with similar characteristics of the project beneficiaries (in terms of land size, crops cultivated and in the same communities). The evaluation team will complete site visits to three governorates (Luxor, Nubaria, and Aswan) for the HEINZ GDA, and three governorates (Aswan, Beni Suef, and El Sharkia) for the VCT project.

A representative sample size of 3% of beneficiaries for the HEINZ GDA activity, and 1% of beneficiaries for the VCT activity in the governorates should also be collected. The method for selecting the representative sample should be discussed with USAID.

Document Review: USAID/Egypt will provide the Evaluation Team with electronic copy of the key Program related documents mentioned above under relevant document section prior to the start of the in-country work. All team members shall review these documents in preparation for the initial Team Planning Meeting.

Interviews and Site Visits: The Evaluation Team will conduct in-depth interviews and focus group discussions and inspect if any aspect of the activity are ongoing, at a minimum, with the following organizations/staff:

- Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation
- Ministry of Education
- Representatives of the GDA private sector participants (tomato processors, green houses owners, small farmers, and other food processors)
- Representatives of the VCT private sector participants (commercial farms)
- USAID Staff

- Smallholder farmers (3% of project beneficiaries in Luxor, Nubaria, and Aswan governorates)
- ATS students, teachers, headmasters, and parents (1% of project beneficiaries in Aswan, Beni Suef, and El Sharkia governorates)

3. Data Analysis Methods

The information collected will be analyzed by the Evaluation Team to identify correlations and establish what are the major trends and issues. The basic unit of analysis will be each stakeholder. Data will be disaggregated by gender to identify how project inputs are benefiting disadvantaged and advantaged groups according to gender and poverty.

4. Methodological Strengths and Limitations

Key informant interviews, information collected during site visits and surveys are suggested as a primary data source for this evaluation. Given the short timeline for this study, the evaluation team may not be able to cross check key informant characterizations of changes in beneficiary behavior and competencies through direct beneficiary interviews or observation

E. EVALUATION PRODUCTS

1. Deliverables

Pre-stakeholder meetings:

- **Work plan:** During the Team Planning Meeting, the Team will prepare a detailed work plan which will include the methodologies to be used in the evaluation, timeline, and detailed Gantt chart. The work plan will be submitted to the Evaluation Program Manager at USAID/Egypt for approval no later than the 3rd day of work.
- **Methodology Plan:** A written methodology and data analysis plan (evaluation design, data analysis steps and detail, and operational work plan) will be prepared during the team planning meeting and discussed with and approved by USAID prior to implementation.
- **List of Interviewees and Schedule:** USAID will provide the Evaluation Team with a stakeholder analysis that includes an initial list of interviewees, from which the Evaluation Team can work to create a more comprehensive list. Prior to starting data collection, the Evaluation Team will provide USAID with a list of interviewees and a schedule for conducting the interviews. The Evaluation Team will continue to share updated lists of interviewees and schedules as meetings/interviews take place and stakeholders are added to/deleted from the schedule.
- **Data collection tools:** Prior to starting fieldwork, the Evaluation Team will share the data collection tools with the USAID Evaluation Program Manager for review, feedback and/or discussion and prior approval.

Post-stakeholder meetings:

- **Discussion of preliminary draft evaluation report:** The Evaluation Team will submit a preliminary draft of the report to the USAID Evaluation Program Manager, who will provide preliminary comments prior to final Mission debriefing. This will facilitate

preparation of a more final draft report that will be left with the Mission upon the evaluation team's departure.

- **Debriefing with USAID:** The team will present the major findings of the evaluation to USAID/Egypt through a PowerPoint presentation after submission of the draft report and before the team's departure from country. The debriefing will include a discussion of achievements and issues as well as recommendations for the future activities designs and implementation. The team will consider USAID/Egypt comments and revise the draft report accordingly, as appropriate.

- **Debriefing with Partners:** The team will present the major finding of the evaluation to USAID partners (as appropriate and as defined by USAID) through a PowerPoint presentation prior to the team's departure from country. The debriefing will include a discussion of achievements and activities only, with no recommendations for future program. The team will consider partners' comments and revise the draft report accordingly, as appropriate.

- **Draft Evaluation Report:** A draft report of the findings and recommendations should be submitted to the USAID Evaluation Program Manager prior to the Team's departure from Egypt. The written report should clearly describe findings and conclusions. Recommendations for future programming will be addressed in a separate internal memo. USAID will provide written comments on the draft report within nine working days of receiving the document.

- **Final Report:** The Evaluation Team will submit a final report that incorporates responses to Mission comments and suggestions no later than three working days after USAID/Egypt provides written comments on the Team's draft evaluation report (see above). If USAID/Egypt determines that there are still content issues to be addressed or that previous feedback has not been satisfactorily addressed, the final unedited report will be considered second draft and further feedback will be given to the team no later than 5 days of receipt of the second draft. If USAID/Egypt determines that there is no need for further changes, the report will be considered final unedited draft and no further feedback will be given. The final report submission is subject to the approval of the Contract Officer's Representative.

Data sets: All data instruments, data sets, presentations, meeting notes and final report for this evaluation will be presented to USAID, in English, on three (3) flash drives to the Evaluation Program Manager. All data on the flash drive will be in an unlocked, editable format. The proposed format for the final evaluation report, to be provided in English, should be organized as follows:

- Executive Summary
- Table of Contents
- Introduction
- Background
- Methodology
- The findings and conclusion from the Heinz-GDA and VCT Projects, and based on these recommendations for future Mission activities.
- Issues/Challenges

- Future Directions
- References
- Annexes

The evaluation Team Leader shall incorporate USAID's comments and submit the final report to USAID in electronic format (Microsoft Word) as well as printed and bound copies (five copies in English and five in Arabic) not later than 3 working days after the receipt of the comments. The entire report shall be no longer than 30 pages (not including annexes), single spaced in a Times New Roman font, size 12 type font. Graphics and tables may apply appropriate font and font size. All data and materials are to be surrendered to and will remain the property of USAID.

F. TEAM COMPOSITION

The team shall include the following personnel, and all attempts should be made for the team to be comprised of an equal number of male and female members.

- **Team Leader:** This individual shall have a minimum of a Master's degree in an agriculture economics discipline or related field and 10 years' experience in the monitoring, evaluation and analysis of agricultural development projects. Experience in designing surveys and development assistance program monitoring systems is required. Arabic language is strongly preferred.

- **Technical Advisor - Agriculture:** It is strongly recommended that the following characteristics be reflected in the Agriculture Technical Advisor in order to maximize use of time and effectiveness of the survey: Arabic language, agricultural extension, value chain, agri-business development, marketing, monitoring and evaluation of development projects, extensive field experience in Egypt or the region, strong written and verbal communication skills and logistics.

- **Technical Advisor - Education:** It is strongly recommended that the following characteristics be reflected in the Education Technical Advisor in order to maximize use of time and effectiveness of the survey: Arabic language, training in basic education field, monitoring and evaluation of development projects, extensive experience in Egypt or the region, strong written and verbal communication skills and logistics.

- **Local Surveyors:** It is strongly recommended that the following characteristics be reflected in the Local Surveyors in order to maximize use of time and effectiveness of the survey: Arabic and English language, monitoring and evaluation of development projects, extensive field experience in Egypt, strong written and verbal communication skills and logistics.

G. EVALUATION MANAGEMENT

1. Logistical Support

USAID/Egypt will provide overall direction to the evaluation team, identify key documents, and assist in facilitating a work plan. USAID/Egypt will assist in arranging meetings with key stakeholders and identified by USAID prior to the initiation of field work. The evaluation team is responsible for arranging vehicle rental and drivers as

needed for their site visits around Cairo and in the specified governorates (including air travel when/if necessary). They will also need to arrange their own hotel arrangements if necessary and procure their own work/office space, computers, internet access, printing and photocopying. Evaluation team members will be required to make their own payments. USAID/Egypt personnel will be made available to the team for consultations regarding sources and technical issues, before and during the evaluation process.

2. Period of Performance

The period of performance for implementing the required deliverable shall be a period of eight weeks, beginning on or about (o/a) June, 2015, with field work completed in April 20 and final report concluding o/a May 8, 2015. Within three months of issuing the final report, the final report shall be submitted to the USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC).

ANNEX II: EVALUATION METHODS

Table 20: Source and method of Analysis for the evaluation questions

Evaluation Question	Source for GDA	Method of Analysis
1 What objectives/targets were met towards AERI's highest level results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review PMP • Project documentation, • In depth interviews and focus groups, using questionnaires, with stakeholders' organizations and staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze progress in indicators data • Analyze progress in project activities and utilization of project resources • Questions in the surveys related to this evaluation question should determine the following indicators: • Changes of areas cultivated and productivity, adoption of new cultivation methods, decrease in production costs per unit, quality of inputs and product, reasons for improvements, challenges of improvements and changes in marketing channels. • Changes in the source of raw material (contracting), quality of product supplied, stability of supply, improvement in employability for processors. • Improvement of income for input suppliers and quality of supplies. • Means of association development.
2 What are the lessons learned from the program's implementation that USAID/ Egypt can take into consideration for future similar programs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation, • In depth interviews and focus groups, using questionnaires, with stakeholders' organizations and staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze the implementation issues • Questions in the surveys related to this evaluation question should determine the following indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weaknesses in designing and implementing the project activities and ideas to overcome these weaknesses in the future from different points of views.
3 In what ways were stakeholder partnerships formed during the projects (from design to the end of implementation)? a. <u>What are areas for improvement?</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project work plans and progress reports • In depth interviews and focus groups, using questionnaires, with stakeholders' organizations and staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Track when and how stakeholders joined the project • Questions in the surveys related to this evaluation question should determine the following indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of stakeholders in planning the project activities, the establishment of the relationship with stakeholders, means of development of the associations, means of support to farmers and other beneficiaries, means of cooperation with project and

			dissemination of project goals and activities.
4	To what extent was the project able to build capacity of the beneficiaries according to the project design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • In depth interviews and focus groups, using questionnaires, with stakeholders' organizations and staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Track and analyze the training programs and verify their impact on the recipients • Questions in the surveys related to this evolution question should determine the following indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Means of technical support especially to producers and processors, deliver of new technologies in production and processing and its impact on production quality, stakeholders access to finance, changes in the source of inputs, means of marketing support and its impact on losses, training offered to stakeholders. • Means of capacity building of the entities involved in the project activities, ability of the associations to benefit from the grants and equipment provided by the project and associations access to finance.
5	How have the projects developed measures to enhance women's participation in their respective sectors?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentations • In depth interviews and focus groups, using questionnaires, with stakeholders' organizations and staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review work plans versus progress reports on women participation • Questions in the surveys related to this evolution question should determine the following indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The changes in women contribution to agricultural value chain activities, improvement of women income as a result of the project and means of support to women. Perception of male and female on women participation and enhancement under the project
6	To what extent were systems and processes for sustainability, institutionalized, or adopted, by the associations (beyond June 2013)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In depth interviews and focus groups, using questionnaires, with stakeholders' organizations and staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions in the surveys related to this evolution question should determine the following indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects established using the grants provided by the project and still exist, the use of equipment provided, means of cooperation between stakeholders during and after the project, the use of production

			methods developed by the project, stability and quality of products supplied after the project and development of new sources of income by the affiliated associations.
7	To what extent did the implementing partners monitor and evaluate the outcomes and impacts of the activities supported by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • In depth interviews and focus groups, using questionnaires, with stakeholders' organizations and staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the monitoring plan and track the progress in monitoring and how the implementation was adjusted, accordingly. • Questions in the surveys related to this evolution question should determine the following indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The degree of involvement for partners in planning the project activities and in M&E. Perception of stakeholders on how ACDI/VOCA monitored the project and how the implementation was adjusted.

ANNEX III: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Table 21: Data Collection Tools – Questionnaires

Questionnaire/ Checklist	استمارة استبيان
Project: Agribusiness Linkages Global Development Alliance; Developing Egypt's Agribusiness Industry	المشروع: تحالف التنمية الزراعية (GDA) لتطوير نظام الأعمال الزراعي في مصر
Governorate:	المحافظة:
Name of Interviewer:	اسم القائم بالمقابلة:

Data of this questionnaire is confidential and for

"بيانات هذه الاستمارة سرية ولا تستخدم إلا في أغراض البحث العلمي
scientific research"

Eval. Ques	1. Proposed Questions (Focus Groups)	1. الاسئلة المقترحة (مجموع اتل فوكي ز)
	1.1 Farmers and Farmers' Association Members:	1.1 لمزراعي ن وأعضاء منظمات لمزراعي ن:
	A list of attendees and their contact information to be attached	برفوكش فبأساء ل حضور وحيات ال اتصال ل خص ق ب هم
	Date of interview:	تاري خ ط ا م ي ل ة:
	Governorate:	البح اف ظ ة:
	District:	ال م رك ز:
	Village:	ل ق ر ي ة:
3	1.1.1 Did the association exist before the project? Yes No	• هل ل ا ج م ع ي ة ك ن ت م و ج و د ة ق ب ل الم ش ر و ع ؟ ن ع م ال
3	1.1.2 Did the project contribute to the development of the association? Yes No If yes, how?	• هل س ا م الم ش ر و ع ي ط و ي ر ل ا ج م ع ي ة ؟ ن ع م ال ن ي ح ل ة ن ع م ، ل ي ف ؟
4	1.1.3 Did the project provide any finance facilitation? Yes No If yes, mention Credit facilitation..... Delayed payment purchases Bank finance Other, mention:	• هل ق د م الم ش ر و ع أ ي ت س ه ال ت و ف ي ل ي ة ؟ ن ع م ال ن ي ح ل ق ن ع م ، م ا ه ي ؟ ت س ي ل ا ت ف ال ق ت ر ا ض ش ر ا ع م ي ن ل م ا ت ن ل ت ب ا ل أ ج ل ن ت ج ا ر ت م و ي ل ب ن ك ي أ خ ر ي ، ت ف ك ر
4	1.1.4 What is the source of seedlings?	• م ا م و ح ص د ر ا ل ش ال ت الم س ت خ د م ف ي ل ل ز ر ا ع ؟

Eval. Ques	1. Proposed Questions (Focus Groups)	1. الاسئلة المقترحة (مجموعات التركيز)
	Before the project: Own nursery Project nurseries Other nursery... After the project: Own nursery ... Project nurseries ... Other nursery	قبل المشروع: مشتل خاص مشتل مشاريع المشروع مشتل آخر بعد المشروع: مشتل خاص مشتل مشاريع المشروع مشتل آخر
1,4	1.1.5 Did the project develop the means of cultivation? Yes No If yes, how? Irrigation system Fertilization New species and varieties Pest and disease control Developed seedlings Other, mention:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل ساعد المشروع على تطوير أساليب الزراعة؟ نعم لا في حالة نعم ، ما هي طبيعة هذا التطوير؟ • أنظمة الري برامج التسميد أصناف سالات جديدة • برامج مكافحة الآفات والأمراض شتلات مطورة • أخرى ، تذكر
1	1.1.6 Did the productivity improve during the project? Yes No If yes, increased by % If no, Same or Decreased %	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل زادت إنتاجية الفدان مع المشروع؟ زادت % لم تتغير انخفضت %
1	1.1.7 If it was increased, what were the reasons for improvement? Changing varieties Improving irrigation system Improved fertilization Improved marketing systems Improved product quality Other, mention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • في حالة زيادة ، ما هي أسباب زيادة؟ • تغيير الأصناف تحسين نظام الري تحسين نظام التسميد • تحسين نظم تسويق المنتج أخرى ، تذكر
1	1.1.8 Have the project contributed to reduce production costs? Yes % No The reason?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل ساعد المشروع على خفض تكاليف الإنتاج؟ نعم % لا ما السبب؟
1,4	1.1.9 Did you face any problems in the crop production? Yes No If yes, mention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل واجهتك أي مشكلات في إنتاج محصول؟ نعم لا في حالة نعم ، أذكرها
1,4	1.1.10 Did the project assist in solving them? Yes No If yes, how?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل ساعد المشروع على حل هذه المشكلات؟ نعم لا في حالة نعم ، كيف؟

Eval. Ques	1. Proposed Questions (Focus Groups)	1. الاسئلة المقترحة (مجموعات التركيز)
4	1.1.11 What are the technical supports offered by the project directly to farmers or via the association? Extension service..... Information Training Other, mention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ما هي مجالات الدعم الفني التي يقدمها المشروع لمزارعين بمباشرة أو من خلال لجمعية؟ إرشاد معلومات تدريب ، أخرى تذكر:
4	1.1.12 Did the project assist in developing packaging and labeling methods? Yes No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل ساعد المشروع على تحسين طرق التعبئة والتغليف وطرق البيع والتداول ومعاملات البيع والشراء؟ نعم لا
4	1.1.13 Did the project contribute to decreasing post-harvest losses? Yes by % No Reasons:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل تسببت مبادرات المشروع في تقليل الخسائر ما بعد الحصاد؟ نعم % لا الأسباب:
4	1.1.14 Did you face any marketing problems before the project? Yes No If yes, mention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل واجهتك أي مشكلات تسويقية قبل بدء المشروع؟ نعم لا في حالة نعم ، أذكرها
4	1.1.15 Did the project assist in solving them? Yes No If yes, how?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل ساعد المشروع على حلها؟ نعم لا في حالة نعم ، كيف؟
4	1.1.16 What is the marketing support offered by the project to farmers or association? Contracting New market opportunities Facilities (post-harvest) Other, mention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ما هي مجالات الدعم التسويقي المقدم من المشروع لمزارعين ولجمعية؟ تعاقد معلومات لوائح جديدة تسعير (معاملات بعد الحصاد) ، تذكر:
6	1.1.17 What are the activities launched during the project and still operating? Improved Varieties Packaging Cultivating methods..... Training Farm mechanization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ما هي الأنشطة التي أطلقت واستمرت أثناء المشروع وما زالت مستمرة؟ أنواع المحسنة طرق التعبئة طرق الزراعة التدريب عمليات الزراعة والجمع ، التحسينات التغليف الميكنة الزراعية
1,4	1.1.18 To whom do you usually sell your crops before the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • لمن كنت تبيع منتجاتك قبل بدء المشروع؟ جمعية تعاونية تاجر محلي تاجر جولة

Eval. Ques	1. Proposed Questions (Focus Groups)	1. الاسئلة المقترحة (مجموعات التركيز)
	A marketing cooperative Local trader Wholesaler Exporter Processor Wholesale market	مُندَر حِصْن سوقال جملة
1,4	1.1.19 To whom do you usually sell your crops during the project? A marketing cooperative Trader Wholesaler Exporter Processor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> لمن لئن تفتي عجاتك من الظم اظم بئاء المشروع؟ جمعي قتع او يفس وقي تاجر تاجر جملة مُندَر حِصْن
4	1.1.20 Did the project organize any awareness and advocacy workshops? Yes No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> لمنظم المشروع أي ندوات أو ورش عمل لشن وفكر المشروع؟ نعم ال
4	1.1.21 Did the project organize any training programs for farmers? Yes No If yes, list them: Technical Post-harvest Marketing Finance Other, mention:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> لمنظم المشروع أي تدريبات للمزارعين؟ نعم ال في حلقة نغم ، ما هي؟ فنية مع ال تبعد لحداد تس وقي أخرى ، تكرر: تدريسية
3	1.1.22 What is the period you have been engaged with the project? From To	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ما هي المدة التي يتبعها مع المشروع؟ من إلى
3	1.1.23 Did you participate in the project planning and management? Yes No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> لشارك في تخطيط وإدارة المشروع؟ نعم ال
6	1.1.24 Do you still apply the project recommendations? Yes No If yes? Mention: Improved Varieties Cultivation methods irrigation systems Contracts safe production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل مازل تفتطبق فس إرشادات المشروع في مطلق بالاتج والتسويق؟ نعم ال في حلقة نغم؟ ما هي؟ ال صناف نظام للزراعة نظام الري تلحق اعدات الإنتاج الآمن
6	1.1.25 Is the In-kind grants delivered to the association still operating Yes No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل ال فح ال عي المقدمة من المشروع ما زالت تفي بطلش غل؟ نعم ال
5	1.1.26 Do women contribute to production activities? Yes No If yes, mention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل تساهم المرأة في أنشطة الزراعة؟ نعم ال في حلقة نغم ، ما هي؟

Eval. Ques	1. Proposed Questions (Focus Groups)	1. الاسئلة المقترحة)مجموعات التركيز(
	
5	1.1.27 Did any women receive trainings from the project? Yes No If yes, type of training	• هل تأققت أي من السيدات تدريب م خلال المشروع؟ نعم ال سي حلة نعم ، ما هي؟
5	1.1.28 What is the ratio of women's contribution to production activities? Before the project % After the project %	• ما هي نسبة مساهمة المرأة المراقبي أنشطة الزراعة ؟ قبل المشروع % بعد المشروع %
5	1.1.29 What is the impact of the project on women's level of income? Positive % Neutral Negative %	• ما هو تأثير المشروع على مستوى دخل المرأة؟ إيجابي % متعادل سلبي %
2	1.1.30 How do you evaluate the project support? Enough somehow enough not enough	• هل تقبلي الدعم المقدم من المشروع؟ كافي إلى حد ما غير كافٍ
2	1.1.31 How can we benefit from such support in the future?	• كيف يمكن الاستفادة من هذا الدعم بشكل أفضل في المستقبل؟
7	1.1.32 Did ACDI monitor the project activities? Yes ... No.... Do not know If Yes: How:	• هل كلت شركة (ACDI) تتابع تنفيذ المشروع؟ نعم لا لا أعرف إذا كلت الاجلة نعم: كيف

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2 أسئلة فردية (قابلية شخصي ة)
	2.1 Farmers and Associations' Members:	1.2 لمزارعين وأعضاء منظمات لمزارعين:
	Date of interview:	تاريخ التقييم:
	Governorate:	الجهة:
	District:	المركز:
	Village:	القرية:
	Name of farmer:	اسم المزارع:
	Name of association:	اسم الجمعية:
	Age:	العمر:

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارة المسئلة (واحد لواحد)
	Level of education: Graduate High school Basic education Read and write Illiterate Other, mention	المستوى التعليمي: على مستوى على مستوى على مستوى أقرأ وأكتب أمي أخرى تذكر
1	2.1.1 Total holding: feddans	• إجمالي مساحة الأرض: فدان - قيراط - سهم
1	2.1.2 Area cultivated with tomatoes before the project: feddans	• المساحة المزروعة قبل المشروع: فدان - قيراط - سهم
1	2.1.3 Area cultivated with tomatoes during the project: feddans	• المساحة المزروعة أثناء المشروع: فدان - قيراط - سهم
1	2.1.4 Area cultivated with tomatoes after the project: feddans	• المساحة المزروعة بعد المشروع: فدان - قيراط - سهم
1	2.1.5 Area cultivated with crop before the project: feddans	• المساحة المزروعة قبل المشروع: فدان - قيراط - سهم
1	2.1.6 Area cultivated with crop during the project: feddans	• المساحة المزروعة أثناء المشروع: فدان - قيراط - سهم
1	2.1.7 Area cultivated with crop after the project: feddans	• المساحة المزروعة بعد المشروع: فدان - قيراط - سهم
3	2.1.8 Did the association exist before the project? Yes No	• هل كانت الجمعية موجودة قبل المشروع؟ نعم لا
3	2.1.9 Did the project contribute to the development of the association? Yes No If yes, how?	• هل ساهم المشروع في تطوير الجمعية؟ نعم لا نعم ،
4	2.1.10 Did the project provide any finance facilitation? Yes No If yes, mention Credit facilitation..... Delayed payment purchases from traders	• هل قدم المشروع أي تسهيلات مالية؟ نعم لا نعم ، ما هي؟ تسهيلات الائحة شراء مستلزمات إنتاج بالأجل بتجار تمويل بنكي أخرى ، تذكر

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارة المسئلة (فردية)
	Bank finance Other, mention:
4	2.1.11 What is the source of seedlings? Before the project: Own nursery Project nurseries Other nursery After the project: Own nursery Project nurseries Other nursery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ما هو مصدر الشتلات المستخدمة في الزراعة؟ قبل المشروع: مشتل خاص مشتل مشاريع مشتل آخر بعد المشروع: مشتل خاص مشتل مشاريع مشتل آخر
6	2.1.12 What are the activities launched during the project and still operating? Improved Varieties Packaging cultivating methods training Mechanization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ما هي الأنشطة التي استحدثت أثناء المشروع وما زالت ممتدة؟ الأصناف المحسنة طرق التعبئة طرق الزراعة التدريب عمليات الزراعة ولا جمع
4	2.1.13 Did the project develop the means of cultivation? Yes No If yes, how? Irrigation system Fertilization New species and varieties Pest and disease control Developed seedlings Other, mention:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ط ساهم المشروع في تطوير أساليب الزراعة؟ نعم لا في حال نعم ، ما هي طيعة هذا التطوير؟ نظم الري برامج التسميد أصناف ساللات جديدة برامج لمكافحة الآفات والأمراض شتلات مطورة أخرى ، تذكر
1	2.1.14 Have the productivity improved during the project? Increased % Same % Decreased %	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل زادت الإنتاجية خلال المشروع؟ زادت % لم تتغير % انخفضت %
1	2.1.15 What are the reasons for improvement? Changing varieties Improving irrigation system Improved fertilization Improved marketing systems Improved product quality Other, mention:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ما هو سبب الزيادة؟ تغيير الأصناف تحسين نظام الري تحسين نظام التسميد تحسين نظم التسويق أخرى ، تذكر
1,4	2.1.16 Did you face any problems in production? Yes No If yes, mention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل واجهتك أي مشكلات في الإنتاج لم تحل؟ نعم لا في حالة نعم ، أذكرها

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارة المسئلة (فردية)
1	2.1.17 Have the project contributed to reduce production costs? Yes % No The reason?	• هل ساهم المشروع في خفض تكاليف الإنتاج؟ نعم % لا السبب؟
4	2.1.18 Did the project assist in developing packaging and labeling methods? Yes No The reason?	• هل ساعد المشروع في تطوير طرق التغليف والتداول ومعاملات ما بعد الحصاد؟ نعم لا السبب؟
4	2.1.19 Did the project contribute to decreasing post-harvest losses? Yes % No Reasons:	• هل حسنت معدل تلف المحصول بعد الحصاد أثناء المشروع؟ نعم % لا السبب؟
4	2.1.20 What are the technical supports offered by the project directly to farmers or via the association? Extension service..... Information Training Other, mention	• ما هي مجالات الدعم الفني التي يقدمها المشروع للفلاحين مباشرة أو من خلال الجمعية؟ إرشاد علومات تدريب أخرى ، تذكر:
4	2.1.21 Did the project assist in developing packaging and labeling methods? Yes No The reason?	• هل ساعد المشروع في تطوير طرق التغليف والتداول؟ نعم لا السبب؟
4	2.1.22 Did you face any marketing problems before the project? Yes No If yes, mention	• هل واجهتك أي مشكلات تسويقية قبل المشروع؟ نعم لا إذا كان، تذكرها
4	2.1.23 Did the project assisted in solving them? Yes No If yes, how?	• هل ساعد المشروع في حلها؟ نعم لا إذا كان، تذكرها
4	2.1.24 What are the marketing supports offered by the project to farmers or association? Contracting New market opportunities	• ما هي مجالات الدعم التي يقدمها المشروع للفلاحين والجمعية؟ إعاقدة علومات تسويق تسويق (معاملات بعد الحصاد) ، تذكر:

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارة (تتطلب ان) (فأبلى شخصي)
	Facilities (post-harvest) Other, mention
6	2.1.25 What are the activities launched during the project and still operating? Improved Varieties Packaging cultivating methods training Mechanization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ما هي الأنشطة التي استحدثت أثناء المشروع وما زالت متبعة؟ • لصناف المحسنة طرق التجهيز طرق الزراعة التدوير ولتكن عمليات الزراعة ولا جمع
1,4	2.1.26 To whom did you usually sell your crops before the project? A marketing cooperative Local trader Wholesaler Exporter Factory Wholesale market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • لمن كنت تبيع منتجاتك من الظم اطم قبل المشروع؟ • جمعي قتع اوي قتعس وقعي تاجر م لحي تاجر جملة • حنر حنر سووال جملة
1,4	2.1.27 To whom do you usually sell your crops during the project? A marketing cooperative Trader Wholesaler Exporter Factory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • لمن كنت تبيع منتجاتك من الظم اطم أثناء المشروع؟ • جمعي قتع اوي قتعس وقعي تاجر تاجر جملة • حنر حنر
3	2.1.28 Did the project organize any awareness and advocacy workshops? Yes No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل نظم المشروع أي ندوات أو ورش عمل لنشر أفكار المشروع؟ نعم ال
3	2.1.29 Did the project organize any training programs? Yes No If yes, list them: Technical Post-harvest Marketing Finance Other, mention:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل نظم المشروع أي تدريبات للمزارعين؟ نعم ال • في حلقة نعم ، ما هي؟ • فنية معاملة لتباعد الاحصاد تسويقية • تمويلية أخرى ، تفكر:
3	2.1.30 What is the period you have been engaged with the project? From To	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ما هي المدة التي تبيع ان تفنيها مع المشروع؟ من الى
3	2.1.31 Did you participate in the project planning and management? Yes No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • في شارك تفني خطط وإدارة المشروع؟ نعم ال
6	2.1.32 Do you still apply the project recommendations? Yes No If yes? Mention:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • هل مازلت تطبق نفس إرشادات المشروع في المخطط بالإنتاج والتسويق؟ نعم ال • في حلقة نعم؟ ما هي؟ • لصناف نظام الزراعة نظام الري للتحاققات

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارات (واحد لواحد) (فأبلى شخصي)
	Varieties cultivation methods irrigation systems contracts safe production الإنتاج الآمن
6	2.1.33 Is the In-kind grants delivered to the association still operating Yes No	• هل لا يزال إعانة المشروع مازالت قيد التشغيل؟ نعم لا
5	2.1.34 Do women contribute to production activities? Yes No If yes, mention	• هل تساهم المرأة في أنشطة الزراعة؟ نعم لا في حالة نعم ، ما هي؟
5	2.1.35 Did any women receive trainings from the project? Yes No If yes, mention	• هل تلقت أي من السيدات تدريب من خلال المشروع؟ نعم لا في حالة نعم ، ما هي؟
5	2.1.36 What is the ratio of women's contribution to production activities? Before the project % After the project %	• ما هي نسبة مساهمة المرأة في أنشطة الزراعة؟ قبل المشروع % بعد المشروع %
5	2.1.37 What is the impact of the project on women's level of income? Positive % Neutral Negative %	• ما هو تأثير المشروع على مستوى دخل المرأة؟ إيجابي % متعادل سلبي %
2	2.1.38 How do you evaluate the project support? Enough somehow enough not enough	• هل تقديرك للدعم المقدم من المشروع؟ كافي إلى حد ما غير كاف
2	2.1.39 How can we benefit from such support in the future?	• كيف يمكننا الاستفادة من هذا الدعم في المستقبل؟
7	2.1.40 Did ACIDI monitor project activities? Yes ... No.... Do not know If Yes: How:	• هل كانت شركة (ACIDI) تتابع تنفيذ المشروع؟ نعم لا لا أعرف إذا كانت الاجابة نعم: كيف

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارات (واحد لواحد) (فأبلى شخشي)
	2.2 Greenhouses Owners:	2.2 ملكي لاصوب:
	Date of interview:	تاري خ لابل:
	Governorate:	الحافظة:
	District:	المرکز:
	Village:	لقة:
	Name of owner:	سم مال لاصوب:
	Age:	العر:
	Level of education: Graduate High school Basic education Read and write Illiterate Other, mention	المستوي لعل عل مي: عل مي عل مي عل مي عل مي عل مي عل مي تعل مي تعل مي تعل مي تعل مي تعل مي تعل مي أمي أخرى ، تذكر
1	2.2.1 # of greenhouses and their total area: greenhouses - square meters	• إجل لى عدل لاصوب ومساخه: صوبة - نهر مبع
1	2.2.2 # of greenhouses cultivated with tomato / seedlings before the project and their area: greenhouses - square meters	• عدل لاصوب ل مزرعة ل طم اطم ل شتلات قبل المشروع ومساخه: صوبة - نهر مبع
1	2.2.3 # of greenhouses cultivated with tomato / seedlings during the project and their area: greenhouses - square meters	• عدل لاصوب ل مزرعة ل طم اطم ل شتلات أثناء المشروع ومساخه: صوبة - نهر مبع
1	2.2.4 # of greenhouses cultivated with tomato / seedlings after the project and their area: greenhouses - square meters	• عدل لاصوب ل مزرعة ل طم اطم ل شتلات بعد المشروع ومساخه: صوبة - نهر مبع
4	2.2.5 Did the project provide any facilitation to expand the greenhouse? Yes No If yes, mention	• هل قدم المشروع أي تسهيلات لتوسيع ل لاصوب؟ نعم لا نعم لا أذكره ،
4	2.2.6 Did the project offer direct finance of credit facilitation? Yes No If yes, mention	• هل كان في التسهيلات لمباشرة أو تسهيلات لتوسيع ل لاصوب؟ نعم لا نعم لا أذكره ،

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2 استمارة (تتطلب ان) (فأبلى تشخصي)
4	<p>2.2.7 Did the project develop the means of cultivation? Yes No</p> <p>If yes, how?</p> <p>Cultivation system Irrigation system Fertilization</p> <p>New species and varieties Pest and disease control</p> <p>Developed seedlings Other, mention:</p>	<p>• هل تمت تطوير نظام للزراعة في الصوب قبل بدء المشروع؟ نعم لا</p> <p>• في حال نعم ، ما هي طبيعة هذا التطوير؟</p> <p>نظام إنشاء الصوب أنظمة الري برامج الحاسوب</p> <p>.....</p> <p>أنواع سالات جديدة برامج مكافحة الآفات والأمراض شتلات مطورة أخرى ، تذكر</p>
1,4	<p>2.2.8 Was the productivity improved during the project?</p> <p>Increased % Same % Decreased %</p>	<p>• هل زادت إنتاجية الصوب مع المشروع؟</p> <p>زادت % لم تتغير % انخفضت %</p>
1	<p>2.2.9 What were the reasons for improvement?</p> <p>Changing varieties Improving irrigation system</p> <p>Improved fertilization Improved marketing systems</p> <p>Improved product quality Other, mention</p>	<p>• ما هو سبب لزيادته؟</p> <p>تغيير الأصناف تحسين نظام الري تحسين نظام الحاسوب تحسين نظم التسويق تحسين نوعية الإنتاج أخرى تذكر</p>
4	<p>2.2.10 What is the source of seedlings?</p> <p>Before the project: Own nursery Project nurseries</p> <p>Other nursery</p> <p>After the project: Own nursery Project nurseries</p> <p>Other nursery</p>	<p>• ما هو مصدر الشتلات المستخدمة في الزراعة؟</p> <p>قبل المشروع: ممتلك خاص ممتلك مشاريع في المشروع ممتلك آخر</p> <p>بعد المشروع: ممتلك خاص ممتلك مشاريع في المشروع ممتلك آخر</p>
6	<p>2.2.11 What are the activities launched during the project and still operating?</p> <p>Improved Varieties Packaging cultivating methods training Mechanization</p>	<p>• ما هي الأنشطة التي استحدثت أثناء المشروع وما زالت مستمرة؟</p> <p>أنواع المحسنة طرق التعبئة طرق الزراعة التدريب عمليات عمليات الزراعة ولا جمع</p>
1	<p>2.2.12 Did you face any problems in production? Yes No</p> <p>.....</p> <p>2.2.13 If yes, mention</p>	<p>• هل واجهتك أي مشكلات في إنتاج محصول؟ نعم لا</p> <p>• في حالة نعم ، أذكرها</p>
1	<p>2.2.14 Did the project assist in solving them? How?</p>	<p>• في ساعد المشروع في حل هذه المشكلات؟</p>

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارات (واحد إلى واحد) (فأبلى شخصي)
	Yes No If yes, how?	نعم ال نعم حللة كيف؟
1	2.2.15 Have the project contributed to reduce production costs? Yes.... % No The reason?	• هل ساعد المشروع على خفض تكاليف الإنتاج؟ نعم % لا ما السبب؟
4	2.2.16 Did the project assist in developing packaging and labeling methods? Yes No	• هل ساعد المشروع على تطوير طرق التغليف والتداول ومعاملات ما بعد الحصاد؟ نعم ال كيف؟
4	2.2.17 Did the project contribute to decreasing post-harvest losses? Yes % No Reasons:	• هل حسنت معدل اتفق له محصول بعد الحصاد لتقليل الخسائر؟ نعم % لا ما السبب؟
1	2.2.18 Did you face any marketing problems before the project? Yes No If yes, mention	• هل واجهتك أي مشاكل في تسويق منتجاتك من قبل المشروع؟ نعم لا كيف؟ أذكرها
1	2.2.19 Did the project assist in solving them? Yes No If yes, how?	• هل ساعد المشروع على حلها؟ نعم ال نعم حللة كيف؟
1,4	2.2.20 To whom do you usually sell your crops before the project? A marketing cooperative Local trader Wholesaler Exporter Factory Wholesale market	• لمن كنت تبيع منتجاتك من قبل المشروع؟ جمعية تعاونية تاجر محلي تاجر جملة مُصدّر مصنع سوق الجملة
1,4	2.2.21 To whom do you usually sell your crops during the project? A marketing cooperative Trader Wholesaler Exporter Factory	• لمن كنت تبيع منتجاتك من قبل المشروع؟ جمعية تعاونية تاجر تاجر جملة مُصدّر مصنع
3	2.2.22 Did the project organize any awareness and advocacy workshops? Yes No	• هل نظم المشروع أي ندوات أو ورش عمل لشرح أفكار المشروع؟ نعم ال

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارة المسئلة (فردية)
3	2.2.23 Did the project organize any training programs? Yes No If yes, list them: Technical Post-harvest Marketing Finance Other, mention:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل نظم المشروع أي تدريبات للمزارعين؟ نعم لا في حلقة نعم ، ما هي؟ معاملات بعد الحصاد أخرى ، تذكر:
3	2.2.24 What is the period you have been engaged with the project? From To	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ما هي المدة التي تعانين فيها مع المشروع؟ من إلى
3	2.2.25 Did you participate in the project planning and management? Yes No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل شاركت في تخطيط وإدارة المشروع؟ نعم ال
6	2.2.26 Do you still apply the project recommendations? Yes No If yes? Mention: Varieties Cultivation methods irrigation systems Contracts Safe production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل مازلت تطبق نفس إرشادات المشروع على مخطط الإنتاج والتسويق؟ نعم ال في حلقة نعم؟ ما هي؟ الاصناف نظام الزراعة نظام الري الإنتاج الآمن
6	2.2.27 Is the In-kind grant delivered to the association by the project still operating Yes No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل مازال الحال على ما كان عليه المدة من المشروع ما زالت تفي بالتشغيل؟ نعم ال
5	2.2.28 Do women contribute to production activities? Yes No If yes, mention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل تساهم المرأة في أنشطة الزراعة؟ نعم ال
5	2.2.29 Did any women receive trainings from the project? Yes No If yes, mention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل تلقى أي من السيدات تدريب من خلال المشروع؟ نعم لا
5	2.2.30 What is the ratio of women's contribution to production activities? Before the project % After the project %	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ما هي نسبة مساهمة المرأة في أنشطة الزراعة؟ قبل المشروع % بعد المشروع %
5	2.2.31 What is the impact of the project on women's level of income?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ما هو تأثير المشروع على مستوى دخل المرأة؟

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2 استمارة (واحد إلى واحد) (فأبلى شخصي)
	Positive % Neutral Negative %	إيجابي % متعادل سلبي %
2	2.2.32 How do you evaluate the project support? Enough somehow enough not enough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> مفيدة جداً لدعم المقدم من المشروع؟ لغداً إلى حد ما غير لغداً
2	2.2.33 How can we benefit from such support in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> لن يفيدنا إلا الفائدة من هذا الدعم شركاً لأفضل في المستقبل؟
7	2.2.34 Did ACDI monitor project activities? Yes ... No.... Do not know If Yes: How:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل كانت شركة (ACDI) تتابع عتدي المشروع؟ نعم لا لا أعرف إذا لا لا إذا لا لا لا إذا لا لا لا
	2.3 Processors:	3.2 لمصنعين:
	Date of interview:	تاريخ المقابلة:
	Governorate:	المحافظة:
	District:	المركز:
	Village:	القرية:
	Name of factory:	اسم المصنع:
	Name of owner/ manager:	اسم مالك/مدير المصنع:
	Mobile #:	رقم الهاتف:
1,3	2.3.1 What is the source of the raw material before the project? Farmers Traders Wholesale Market Contract Other, mention:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ما هو مصدر المادة الخام قبل بدء المشروع؟ تجار سوق الجملة تفاعل أخرى: تفاعل أخرى:
1,3	2.3.2 What is the source of the raw material during the project? Farmers Traders Wholesale Market Contract Other, mention:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ما هو مصدر المادة الخام أثناء المشروع؟ تجار سوق الجملة تفاعل أخرى: تفاعل أخرى:
1,3	2.3.3 Did the project contribute to the availability of the raw material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> لن يساهم المشروع في توفير المادة الخام بسهولة أكبر عن ذي قبل؟

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارة المسئلة (واحدة لواحدة)
	better than before? Yes % No	نعم % لا
1	2.3.4 Is there any difference in the product quality during the project? Yes No If yes, what is the difference? Suitable varieties Sorted and Graded Fruits Improved Packaging Other, mention:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل تغيرت جودة محصول المور خلال فترة المشروع؟ نعم لا في حل قعم ، ما هي طبيعة الاختلاف؟ أنواع الفئمة فرز وتديج الم محصول عوات الفئمة أخرى ، تذكر:
1	2.3.5 Is there any difference in the product quality after the project? Yes No If yes, what is the difference? Suitable varieties Sorted and Graded Fruits Improved Packaging Other, mention:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل تغيرت جودة محصول المور بعد انتهاء المشروع حتى الآن؟ نعم لا في حل قعم ، ما هي طبيعة الاختلاف؟ أنواع الفئمة فرز وتديج الم محصول عوات الفئمة أخرى ، تذكر:
4	2.3.6 Did the project provide training of the workers? Yes No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل ساهم المشروع في تدريب العاملين؟ نعم لا
1	2.3.7 Did the project contribute to developing the production method? Yes No If yes, how	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل ساهم المشروع في تطوير طريقة الإنتاج؟ نعم لا في حل قعم ، كيف؟
6	2.3.8 Did the project contribute to increase the quantity and quality of production? Yes No How?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل ساهم المشروع في زيادة كمية الإنتاج وجوده؟ نعم لا كيف؟
6	2.3.9 Did the project contribute to stability of quantities supplied of raw material? Yes No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل ساهم المشروع في تنظيم وتوريد كميات المواد الخام؟ نعم لا
1	2.3.10 Did the project contribute to increase the level of operating? Yes No If yes, what is the ratio? %	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> هل ساهم المشروع في زيادة نسبة التشغيل؟ نعم لا في حل قعم ، ما هي النسبة المئوية؟ %

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2 أسئلة (تتضمن أسئلة فردية)
4	2.3.11 Did the project provide credit facilitation? Yes No	• هل ساهم المشروع في توفير تسهيلات في الحصول على قرض؟ نعم لا
5	2.3.12 Do women contribute to processing activities? Yes No If yes, mention	• هل تساهم المرأة في أنشطة التصنيع؟ نعم لا في حالة نعم ، ما هي؟
5	2.3.13 What is the ratio of women's contribution to greenhouse activities? %	• ما هي نسبة مساهمة المرأة في أنشطة الدفيئة؟ %
5	2.3.14 What is the impact of the project on women's level of income? Positive % Neutral Negative %	• ما هو تأثير المشروع على مستوى دخل المرأة؟ إيجابي % متعادل سلبي %
2	2.3.15 How do you evaluate the project support? Enough Somehow enough not enough	• هل تقضي دعم المشروع ما يكفي؟ كاف إلى حد ما غير كاف
2	2.3.16 How can we benefit from such support in the future?	• كيف يمكننا الاستفادة من هذا الدعم في المستقبل؟
	2.3.17 Are there any other questions we did not ask? What are these questions? What are their answers?	• هل توجد أسئلة أخرى لم نطرحها؟ ما هي تلك الأسئلة؟ وما هي الإجابات عليها؟ من وجهة نظرك؟
	2.4 Traders	2.4 التجار
	Date of interview:	تاريخ المقابلة:
	Name of trader:	اسم التاجر:
	Mobile #:	رقم الهاتف:
	Address:	العنوان:
1,3	2.4.1 What is the source of the raw material before the project? Producers Own farm Wholesale Market Contract Other, mention:	• ما هو مصدر المواد الخام قبل بدء المشروع؟ منتجون مزرعة خاصة سوق الجملة متعدد أخرى: تذكر
1,3	2.4.2 Did it change after the project? Yes No If yes, mention new sources.....	• هل تغيرت هذه المصادر بعد بدء المشروع؟ نعم لا في حالة نعم ، أكثر المصادر الجديدة؟

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارات (واحد إلى واحد)
1	2.4.3 What is the nature of relationships with producers before and after the project?	• ما هي طبيعة العلاقات مع المنتجين قبل وبعد المشروع؟
1,4	2.4.4 Are there any changes in quantity and quality of products received from producers after the project? Yes No If yes, what is the difference? More quantities Suitable varieties Sorted and Graded Fruits Improved Packaging Other, mention:	• هل حدثت أي تغييرات في كمية وجودة المنتجات التي تم تلقيها من المنتجين بعد المشروع؟ نعم لا إذا كان الأمر كذلك ، فما هي طبيعة الاختلاف؟ كمية أكبر أصناف متنوعة فرز وتدرج الفواكه تحسين التغليف أخرى ، تذكر:
5	2.4.5 Do women contribute to trading activities? Yes No If yes, mention	• هل تساهم المرأة في الأنشطة التجارية؟ نعم لا إذا كان الأمر كذلك ، فما هي طبيعة مساهمة المرأة في الأنشطة التجارية؟
5	2.4.6 What is the ratio of women's contribution to trading activities? %	• ما هي نسبة مساهمة المرأة في الأنشطة التجارية؟ %
5	2.4.7 What is the impact of the project on women's level of income? Positive % Neutral Negative %	• ما هو تأثير المشروع على مستوى دخل المرأة؟ إيجابي % متعادل سلبي %
2	2.4.8 How do you evaluate the project support? Enough Somehow enough not enough	• كيف تقيم الدعم المقدم من المشروع؟ كثيرا إلى حد ما غير كاف
2	2.4.9 How can we benefit from such support in the future?	• كيف يمكننا الاستفادة من هذا الدعم في المستقبل؟
	2.5 Input Suppliers (Vendors):	2.5 موردين عن الموردين:
	Date of interview:	تاريخ المقابلة:
	Name of supplier:	اسم المورد:
	Mobile #:	رقم الهاتف المحمول:
	Address:	عنوان المورد:
	Kinds of inputs supplied:	نوع المواد المدونة:
3	2.5.1 When did you know about the project activity?	• متى علمت بتبني مشروعنا؟

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2) استمارة المسئلة (إحدى شخصي)
3	2.5.2 When did you start cooperating with the project?	• بقي بدأ التعاون مع المشروع؟
3	2.5.3 What are the kinds of cooperation with the project?	• ما هي أوجه التعاون مع المشروع؟
1	2.5.4 Did the project contribute to developing your activities? Yes No If yes, how?	• هل ساهم المشروع في تطوير الأنشطة الخاصة بكم؟ نعم لا نعم لا كيف؟
1	2.5.5 Did the project contribute to increase survivability ratio of seedlings? Yes % No	• هل ساهم المشروع في زيادة نسبة البقاء للشتلات؟ نعم % لا
1	2.5.6 Did the project contribute to changing quantities and types of fertilizers and pesticides? Yes No If yes, how?	• هل ساهم المشروع في تغيير كميات وأنواع الأسمدة والمبيدات؟ نعم % لا كيف؟
1	2.5.7 Did the project contribute to increase farm income? Yes No If yes, how?	• هل ساهم المشروع في زيادة دخل المزرعة؟ نعم % لا كيف؟
4	2.5.8 What kind of support did you receive from the project? Financial support Capacity building Training Information Other, mention:	• ما هي طيعة الدعم التي قدّم لكم من المشروع؟ دعم مالي بناء مؤسسي تدريب معلومات علاقات أخرى ، تذكر:
6	2.5.9 Did the cooperation with project continued to its end? Yes No	• هل استمر التعاون مع المشروع حتى نهايته؟ نعم لا
6	2.5.10 Did the cooperation with the project beneficiaries continue after the project? Yes No	• هل استمر التعاون مع المستفيدين من المشروع بعد انتهاء المشروع؟ نعم لا
2	2.5.11 How do you evaluate the project support? Enough Somehow enough not enough	• ما تقييمكم للدعم المقدم من المشروع؟ كافي إلى حد ما غير كافي

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارة المسئلة (واحد لواحد)
2	2.5.12 How can we benefit from such support in the future?	• ايفي لمن الامفاده من هذا الدعم شرك لافضل في المستقبل؟
	2.5.13 Are there any other questions we did not ask? What are these questions? What are their answers?	• هليو بسئلة اخري ليعتدتم الطرق اليها؟ ما هيتلك الاسئلة؟ وما هي الاجابة عليها من وج هه نظررك؟
	2.6 Farmers Associations' Staff	2.6. موظف منظمات ل مزارعين:
	Date of interview:	تاري خ ل امل:
	Name of association:	اسم لاجمعي:
	Name of association director:	اسم ميري لاجمعي:
	Mobile #:	رقم الموبيل:
	Address:	عنوان لاجمعي:
4	2.6.1 What are the kinds of support offered by the project to the association staff? Financial support Capacity building Training Other, mention:	• ما هي مجالات الدعم التي قدمها المشروع لعماله بل لاجمعي؟ دعم مالي بناموس سي تدريب أخرى تذكر:
4	2.6.2 Did the association receive any grants from the project? Yes No If yes: Mention:	• هل صلت لاجمعي لحي أي فح من المشروع؟ نعم ال فبي حلة قنعم: ما هي؟
6	2.6.3 Did the association activities initiated during the project still operating? Yes No	• هل ما زالت الاشطة التي بييت على ال فح قنم لاشغل؟ نعم ال
6	2.6.4 Did the project created extra income for the association? Yes No Mention:	• هل أدى المشروع إلى طيق حصادر دخل مسمدة ل لاجمعي؟ نعم ال اييف؟
4	2.6.5 How the support by the project assisted in developing the association performance?	• كيف س امم ل دعم المقدم من المشروع وغييت طوير أداء لاجمعي؟
1,4	2.6.6 What are the training programs attended by staff? Strategic planning Income generation Meeting organization Other, mention:	• ما هي التدريبات التي حمر ل علي هالعام ل بل لاجمعي؟ تخطيط استراتيجي تطوير حصادر الدخل أخرى، تذكر:

Eval. Ques	2. Questionnaires (one-to-one)	2. استمارة المسئلة (واحد إلى واحد)
4	2.6.7 What is the ratio of staff attended training programs? %	• ما هي نسبة العاملين الذين حصلوا على تدريبات؟ %
1	2.6.8 What are the impacts of the training programs?	• ما هو الأثر المتتبع على هذه التدريبات؟
5	2.6.9 Did the project contribute to increase the ratio of women's contribution to association activities (as an employee)? Yes No	• هل ساهم المشروع في زيادة نسبة مساهمة المرأة في أنشطة الجمعية كموظفة بلال جمعية؟ نعم % لا
3,7	2.6.10 Did you participate in planning and implementation of the project activities? Yes No	• هل شاركت في تخطيط وإدارة أنشطة المشروع؟ نعم لا
2	2.6.11 How do you evaluate the project support? Enough Somehow enough not enough	• هل تقبّل الدعم المقدم من المشروع؟ الكفلي إلى حد ما غير الكفلي
2	2.6.12 How can we benefit from such support in the future?	• كيف يمكن الاستفادة من هذا الدعم بشكل أفضل في المستقبل؟
7	2.6.13 Did ACDI monitor project activities? Yes ... No.... Do not know If Yes: How:	• هل كانت شركة (ACDI) تتابع وتقيّم أنشطة المشروع؟ نعم لا لا أعرف إذا كانت الإجابة نعم: كيف
	2.7 Collaboration with related authorities and organization (Directorates of Agriculture – International affairs department at Ministry of Agriculture)	2.7. التعاون مع الهيئات والمنظمات ذات الصلة (مديريات الزراعة – إدارة العلاقات الخارجية بوزارة الزراعة)
	2.7.1 What are the kinds of cooperation with the project?	• ما هي أوجه التعاون مع المشروع خلال مراحل التخطيط؟
	2.7.2 Did the cooperation contribute to solving any of the problems within the projects areas?	• هل ساهم التعاون مع المشروع في حل أو تخفيف بعض المشاكل الكفلي في نطاق المشروع؟
3,7	2.7.3 Did you participate in planning and implementation of the project activities? Yes No	• هل شاركت في تخطيط وإدارة أنشطة المشروع؟ نعم لا
7	2.7.4 Did ACDI monitor project activities? Yes ... No.... Do not know If Yes: How:	• هل كانت شركة (ACDI) تتابع وتقيّم أنشطة المشروع؟ نعم لا لا أعرف إذا كانت الإجابة نعم: كيف

The evaluation questions are:

1. What objectives/targets were met towards AERI's highest level results?
2. What are the lessons learned from the program's implementation that USAID/Egypt can take into consideration for future similar programs?
3. In what ways were stakeholder partnerships formed during the projects (from design to the end of implementation)?
 - a. What are areas for improvement?
4. To what extent were the projects able to build capacity of the beneficiaries according to the project design?
5. How have the projects developed measures to enhance women's participation in their respective sectors?
6. To what extent were systems and processes for sustainability, institutionalized, or adopted, by the associations (beyond June 2013)?
7. To what extent did the implementing partners monitor and evaluate the outcomes and impacts of the activities supported by the project?
 - a. How did ACDI/VOCA adjust the implementation to address findings?

U.S. Agency for International Development

1A Nady El Etisalat Street

New Maadi, Cairo

Egypt

Postal Code - M 11435

Phone +20 2 2522-7000

Fax +20 2 2516-4628

Email cairomedia@usaid.gov