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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is an evaluation of a project on Promoting Agriculture-Climate-Trade linkages in the East African Community (PACT EAC) which was funded by Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) during the period 2011-2014. The project focused on human and institutional capacity building of East African Community (EAC) stakeholders so that they are able to take better advantage of international trade opportunities for growth and development and poverty reduction while dealing with the impact of climate change on food security.

In this context, the three fold project objectives are the following:

1. Increased knowledge and capacity on trade, climate change and food security linkages by stakeholders so they are able to identify their own policy options, make recommendations and advocate for change;
2. Improved capacity of the EAC Geneva Missions in the WTO discussions and negotiations on issues of interest to them; and,
3. Improved/enhanced coordination between and across stakeholders at national, regional and multilateral levels.

The main objective of this report is to evaluate whether the project has fulfilled its objectives. In doing so, the external evaluators have focussed on two main aspects:

- Provide an assessment of the performance of the project.
- Identify key points of learning, best practices and propose practical recommendations to inform future programming of similar projects for both CUTS and Sida.

The general framework of this evaluation is defined in the Terms of Reference (TORs) approved by Sida and CUTS. In terms of evaluation structure, the approved TORs refer to the “DAC criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance”, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability as well as project design and approach.

Data collection methods for the project evaluation included an extensive review of documents provided by CUTS International and Sida, semi-structured interviews including face-to-face in project countries and Geneva, and email correspondence with a total of 70 persons covering 52 organizations in the five EAC countries as well as EAC negotiators in Geneva, Switzerland. The evaluation took place in March-June 2014, including a field mission to Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda and Switzerland. The stakeholders interviewed ranged from farmers, farmer-based organizations, civil society organisations, East African Community Secretariat, government ministries, EAC delegates based in Geneva, regional organisations, and private sector.

The evaluation findings and conclusions are summarized below:

Relevance
The PACT EAC project can be considered as relevant as the activities, undertaken by CUTS and its country partners in the EAC countries, have addressed the needs and priorities of the target groups as reflected in regional policies, strategies, and action plans; national
policies, strategies and priorities; and in other on-going initiatives. The project is consistent with the Swedish Government’s priorities in Sub-Saharan African; with continental (agricultural, trade, climate change) development strategies.

**Project design and approach**
Despite some overlaps in the indicators of project objectives, these did not constrain the achievement of the project outcomes. The project design is rated satisfactory as the activities were implemented in a participatory and inclusive manner.

**Effectiveness and impact**
The project implementation is on track and it is expected that by the end of the project all of the project activities would have been implemented. The evaluation team concludes that the project has contributed to immediate positive effects particularly with respect to holistic review/development of policies. It has contributed significantly to improved knowledge and capacity by stakeholders on climate-food-trade linkages, to hence enable them identifying their own options, making recommendations and advocating for change. Moreover, the PACT EAC project has provided support to EAC Geneva delegates to better participate in WTO discussions and negotiations. Finally, through advocacy campaigns and strategies, the project interventions have made significant contributions to improved coordination between and across stakeholders at the national, regional, and multilateral levels. If fully implemented, the revised policies and improved strategies and practices will contribute to: enhanced environmental protection; increased agricultural productivity; more trade, and poverty reduction among rural communities.

**Efficiency**
Specific strategies like limited flexibility in the budget were incorporated in the agreement to allow the project to address specific emerging needs. The financial reporting was in line with the laid down guidelines as supported by audit reports which found that expenditures had been in accordance with budgets without financial mismanagement. The project was also cost effective through strict cost controls, utilisation of less costly options (e.g. to organise meetings, arrange translations and printing etc), and partnership with local institutions. The project’s annual review meetings, inputs by NRGs and Project Advisory Committee contributed to regular monitoring of project progress which the above suggests that stakeholder ownership over the project, especially design of activities, is rather high.

**Sustainability**
The evaluation team concludes that the project created various sustainable outputs that are likely to continue after the end of the project in particular, the knowledge and capacity built on climate change-food security-trade (CCFST) linkages and other related issues, the project materials, particularly research study reports and training manuals which will continue to be used in the region, collaboration and consultations among stakeholders within and between organizations/ institutions and the confidence built by the project among members of the National Reference Groups (NRGs) as the NRGs represent a broad spectrum of stakeholders.
Lessons Learnt

The main lessons derived are the following:

- Advocacy campaigns based on research and run through a network-based approach constitute an effective means of bringing stakeholders together for policy change, enhanced collaboration and thus achieving objectives of projects such as PACT EAC.
- Wide and continuous involvement of the media (both print and electronic media) is an effective way of reaching a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including indirect beneficiaries of the project.
- Arrangements such as the Geneva EAC Forum can be very useful in improving the capacity of EAC delegates for better participation in WTO and other negotiations by providing them a space to come together as well as substantive notes/papers on relevant issues, and by linking them to their capitals/grassroots. But more resources are needed to improve the effectiveness of such arrangements.
- In-built flexibilities – as is the case with PACT EAC – help in the effective implementation of the project to achieve its objectives.
- The three-year duration is too little to create policy and practice changes. Such projects should be at least of a duration of 5-6 years.

Recommendations

The main recommendations that have emerged from the external evaluation include:

- PACT EAC project should be extended for another 3-5 years to ensure that the impact created thus far is built upon for long term policy and practice changes.
- There should be deeper consultations with grassroots communities and local civil society organizations in the design of similar projects.
- Efforts should continue to improve coordination with the EAC Secretariat while engaging more with other regional stakeholders such as the East African Business Council, EAGC, and the EAC Civil Society Forum.
- More resources should be provided for EAC Geneva Forum and for advocacy campaigns at the national level in future such projects.
- More efforts should be put on research studies to address specific needs of different stakeholders, revision or upgrading of training manuals, and addressing the needs of EAC WTO delegates.
- The synergies created between regional and multilateral levels need to be built upon and consolidated so that the two-way flow of information and analysis between Geneva and countries/region can be optimized with a view to strengthening links between grassroots aspirations/concerns and multilateral discussions/negotiations.
1 INTRODUCTION
CUTS International Geneva (CUTS), a research-based NGO, and its partners throughout the EAC region (Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda), have been undertaking a project on Promoting Agriculture-Climate-Trade linkages in the East African Community (PACT EAC Project) with funding support from Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) during the period 2011-2014. The project focuses on human and institutional capacity building in the East African Community (EAC) aiming to enhance positive impacts of regional and international trade on economic growth, sustainable development and poverty reduction, with particular focus on food security, in the context of climate change.

1.1 Aim of Evaluation
The main aim of this evaluation is to assess the overall performance of the PACT EAC project, in the period from its initiation in September 2011 until the May 2014 (end of the evaluation process). For this purpose, the two overall objectives of this evaluation are defined as follows:

1. Identify how effectively the PACT EAC project has been implemented, paying particular attention to the impact of the project’s interventions against its stated objectives.
2. Provide Sida and CUTS with main lessons from the project and recommendations on any possible improvements for future project design, implementation, follow-up and evaluation commensurate to the scope of the project and the existing institutional capacities.

In line with the two overall objectives mentioned above, this evaluation shall reflect the strengths and weaknesses of the current project implementation approaches. In addition to that it suggest ways of enforcing the observed strengths and suggests how to improve on shortcomings.

1.2 Evaluation Criteria
The general framework of this evaluation is defined in the “terms of reference” approved by Sida and CUTS (see Annex 1). In terms of evaluation structure, the approved terms of reference refers to the “DAC criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance”, namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and project design. These five evaluation criteria serve as guideline for this review and are all integrated in the “evaluation findings” section (section 3). They are defined as follows:

1. Relevance: examines the extent to which the objectives of the development intervention protect is consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, national and regional needs, global priorities and partners’ and Sida’s policies. It also examines the responsiveness of the projects to stakeholders’ expressed needs through participation in project design. Coherence with other on-going and planned initiatives is also discussed here.
2. Effectiveness: assesses the progress of activities towards the achievement of results, objectives and the project purpose. The effectiveness criterion concerns how far the
project’s results were attained, and the project’s specific objective(s) were achieved, or are expected to be achieved.

3. **Efficiency**: The efficiency criterion concerns how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results (also referred to as outputs), in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness.

4. **Sustainability**: Discusses the likelihood that results will persist after the project ends and whether national ownership has taken place or is likely to do so.

5. **Project design**: Explores the suitability of the project model and its design as a means to achieve objectives.

### 1.3 Methodology

Data collection tools included semi-structured interviews, telephone interviews, e-mail correspondence, questionnaires, review of documents, media coverage analysis and internet research. Regarding the methodology of data analysis, we distinguish between primary and secondary data collection.

The primary data collection involved semi-structured interviews and discussions with key stakeholders in Geneva, Burundi, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda and Uganda. Where visits were not possible, the interviews were conducted through the telephone and e-mail (e-questionnaire). The selection of stakeholders to be interviewed was made in consultation with Sida and CUTS International’s Geneva and Nairobi Resource Centers. The selection of the sample of potential interviewees was based on the priority made to focus on project stakeholders’ in order to cover the spectrum of representation among the private, public and civil society sectors in a balanced manner (for list of interviewed stakeholders see Annex 6). The interviews allowed evaluators to capture the views and expectations of the stakeholders concerning the implementation of the project and sustainability of the project results. In addition to the interviews, a questionnaire was prepared (Annex 5) and sent to selected respondents. The questionnaire was important because it provided quantitative data and information regarding the implementation of the project activities.

Secondary data collection includes the review of project documents made available by Sida and CUTS (see list of references in Annex 9). Moreover, an analysis of relevant media coverage was conducted (see Annex 7), as well as an Internet research covering relevant websites of PACT EAC, CUTS, the EAC and the WTO.

In order to ensure accuracy and reliability of the analysis, data scrutiny has high priority in this evaluation. The data analysis focuses mainly on descriptive statistics of the key variables. The findings are presented in tables and appropriate figures. The detailed evaluation methodology is presented in Annex 4.

### 1.4 Structure of the Evaluation Report

The evaluation is structured in four sections. First, the introduction presented the aim of this report, the evaluation criteria as well as a short methodological overview. Second, the
evaluated intervention is presented, covering the project background, the political context of the intervention and the objectives of the PACT EAC project. Section three presents the findings, providing the factual evidence, data and relevant observations of the project evaluation. Finally, the lessons learned and recommendations are presented in section four.
2 THE EVALUATED INTERVENTION

2.1 Intervention Background
With about 40 million undernourished people, food security is one of the main challenges in the East African Community where food production is affected by extreme weather events. In the next decades, the situation is expected to further aggravate as climate change worsens in a region where as many as four in five people rely on agriculture for a living. If sub-Saharan Africa is not to become the home of an additional 600 million hungry people, early action and adaptation of sound policies harnessing the potential role of trade is a must. Trade can be an instrument to impact food security positively when a free flow of products leads to greater production efficiency, larger available quantities and lower prices. However, trade can also have negative impacts on food security when subsidized food imports displace domestic production and when international trade rules and agreements impede the access to and utilization of all the needed policy tools. Climate change is linked to trade because different patterns of production, especially in agriculture, will emerge that in turn will result in changed trade relationships between countries. EAC countries, for example, will have to import more food in the next years or build up their own capacity to produce. Unfortunately, the linkages between trade, climate change, and food security are little understood and the respective policies are often developed and implemented independently of each other. Hence, there has been a need to build the capacity of EAC stakeholders to better understand the climate change – food security – trade linkages in policy and practice.

The EAC Secretariat is conscious of these challenges and has strived to develop national and regional policies to deal with them. In this context, the EAC Secretariat signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with CUTS International in January 2010 that provided for collaboration on various issues particularly related to climate change, food security and trade. This led to the development of the project “Promoting Agriculture-Climate Change-Trade Linkages in the East African Community” (PACT EAC).

2.2 The political and institutional context of the intervention
With regard to existing challenges of climate change, food security and trade, EAC countries have taken commendable steps on the national, regional and international level.

On a national level, each EAC country has developed its own policy strategies. On the regional level, the EAC has adopted the East African Community Climate Change Policy (EACCCP) as well as the EAC Food Security Action Plan for the period 2011-2015 following the EAC Council Decision on Climate Change in 2011 and Food Security. The Action Plan serves as a guide to the implementation and actualization of the regional food security objective.

Despite of the national and regional efforts undertaken so far, the assurance of food security remains a major challenge in the EAC. This situation is bound to be aggravated by the impacts of climate change. Other factors that contribute to food insecurity in the EAC include limited implementation of agricultural policies at national level and poor trade policies that limit free movement of food from surplus to deficit areas, particularly for
grains. Moreover, the lack of access to markets and productive resources by farmers, majority of whom are smallholders, limits the food supply. According to the EAC Food Security Action Plan for 2011-2015, the region remains food insecure although it has a huge potential and capacity to produce enough food for regional consumption and a large surplus for export to the world market. The Action plan recognizes the most critical causes of food insecurity as being (i) inadequate food exchange/trade between times and/or places of abundant harvest on one hand, and those with deficit on the other; (ii) high variability in production caused by high variability of weather which is becoming worse due to climate change; (iii) increased frequency and severity of extreme weather such as floods and drought as a result of global warming and climate change, are adversely affecting food production in the region; and (iv) inadequate flow of information on the adverse climate change impacts and actions to the producers.

On the international level, EAC countries are active participants in international trade and are members of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Although EAC countries are yet to formally negotiate as one and coordinate their positions in the WTO, they undertake their trade policy review exercises at the WTO together. This coordination can be enhanced by operationalizing the EAC Trade Negotiation protocol, which would enable formal joint negotiations for both bilateral and multilateral trade negotiations of the region, which will be particularly important for effective participation in the WTO Ministerial Conferences.

However, EAC countries have weak negotiating capacities to fully and effectively participate in the relevant international negotiations under the WTO and UNFCCC. The links between their negotiators and country stakeholders are few, irregular and ad hoc, if any. Their human and institutional capacities are limited and the knowledge on issue linkages such as trade, climate change and food security is particularly lacking. The coordination among relevant ministries is sub-optimal, often leading to the adoption of policies related to trade, climate change and food security that are not synergized and, at times, are contradictory. The spaces where stakeholders interested in the three issue areas can interact, share information and knowledge, and develop holistic solutions, are almost non-existent. Finally, no targeted training opportunities are available to understand the policy and practice linkages of trade, climate change and food security.

2.3 Project Description

“Promoting Agriculture-Climate-Trade linkages in the EAC” (PACT EAC) is a three year project undertaken by CUTS International, Geneva with funding support from the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA). The project had two separate but synergetic segments for human and institutional capacity building of East African Community (EAC) stakeholders so that they are able to take better advantage of international trade opportunities for their growth and development and poverty reduction while dealing with the impact of climate change on food security. It assists EAC stakeholders in better understanding and dealing with the crucial challenges of climate change, food security and effective participation in the multilateral trading system. Through research-based advocacy, training and networking, and by linking grassroots with Geneva, the projects builds the human and institutional capacity in the EAC to take better advantage of international trade for growth, development and poverty reduction, particularly in the context of climate
change. To ensure sustainability and inclusiveness, the project is implemented in partnership with grassroots organizations in participating countries.

2.4 Project Objectives
Climate change, food security, and trade are interlinked and need to be addressed together at the national, regional and multilateral levels. While the impacts of climate change on food security and trade are widely accepted, the three issues are not holistically addressed. In this context, the project objectives are three-fold:
1. Increased knowledge and capacity on trade, climate change and food security linkages by stakeholders so they are able to identify their own policy options, make recommendations and advocate for change;
2. Improved capacity of the EAC Geneva Missions in the WTO discussions and negotiations on issues of interest to them; and,
3. Improved/enhanced coordination between and across stakeholders at national, regional and multilateral levels.

2.5 The Project Stakeholders
PACT EAC project follows a multi-stakeholder approach. It brings together national, regional, and international level stakeholders from climate change, trade, and agriculture/food security sectors. Stakeholders from the different issue areas have had approximately equal level of representation. These stakeholders include the EAC Secretariat, EAC government ministries and other public institutions, civil society organizations, academia/research institutions, private sector, media, farmers’ organisations, and other regional organizations such as trapca, EACSOF and EAGC. At the international level, the main stakeholders have been WTO Geneva Delegates comprising EAC WTO Geneva Missions’ diplomats and to some extent their Ambassadors. The project also involved the relevant international organisations, e.g. FAO, UNEP, WTO and UNFCCC.

2.6 Project Organisation and Management
The project has been implemented by CUTS International Geneva and its partners in the region. In addition to preparing many substantive outputs, CUTS Geneva has the overall planning, oversight, monitoring, and guidance role. It also ensures the quality of various outputs including by country partners and undertakes all Geneva-centred activities. Moreover, it is responsible for internal monitoring and evaluation and reporting to the donor. CUTS Jaipur, India has provided valuable support related to editing, layout, and printing of the project materials as well as inputs related to research, advocacy and networking activities. CUTS ARC Nairobi, as one of the regional partners of the project has been undertaking most of the regional follow up activities with regard to the other four partners. The five regional project partners are Action Développement et Intégration Régionale (ADIR) in Burundi; CUTS Africa Resource Centre, Nairobi, in Kenya; Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF) in Tanzania; Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute (SEATINI) in Uganda; and, Rwanda Civil Society Forum (RCSP) in Rwanda. These five partners have undertaken the implementation of the regional activities. Trade Policy Training Center in Africa (trapca) has prepared most of the training materials and conducted the training workshops. Meanwhile, the EAC Secretariat
that was supposed to be the recipient of many of the research findings of the project and closely involved in the implementation of the project, but has been mostly absent despite repeated efforts by CUTS Geneva and CUTS Nairobi (e.g. through direct meetings and requests to the SG EAC, regular communications with the DSG EAC who is a member of the Project Advisory Committee, and approaches to the relevant technical level staff). This lack of full participation by the EAC Secretariat has been compensated to some extent through the national advocacy campaigns, implemented by the five regional partners that aim to mainstream the CCFST linkages into the policies and practice and help to build the stakeholders’ capacity on these issues.

2.7 The Project Activities and Key Outputs Delivered
The PACT EAC follows an integrated research, advocacy, networking, and training approach (RAN-T).

On a national and regional level, different activities have been undertaken, such as the collaborative and evidence-based research through local partners on the linkages regarding climate change, food security and trade (CCFST). Advocacy activities included briefing papers and action alerts as well as advocacy campaigns to call for the attention of different stakeholders as well as to achieve behaviour and policy change in the national context on the CCFST linkages issues. Establishment and functioning of regional and national multi–stakeholder networks; National Reference Group and Regional Annual Meetings, have provided networking opportunities. Finally, training of all relevant stakeholders through national and regional training workshops to instill understanding of the CCFST linkages to a critical mass of people from the region.

On an international level, (Geneva and the World Trade Organization) activities consisted of the EAC Geneva Forums taking place every two months with the aim to build capacity of the EAC country WTO negotiators in their discussions and negotiations at the WTO according to their expressed needs. The EAC Geneva Forum constitutes a Platform for EAC delegates, where they can come together and discuss WTO and other related issues that matter to the EAC countries. For each Forum meeting, CUTS prepared technical WTO-related notes as well as other update notes on specific issues (including on topics related to trade, food security and climate change linkages). This activity has accentuated on the proven strengths of CUTS in Geneva to specifically complement the needs of the EAC countries in their day-to-day work and established a durable and effective support mechanism for EAC countries in Geneva with links to the grassroots.

The project activities carried out so far (31 March 2014) are presented in table 2. The key outputs achieved to date include: 5 research study reports, synthesis reports, inception meeting, 5 National Reference Groups, 1 Interactive Website, and 5 National and one regional training manual. The outputs actually delivered as against the project targets for the full 3-year duration include: 30 out of 36 country update notes and WTO-related notes, 25 NRG meetings out of 30, 28 advocacy, messages/press releases out of 30, 15 Geneva meetings out of 18, and 30 communications to and from the EAC grassroots out of 36.
2.8 The assumptions about external factors that were part of intervention planning

As the project is implemented involving many different stakeholders, across levels and countries, it is dependent on their involvement, therefore the assumption from the beginning of the project has been to be able to sustain engagement with all the relevant stakeholders. All of the safeguards that had been built into the project with regard to ensuring the participation of the relevant stakeholders were enough for other stakeholders except with regards to the EAC Secretariat. The reasons for lack of full response and participation by the EAC Secretariat can include among others: the busy schedules and travel of its staff, strict application of CUTS Travel Policy (that is monitored by auditors as requested by Sida and allows for only economy class travel and meals allowance), and EAC Secretariat staff turnover. These were not anticipated. However, project management has undertaken some remedial measures by initiating greater contacts and involvement of other regional organisations (e.g. EABC, EAGC, EACSOF) as well as the national EAC Ministries in the project to compensate for the less-than-expected participation by the EAC Secretariat.

Another assumption with regards to the International segment of the project was that the WTO negotiations are ongoing, alongside which the project would be providing support to these negotiations and deliberations, which however had not been the case for two-thirds of the time of the project as the WTO remained dormant till the preparations for the Bali Ministerial Conference started in earnest. The project had assumed that it is appropriate to support the WTO delegates by analyzing and synthesizing the current available information in order to prepare positions at the WTO. It has become clear with the revival of negotiations after the WTO Bali Ministerial Conference in December 2013 that what the WTO delegates need more are large scale primary research on macro-economic tendencies and impacts of various WTO negotiating areas and options in their countries and regions. This is a need that was not covered under the project.

The safeguards put in place to assure against possible corruption have been sufficient. They included *inter alia* annual audits by Mazars, IFAC-accredited auditors, submission of audit reports of the major partners, reports to the donor, annual stakeholder meetings, and periodic substantive and financial reporting, etc. Also, the country partners were mostly chosen on the basis of prior work that had been handled by them in other CUTS projects or on the basis of open selection processes.
3 FINDINGS AND EVALUATIVE CONCLUSIONS

This section presents the factual evidence, data and relevant observations of the project evaluation. In terms of structure the findings are organised according to five evaluation criteria, which are the following: (i) relevance, (ii) project design, (iii) efficiency, (iv) effectiveness and (v) sustainability.

3.1 Relevance

The PACT EAC project can be considered as relevant if the activities, undertaken by CUTS and its country partners in the EAC countries, have addressed the needs and priorities of the target groups.

Findings

In the following paragraphs, beneficiaries’ requirements, national and regional needs and policies, global priorities as well as Sida's strategies will be reviewed. Those findings will allow to assess the relevancy of the PACT EAC project.

Sida has developed a Cooperation Strategy for Regional Development Cooperation with Sub-Saharan Africa (January 2010-December 2015). Its sector 2 on Environment and Climate has the objective to “Increase regional cooperation aimed at promoting environmentally sustainable use of natural resources, and mitigating as well as adapting to the impacts of climate change”. The strategy indicates that Sida will support “food security based on sustainable and, as far as possible, low-carbon solutions; and equitable and sustainable use and protection of ecosystems and natural resources. Under the sector 3 of the strategy on Economic integration, trade, industry and financial systems, the government aims at “Increase regional cooperation aimed at promoting regional and international trade and economic integration”. According to the strategy, ‘Sweden will provide support aimed at enhancing opportunities for African countries to step up their participation in and benefit from, inter-regional as well as international trade through economic integration’.

At the Pan African level, governments have agreed on the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) based on 4 pillars: Pillar 3 – Increasing Food Supply, reducing hunger, and improving responses to food emergency crises; and Pillar 4 – Improving agricultural research, technology development and adaptation. Moreover, African head of states have also developed the Framework for African Food Security (FAFS), whose objectives are to ‘improve risk management, increase supply of affordable food through increased production and improved market access linkages, increase economic opportunities for the vulnerable and increased quality of diets through diversification of food among the target groups’.

Moreover, the Joint EU Africa Strategy (JEAS) crafted by the African Union and the EU, under the Action Plan 2011-2013 « Partnership on Regional Economic Integration, Trade and Infrastructure », concerns the improvement of the competitiveness and the diversification of African agriculture and industry.
In the East African region in particular, the East African Community follows a Climate Change Policy (EACCP) and EAC Food Security Action Plan (EACFSAP). The Action Plan serves as a guide to the implementation and actualization of the regional food security objective. It outlines the current and future constraints with regards to production, productivity, efficiency, health, infrastructure, institutional support, and climate change. The Action Plan points out the priority areas for food security, among which are enabling environment, legal and institutional framework, increasing food availability, improving access to food, improving food stability, promoting food utilization, and mobilizing financial resources.

Within the region, each EAC country has developed some policies and/or strategies on climate, food, and trade. In Kenya, the government developed the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (ASDS), the National Climate Response Strategy (NCCRS) in 2010 and the National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) for the period 2013-2017. The NCCAP was developed to implement the NCCRS. The Tanzanian government has implemented the National Agricultural Policy (NAP), the Agricultural Marketing Policy (AMP), the Tanzania Agricultural and Livestock Policy (TALP), Tanzania Poverty Reduction Strategy (TPAS), and Integrated Industrial Development Strategy (IIDS). All the three (TALP, TPAS, and IIDS) work in tandem to achieve the goal of sustainable development and food security. In Uganda, there are Agricultural Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan (ASDSIP), the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) of 2007, and the National Trade Policy of 2002. In addition, the development of the Uganda Climate Change Policy (UCCP) also started in 2012. Similarly, in Rwanda, the State has developed and implemented the Strategic Plan for Transformation of Agriculture Phase III (SPTA), the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) in 2006, and the Climate Change Low Carbon Growth Strategy (CCLCGS) in 2011. Finally, Burundi also had a National Agricultural Investment Plan (NAIP), a National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) implemented since 2008, a National Communication on Climate Change (NCCC) since 2010 and a National Agricultural Strategy (NAS) for the period 2008-2015. The NAS has taken account of the preservation and sustainable management of the environment.

With regard to international commitments, all the EAC countries are signatories to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBO), National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAP), and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). All these agencies deal with various issues relating to impacts of climate change.

Other on-going initiatives are taking place in the EAC, on the climate, food and/or trade issues. For instance at national level, many organizations have led activities related to organic agriculture. At the regional level, the Climate Change Initiative of the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa, (COMESA) includes sustainable agricultural production practices. Moreover, the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) also undertakes programmes in collaboration with other United Nations (UN) Agencies and stakeholders that promote sustainable agriculture production and consumption.

The existence of these national and regional policies indicate that the issues related to trade, climate change and food security are considered very important by the EAC gov-
ernments. The development trajectory of these policies also indicates these were not developed holistically and in tandem.

After having presented the state of policies and strategies on climate-food-trade in the EAC region that points to the relevance of the project as it aims to improves the linkages among the three areas, it seems critical to have a deeper look on the stakeholders' points of view and expectations. During the PACT EAC Project evaluation the stakeholders were requested to rate their assessment of the relevance of the project. 86.9% of them indicated that the relevance of the project was high to very high. Below, the table presents the stakeholders responses' statistics concerning the project relevance.

Table 1: Responses of Stakeholders to the Project Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>% Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACT EAC Project Evaluation

Evaluative Conclusions

Based on the above, the project is consistent with the Swedish Government’s priorities in Sub-Saharan African; with continental (agricultural, trade, climate change) development strategies; with regional policies, strategies, and action plans; with national policies, strategies and priorities; and with other on-going initiatives.

The focus on the linkages between climate change, food security and trade makes the project not only relevant but also unique. However, the project mainly focused on policy change and put less emphasis on developing practical solutions for practice change to enable communities respond to food security and trade challenges and opportunities brought about by climate change.

Keeping in mind the various national and regional policies in the areas of trade, climate change, and food security; current Sida development priorities; the on-going important international negotiations on trade, climate change and food security at the WTO and UNFCCC; and the long time required for policy change, the evaluation team also concludes that the project objectives will remain relevant after the completion of the three-year project period in end September 2014.
3.2 Project Design and Approach

This section explores the suitability of the project model and its design as a means to achieve the stated objectives. For this purpose we will assess how appropriate and effective the project design was regarding (i) the cooperation and coordination at the national, regional and international level; (ii) the capacity building; and (iii) the increase and transfer of knowledge.

Findings

Cooperation and Coordination at Multilateral, Regional and National Levels

The coordination of the project at multilateral and national levels was fairly effective. Project implementation and oversight structures such as Regional Annual Meetings and NRG meetings with broad stakeholder representation provided space for review of project progress and adjustment where necessary. The presence of the CUTS Africa Resource Centre in the region (Nairobi) brought coordination from Geneva closer to national stakeholders and partners. In addition, the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) consisting of very experienced and international organizations such as FAO and UNEP provided guidance to the project at highest levels.

In order to broaden cooperation in the project, formation of NRGs was a very positive element of project design. The NGRs, which consisted of diverse stakeholders at country level played a key role in identifying research gaps and capacity building needs, reviewing the project studies and training manuals, and contribute to the advocacy effort to promote policy change as identified by them and the broader project. Moreover CUTS referred to the use of social media (websites, email) to share information and outputs such as brochures and action alerts. These enabled access to information by the global community that could not be directly reached by the project. For instance the use of East Africa Development Forum, an e-group created to share information with stakeholders within and across the EAC, with more than 300 members was instrumental in this particular endeavour. However, use of social media, though largely efficient was not easily accessible to grassroots communities that may not have access to the Internet and thus project outreach among the rural poor risks to be limited. CUTS also established a list of ‘Tried, Tested and Trusted Partners (TTTPS)’ based on past track record of working with international organizations. This ensured proper use of funds provided to these partner organizations.

Despite the generally effective coordination of different partners on the national and multilateral level, there is some room for improvement. First, the coordination at the regional EAC level was rather weak. There was no clear link between the project activities and the EAC Secretariat despite signing of an MoU between CUTS and the EAC Secretariat and having the EAC Deputy Secretary General as a member of the Project Advisory Committee. The limited participation of the East African Community Secretariat, though not attributable to project design is an issue of concern. Keeping in mind the limited staff and busy schedules of the EAC Secretariat staff, its key role, as well as the prior experience of other donors and organisations who have always found it difficult to fully engage the EAC Secretariat on a regular and sustained basis, the project design could have envisaged
alternatives and back up plans. It has now been done to some extent by engaging other regional bodies and approaching the national EAC ministries. Second, there is little evidence that grassroots communities were consulted during project design stage. Although consultations were held in the EAC region during an inception workshop, rural communities that are directly impacted on by the nexus between climate change, food security and trade were represented at the workshop indirectly through farmers’ organisations and CSOs.

**Capacity Built through the Project**
The project built the capacity of stakeholders at two main levels. First, on the international level through participation of EAC-Geneva-based delegates who before the project did not have a forum of exchanging information and analysis amongst themselves on climate change, food security and trade linkages, particularly for the multilateral negotiations of the WTO, and on the basis of grassroots inputs from their respective countries. The policy briefs, action alerts and research reports generated by the project contributed to their understanding of the nexus issues including on the nexus between climate change, food security, and trade being the theme of the project activities in the EAC region. Second, capacity was also built at EAC country level through evidence-based research and policy advocacy. The use of local partners and consultants in implementing the project, the awareness created through advocacy and networking and the training component of the project contributed to building the capacity of stakeholders at the national level. Some of the information generated through the country studies is being used to develop and adjust training in institutions of learning, for example in the Economics of Climate Change course being offered at the University of Dar es Salaam.

**Increase and Transfer of Knowledge**
The research component of the project was apt for generating new knowledge on the linkages between climate change, food security and trade. Five country studies and one regional study were carried out in the EAC region. The value addition of these studies was the demonstration of the linkages between climate change, food security and trade and the development of policy campaigns from these studies at both national and regional level. In addition to that, the project was quite unique in addressing the three issues of climate change, food security and trade together. The linking of the three issues was hailed by most stakeholders consulted as having been very innovative. Whereas many initiatives linking climate change with food security or food security with trade existed, the idea of linking the three was something very new and which addressed a unique and complex problem. Similarly, the project has adopted an innovative methodology by undertaking organically linked research-advocacy-networking-training activities at the national, regional and international levels. This is seldom the case as most projects focus on one or two levels and one or two sets of activities. This innovative approach of combining four sets of activities on three levels has led to increased generation and dissemination of new information among stakeholders.

**Evaluative Conclusion**
Taking into account the above, the evaluation team concludes that the project design was effective. The coordination of the project at multilateral and national levels was good; capacity building was successful at the EAC country level as well as at the international level; and the innovative project design has led to increased generation of new
information among stakeholders. However, the following two aspects need to be taken into consideration in the design of similar project in future. First, there should be greater efforts for deeper consultations with grassroots communities in the design phase. Second, alternatives to EAC Secretariat involvement should be built into the project so that other regional stakeholders can compensate to some extent the gap by the lack of full participation by the EAC Secretariat. With these improvements, the project design can be used for a follow-up project to respond to the capacity building needs at the national, regional and international level as such needs will continue in the foreseeable future.

3.3 Efficiency

In order to assess the cost efficiency and efficiency in general, this report will emphasize on whether the project inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc) were converted into results in required quantity, quality and time. It also highlights whether synergies with other initiatives have been created, unnecessary duplication avoided, and timing coordinated.

Findings

To address the above, the evaluation team focused on: planning and budgeting, disbursement and reporting, adequacy/timeliness and cost-effectiveness, expenditure, and controls and audit.

Planning and Budgeting

The project was launched through a Project Inception Meeting in Arusha, Tanzania with diverse national and regional stakeholders and partner organizations. The project also set up National Reference Groups consisting of various stakeholders and has held two Regional Annual Meetings which among others, discussed and evaluated the outputs and outcomes of the project.

Three additional activities (synthesis report, national advocacy strategies and campaigns, and visits of the Geneva delegates to the region) were necessary to ensure that outcomes are captured across a broad range of outputs.
### Table 2: Project Outputs by 31st March 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>Actual Outputs</th>
<th>Three-Year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research</td>
<td>1.1 Country Research Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Regional Study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Synthesis Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Country Update notes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 WTO-related Issues Notes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advocacy</td>
<td>2.1 Advocacy Messages/Press Releases</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 National Advocacy Strategies and Campaigns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Communication to and from the EAC Grassroots</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Policy Briefs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Networking</td>
<td>3.1 Inception Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 National Reference Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 National Reference Group Meetings</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Regional Annual Meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 International Conference in Geneva</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 Interactive Website</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 EAC Geneva Forum Meetings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 WTO Geneva Delegates’ Visits to the Region</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9 EAC and Country Reps Visits to Important WTO Meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10 Project Advisory Committee Meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training</td>
<td>4.1 National Training Manuals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 National Training Workshops</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Regional Training Manual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Regional Training Workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: PACT EAC Project Status Report

*Planned for 19th-20th June, 2014*

Some limited flexibility to move funds between budget lines (except those for salaries and hospitality) within the yearly budgets was incorporated in the agreement to allow the project to address specific emerging needs during implementation subject to prior approval by Sida. This also allowed the hiring of a project assistant for advocacy work for one year (1 October 2013-30th September 2014) using savings under the budget line for CUTS Nairobi salaries. Although the budget allocated to staff salaries might appear rather high, it is important to note that this was directly related to implementation of project activities as opposed to carrying out administrative duties. In terms of adequacy, one partner (ERSF in Tanzania) noted that the budget for activities such as research and advocacy was insufficient. Although staff salaries were budgeted based on staff time contributed in implementing project activities, no system was in place in CUTS International Geneva to monitor and document the actual time spent by staff on the
Project, a matter that was pointed out by auditors in their 2011-2012 report and which has been addressed by CUTS International Geneva since April 2012. There was also need to revise the results framework, combining the two project segments into one. This was carried out when it became clear during project implementation that some of the expected results as initially planned (such as policy change) were too ambitious and could not be realised during the short project period of three years. The original and revised budgets are presented in Annex 2.

Table 3 (Table 12 in Annex 8) presents the responses of the stakeholders to how the project was implemented. About 74% of the respondents indicated that the project was implemented in a fairly to highly participatory and inclusive manner. Stakeholders and NRG members (mainly through NRG meetings) have actually been actively involved in all activities of the project, inter alia: (i) inputs to research ToRs, desktop and field research and final studies; (ii) ToRs and design of training programmes; (iii) briefing Geneva delegates through inputs to country update notes; (iv) stakeholder-led elaboration of advocacy campaigns through focus group discussions; (v) lead role in implementation of advocacy campaigns e.g. through writing briefing papers (Uganda), bilateral meetings to influence policy makers (Kenya, upcoming in Rwanda), devising pilot early warning systems for their country (Burundi) etc. The above suggests that stakeholder ownership over the project, especially design of activities, is rather high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Participation</th>
<th>Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly participatory and inclusive manner</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly participatory and inclusive manner</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory participatory and inclusive manner</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally participatory and inclusive manner</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in participatory and inclusive manner</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACT EAC Project Evaluation

Disbursement and Reporting
The disbursement of funds by Sida was based on approved work plans and budgets and no delays in disbursement were reported. The financial reporting was in line with the laid down guidelines as supported by audit reports for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 which found that expenditures had been in accordance with budgets and no loss of funds through financial mismanagement had taken place.

The preparation and submission of narrative reports was timely, for example, for the 2011-2012 narrative report, as documented in the minutes of the first annual review meeting between Sida and CUTS International Geneva held in Kigali, Rwanda on the 19th September 2012. In the minutes of the first annual meeting, it is reported that Sida appreciated ‘the timeliness of the submission of the reports as required as well as their content and structure’. The financial and audit reports for 2011-2012 was also reviewed and approved by Sida. Similarly, minutes of the second annual review meeting between Sida and CUTS International Geneva held in Kampala, Uganda on 24th September 2014 show that
narrative, financial and audit reports had been submitted on time as required with the necessary contents, which were appreciated by Sida. CUTS International was responsive and took the necessary steps to address all issues that had been raised by Sida. The quality of reports has generally been good, having taken on board various proposals for improvement suggested by Sida during the annual review meetings.

In addition to activity reporting, the reports, such as the intermediate results progress report for the period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013 have focused more on movement towards realisation of expected outcomes as well as including challenges being experienced during project implementation. However, an examination of agreements with partners shows for example, between CUTS-International Geneva and Country partner SEATINI in Uganda a series of agreements for very small amounts of money: Agreement dated March 25th 2012, July 9th 2012, October 1st 2012 and January 1st 2013 each for CHF 2,100.00. The administration of such agreements could not have been cost effective. CUTS team fully recognizes that this arrangement adds administrative burden to both CUTS and country partners. However, this system was instituted to allow the non-application of Article 7, paragraph 7 of the Agreement between Sida and CUTS for PACT EAC as well as “additional requirements when ORG channels funds” under Annex 6 of the said Agreement (Sida's Instructions for reporting). Together these provisions would have imposed much stricter financial and audit reporting requirements on country partners that would have been very costly. In future, particularly with ‘Trusted and Tested Partners’, Sida should relax the above mentioned provisions so that the disbursement of funds to project partners can be improved by reducing the number of agreements to one or at most two.

Adequacy, Timeliness and Cost-Effectiveness
Several factors contributed to cost-effectiveness. These include: the partnership with local institutions (country partners) for implementing some of the project activities and use of local consultants for carrying out research studies; the use of 3-star hotels for organising meetings; in-house quality control of all outputs, monitoring, and editing/formatting of printed material by CUTS International Geneva at no additional budgetary cost; and CUTS International Geneva travel and other policies that do not provide for per diems and emphasise using cost-effective options.

It is also instructive to see that CUTS International Geneva carried out several additional activities (e.g. preparation and publication of a synthesis research study, organisation and undertaking of an interim impact assessment of PACT EAC after the first two years of implementation) within the same budgetary allocations, mainly through greater productivity of its staff.

As can be seen from the transfer of funds indicated in the agreements between CUTS International Geneva and the five country partners financial resources were channelled directly to these country partners from various budget lines and for different activities. These included regular quarterly payments of CHF 2100 to prepare one country update note (4-6 pages) and disseminating the EAC Geneva Forum Digest to national stakeholders every two months. In addition, funds were channelled to country partners, based on agreed budgets between CUTS and the country partners, for research, organization of NRG meetings and national training workshops, advocacy campaigns, etc. While provision was
always made for about 5 out of town participants for both NRG and Training workshops, this did not allow many representatives from grassroots communities, particularly local leaders who are responsible for policy implementation to attend NRG meetings and national training workshops. Although the funding was adequate for high level policy work, the overall budget was not adequate for other activities, particularly at the country level.

**Expenditure**
The expenditure for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 together with planned budgets are presented in annex 2. According to the audited reports for the two financial years, the expenditures were in line with work plans and budgets for the two segments.

**Controls and Audit**
The project was implemented under strict financial and procurement controls as outlined in the agreement between Sida and CUTS International Geneva. The financial reports were audited using international accounting standards by MAZARS SA, an audit firm based in Fribourg, Switzerland, selected through an open process and approved by Sida, and indicated that all expenditures were eligible and according to agreed budgets. The audit reports for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 final years are presented in annex 3. In the opinion of the auditors, the financial reports give a true and fair picture of the financial position, costs and revenues associated with the PACT EAC project.

**Management of Personnel, Information and Other Resources**
The PACT EAC Project is implemented by CUTS International Geneva in collaboration with CUTS Africa Resource centre, Nairobi with technical back up from CUTS International Jaipur India which is providing some inputs for research, advocacy and networking activities. A Project Implementation Team is constituted consisting of the staff at the three CUTS’ Centres dealing with the PACT EAC. This greatly helped in the management of personnel as well as other resources. It is also noted that the turnover of staff dealing with PACT EAC implementation at CUTS International Geneva and CUTS Jaipur was minimal, indicating good personnel management and having a positive impact on project implementation.

The project generated a lot of information (research reports, brochures, action alerts, etc) that were circulated to stakeholders. This information was also placed on the CUTS International, Geneva website for access by the global community. Unfortunately, the website has not been much used, according to the latest status report produced by CUTS International, Geneva for a variety of reasons, among them being the ‘complexity of navigating the site’ despite efforts made by CUTS International, Geneva to simplify the website and make information posted on it easily accessible. In general however, this information has been very useful. For example, the research studies and training materials are being used to revise training programmes at the University of Dar es Salaam and trapca.

**Relations/Coordination with Beneficiaries and Other Organizations**
The project was implemented in collaboration with country partners in each of the five EAC Countries, thus bringing project activities and services ‘closer to the people’. These partners were selected on the basis of CUTS internal guidelines and proven quality and timely delivery of outputs under previous projects. These include Action Development et Integration Regionale (ADIR) in Bujumbura, Burundi, CUTS Africa Resource Centre, Nairobi,
Kenya, Agency for Cooperation and Research in development (ACORD) in Kigali, Rwanda, Economic and Social research Foundation (ESRF) in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and Southern and Eastern Africa Trade Information and Negotiations Institute, SEATINI in Kampala, Uganda. The project has also worked with other institutions in the region including, trapca that is engaged as a partner for the training component of the project. Other regional and international partners that are also represented on the Project Advisory Committee include EAC Secretariat, FAO, UNFCCC and UNEP. In addition, close working relationships exist with the WTO, UNCTAD, ITC in Geneva and with EAGC, EACSO and EABC in the region.

Quality of Monitoring
Monitoring and evaluation was an integral part of the project which was carefully included at the planning stage using several mechanisms and approaches. These include:

- The holding of the inception meeting involving various stakeholders also served as a monitoring tool right from the beginning. Stakeholders were given an opportunity to contribute and provide guidance to the project at the very start.

- The formation of the Project Advisory Committee which reviewed project progress and provided inputs on a quarterly basis electronically.

- The National Reference Group meetings that brought together diverse stakeholders from each participating country to discuss and provide inputs into project implementation.

- The Regional Annual Meetings that brought together diverse stakeholders from the region to discuss and provide inputs into project implementation. Two meetings have been held one in Kigali and the other in Kampala.

- An internal evaluation was conducted by CUTS using own resources (staff). This evaluation resulted in renewed focus on advocacy component of the project in the third year.

- The final Regional Annual Meeting will be presented a comprehensive report on the outcomes and lessons learnt and give a chance to beneficiaries to evaluate the project by the intended beneficiaries.

- The flexibility built in the project design, allowed the revision of the results framework based on the experience with implementation of project activities to set a realistic ambition level reflected in the logframe and especially the indicators. The review of the logframe simplified and made it more realistic and firmed up results monitoring plan.

- The end of project evaluation being undertaken was planned and budgeted for under the project unlike other projects which do not have a specific budget allocation for this important activity.

Delivery of Project Outputs
The outputs for each of the four project components (research, advocacy, networking and training) are presented in table 2. The delivery of outputs against the targets for the three-year duration of the project is high and according to the activity implementation timelines.
It is expected that by the end of the project period (September 2014) all activities would have been implemented. However, it is noted that out of the target of 12 policy briefs, only 1 has been done, 4 are under review, leaving 7 which are set to be published either for the June 2014 Geneva conference or in the final phase of advocacy campaigns; out of the target of 10 national training workshops, 5 have been held (the remaining, according to the approved project document, are to be organized back-to-back with the next NRG meetings scheduled in the summer of 2014); and out of the target of 3 regional workshops, only one has been held whereas trapca is in touch with the EAC Secretariat to organize one regional training workshop at a time to be chosen by the later subject to its convenience, and a final regional training workshop will take place back-to-back with the final regional annual meeting as envisaged in the approved project document. In view of the fact that the project ends in September 2014, there is need to pay special attention to the implementation of these remaining activities.

**Evaluative Conclusion**

Project progress reports were submitted on time and were of good quality. The project’s annual review meetings, inputs by NRGs and Project Advisory Committee contributed to regular monitoring of project progress. The use of local partners involved in similar work for research, training, advocacy and other networking activities not only avoided duplication of effort and built local capacity but also contributed to lowering the cost of project implementation, thus improving the project’s cost effectiveness and efficiency. The cost-effectiveness was also high due to the strict application of CUTS International Geneva policies on travel, procurement etc that emphasise cost-effective options. There was high stakeholder buy-in, including by government through participating in project activities and thus indirectly contributing resources to the project.

The annual audits served as important risk management tool to ensure financial resources were used for intended purposes to avoid any misappropriation. According to audit reports, there was no evidence of funds being misused. In addition, the Project Advisory Committee, National Reference Group meetings and Regional Annual Meetings played an oversight role which ensured that project activities were implemented as planned and both financial and narrative reports were provided on time. These interventions were aimed at managing any potential risks that could disrupt project implementation and achievement of planned results.

Based on the above, the evaluation team concludes that the project has been implemented efficiently.

### 3.4 Effectiveness and Impact

This section presents the assessment of the project management and implementation effectiveness.

For each objective, the outcomes are presented under the respective indicators (see annex 8). Conclusive answers are developed at the end of this section, to see whether the activities have contributed to the attainment of key results/objectives of the project and the likelihood that the project purpose will be reached.
Findings

To be able to analyse the effectiveness of the PACT EAC project, main outcomes by the three project objectives will be presented in the following paragraphs. Annex 8 provides the detailed project outputs and outcomes by indicators of the revised logframe. The annex gives concrete examples on the achievement of objectives and outcomes.

To begin with the objective 1: *increased knowledge and capacity on climate change, food security and trade (CCFST) linkages by stakeholders so they are able to identify their own policy options, make recommendations and advocate for change*; the main outcome is the incorporation of identified CCFST linkages in revised policies and strategies relating to agriculture, environment and trade at the national and regional levels.

Through participation in the project activities, particularly training workshops, and national and regional meetings, 87.7% of the stakeholders indicated that their level of understanding and capacity is good to excellent and this was attributed to their participation in project activities. An officer in the Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA) in Rwanda indicated that the project has improved the capacity of the Ministry to: include CCFST linkages in the national plan of action; introduce climate change considerations in the environmental protection plan; and how to improve gathering and presentation of meteorological information for different stakeholders.

During the PACT EAC project external evaluation interviews, the stakeholders were asked to indicate their level of understanding before the project and now. 78.3% of the stakeholders indicated that their level of understanding is now high as compared to only 4.3% who indicated it was high before the project. The results of the PACT EAC Stakeholder’s Survey and the results of the PACT EAC Evaluation show that participation in project activities has contributed significantly to increased understanding of CCFST linkages. Participation in training workshops was the leading cause (91.3%) followed by research reports (82.6%). Advocacy/networking and availability of training materials were important causes with 69.6% and 65.2% respectively. During the interviews, it was established that the time allocated to training workshops was not adequate.

The project has triggered a number of new initiatives, policies and actions/activities in the EAC countries. The 31 initiatives are detailed in Annex 8 are more than the expected target of 5. It is expected that more initiatives will emerge as more stakeholders appreciate CCFST linkages and develop strategies and action plans to address impacts of climate change.

The five advocacy campaigns, one in each of the EAC countries, have contributed significantly to effective consultations between government top policy makers and professionals from relevant sectors in addressing CCFST linkages. This has resulted in positive policy changes among the stakeholders, particularly among top government policy makers.

Three country partners (SEATINI, CUTS Nairobi and ACCORD) and other stakeholders provide examples on how similar work will be continued in their organization. For instance, through technical cooperation between ACCORD (formerly the country partner in Rwanda) and the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) have developed a draft project on food
security control system. Other examples are available in the annex 8.

To continue with the objective 2: **Improved understanding and capacity of EAC Geneva Missions to participate in the WTO discussions and negotiation on issues of interest to them.**

In Geneva, an exclusive Forum has been established for EAC Geneva-based Delegates. The Forum allows the EAC delegates (current and those that constantly arrive in Geneva) to have a space outside of the WTO to discuss WTO issues, reflect informally on the issues discussed at the Forum meetings, and learn from the realities back home in their capitals. At the multilateral level, the EAC Geneva Forum has become a point of reference for EAC Geneva-based delegates.

At the regional level, the EAC negotiators based in Geneva’s visits to the EAC countries have enabled the delegates to understand CCFST linkages in practical terms and have a clear perception of ground realities, which have informed their positions in Geneva. This has contributed to creation of two-way information and knowledge exchange between the delegates and the grassroots.

From the PACT EAC project evaluation, all the five (100%) EAC country Geneva delegates interviewed have indicated that the project has increased their capacity and knowledge to participate in WTO discussions and negotiations. This has enabled them to:
- Deal with the critical challenges of climate change, food security and effective participation in the multilateral trading system.
- Understand options and implications of specific WTO negotiation issues and discussions.
- Handle WTO negotiations on trade and environment.
- Internalize implications and improve interface between multilateral, inter-regional processes and North-South FTAs (e.g EPAs)
- Identity selected tariff and non-tariff barriers for EAC exports.
- Adopt informed positions and decisions in certain aspects of WTO negotiations.
- Provide argumentations to defend or advance positions and to create coalitions.
- Respond in a timely manner to the negotiating proposals of other WTO members, particularly while preparing for the WTO Bali Ministerial Conference

During the PACT EAC Project evaluation interviews, some country partners indicated that the WTO Geneva Forum meetings focused more on trade issues than climate change. The partners also indicated that although the partners prepare the country update notes, their feedback is only through the Geneva EAC Forum Digest.

To finish with the objective 3: **“Improved/enhanced coordination between and across stakeholders at national, regional and multilateral levels”**.

From the PACT EAC reports and from the PACT EAC evaluation interviews, the evaluation team established that a majority of trained stakeholders are using the knowledge gained in various ways, particularly with regard to coordinating or collaborating with other stakeholders on CCFST issues. A rating of 63.3% of good to excellent shows that
participation in trainings and meetings constitutes significantly to coordinating or collaborating with other stakeholders on CCFST issues.

Efforts to achieve this objective also focused on policies, actions and initiatives that have emerged through the project interventions. Examples include the following:

- Lobbying and advocacy for revising national policies, strategies and action plans to incorporate identified CCFST linkages.
- Organizing collective actions to bring out the relationship between the three CCFST linkage issues.
- Incorporating climate change components into the curriculum of training institutions as is being done by Makerere University College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of Dar-Es-Salam, trapca.
- Supporting agricultural cooperatives in order to raise their awareness on climate change in Tanzania.

88.5% of the stakeholders indicated that they have already started to coordinate and collaborate with other Project stakeholders as by August 2013 as a consequence of their participation in project trainings and meetings. National Reference Group (NRG) meetings, Regional Annual Meetings (RAM) and national and training workshops have provided space for debate, confidence building and platforms for coordination.

EAC Geneva Delegates at the WTO made 5 visits to the EAC countries. This has contributed to the creation of better linkages between their capital-based/grassroots and Geneva-based work. As indicated under indicator 2.2 in annex 8, the visits contributed to creation of two-way information and knowledge exchange between the delegates and the grassroots.

**Evaluative conclusions**

The following are the overall evaluation conclusions resulting from analysis and assessment of the project’s management and implementation effectiveness and impact:

- The project implementation is on track and it is expected that by the end of the project (end of September 2014) all of the project activities would have been implemented.
- The project has contributed significantly to improved knowledge and capacity by stakeholders to enable them to identify their own options, make recommendations and advocate for change.
- The project has significantly contributed to better understanding of the impacts of climate change on food security and trade leading to incorporation of identified climate change-food security-trade (CCFST) linkages in the development/revision of policies and strategies relating to agriculture, environment and trade.
- The project has provided support to EAC Geneva-based delegates which has been recognised by these delegates to have contributed to their better and more informed participation in WTO discussions and negotiations on some issues.
- Through advocacy campaigns and strategies, the project interventions have made significant contributions to improved/enhanced coordination between and across
stakeholders at the national, regional, and multilateral levels.

- If fully implemented, the revised policies and improved strategies and practices will contribute to: enhanced environmental protection; increased agricultural productivity; more trade; and poverty reduction among rural communities.

The evaluation team therefore concludes that the project has been implemented effectively and its impact is becoming visible, as assessed in terms of the achievement of the three project objectives based on the criteria in the revised LFA. It should also be noted that the socio-economic impacts of a project normally come several years (5 or more) after the end of the project. This is particularly true for projects like PACT EAC that aim to achieve policy and practice changes. Therefore, and to ensure that impact so far created by PACT EAC is broadened and deepened, a follow-up project may be necessary.

3.5 Sustainability

In order to evaluate the criteria of sustainability of the project, this report points out if some of the project benefits/outputs likely to be sustained after the end of the project and to what extent will the benefits of the project continue when donor funding may cease. Also, it is important to emphasize on the major factors which can influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of this project.

Findings

Benefits/Outputs Likely to be sustained

All the stakeholders interviewed indicated the project produced positive changes, particularly with regard to increased understanding of CCFST linkages. The following are benefits/outputs that are likely to continue after the end of the project:

- The knowledge and capacity built on climate change-food security-trade (CCFST) linkages and other related issues will remain in the region as the target beneficiaries are stakeholders from the region who shall also disseminate these to other stakeholders in their organizations/institutions in their respective locations and areas of work.
- The project materials, particularly research study reports and training manuals, will remain in the region and will continue being used by stakeholders and indirect beneficiaries of the project. The materials are already being used as reference materials in a number of ways. Examples include: development/revision of policies, strategies and action plans to incorporate impacts of climate change on trade and food security; preparation of research papers; preparation of policy briefs; and preparation of project proposals for submission to funding agencies.
- The collaboration and consultation among stakeholders within and between organizations/institutions will continue to address common interests.
- NRGs are groups that go beyond the project and CUTS engages these stakeholders for their knowledge and capacity in existing and future initiatives beyond PACT-EAC. Even for future related engagements, without necessarily using the PACT EAC platform, the reference groups present the first point of contact for any issue related to CCFST linkages. The knowledge acquired by members of the National Reference
Groups (NRGs) on CCFST linkages and addressing the issues in a holistic manner will continue leading to sustainability of benefits/outputs as the NRGs represent a broad spectrum of stakeholders.

- Furthermore, CUTS is planning on continuing the EAC Geneva-based Forum for the delegates and providing particularly to the new arriving delegates a one-stop-shop to become up to date on WTO issues in relation to the EAC.

Factors Likely to Influence Achievement of Sustainability

The major factors likely to influence the achievement of sustainability include the following:

- Through the project, there has been involvement of some of the government officials and key policy makers of the respective countries who can push for reforms in the policy mandates. Therefore, acceptance of the national governments of the reality of the impacts of climate on sustainable development and livelihoods can lead to increased budgetary allocations and other resources to address the impacts of climate change.
- Continued implementation of initiatives that have emerged from the PACT EAC Project interventions indicated under indicator 1.6 (see annex 8).
- Participation of EAC countries in the important negotiations under the WTO that include food security, agriculture and environment, as well as in the UNFCCC that include agriculture and trade-related aspects. Both these organisations are scheduled to negotiate major agreements related to trade, food security and agriculture, and climate in the next couple of years. This should increase the attention and focus of EAC stakeholders on the linkages among trade, food security and climate change.
- Engagement of relevant international organisations such as FAO, UNEP and UNFCCC that are also part of the Project Advisory Committee, as well as the WTO, UNCTAD and ITC has generated interest of these organisations on working at nexus of the three issues. Some of them, e.g. FAO may incorporate some elements of PACT EAC in its work in the EAC.
- Continued collaboration with the WTO that will help the EAC participate better in the important WTO negotiations that include food security and environment also.
- Capacity of country partners has been built that can be used by them to incorporate such work in their own work plans subject to availability of funding.

Factors Likely to Influence Non-Sustainability

Some of the major factors at the national, regional and global levels that are likely to influence non-achievement of sustainability include the following:

- Inadequate capacity at the EAC Secretariat due to other priorities.
- Limited own financial and human resources of partners as well as own agendas and priorities of partners.

Evaluative Conclusion

The evaluation team concludes that there is greater likelihood that most of the project benefits/outputs will be sustained due to, inter alia, the following factors: the increased awareness, improved knowledge and capacity to deal with impact of climate change will remain in the region; the national governments have accepted the realities of the impact of climate change and are likely to increase resources to address impact of climate change; increased focus of stakeholders on climate change mitigation and adaptation; important
on-going negotiations at the WTO and UNFCCC where EAC countries are improving their participation; and continued collaboration among stakeholders including relevant international and multilateral agencies such as FAO, UNEP and UNFCCC.
4 LESSONS LEARNT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Lessons Learnt

From the available relevant documents on the project and field consultations, the main lessons learnt are presented below:

- The unique approach to build awareness and capacity at the nexus of three issues, i.e. trade, climate change, and food security, has worked. At least partly as a result of PACT EAC, the reality of the impact of climate change on food security and trade are now accepted by stakeholders, particularly at the policy level contributing to change in policies and behaviour. Hence such approaches, when properly designed and diligently implemented can create the desired impact.
- Advocacy campaigns based on research and run through a network-based approach constitute an effective means of bringing stakeholders together for policy change, enhanced collaboration and thus achieving objectives of projects such as PACT EAC.
- Wide and continuous involvement of the media (both print and electronic media) is an effective way of reaching a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including indirect beneficiaries of the project.
- Relevance to the policies, strategies and programmes at national and regional levels contribute to the sustainability of project benefits/outputs.
- Research on benefits of climate change can also bring about some benefits, for example, in Tanzania, it has led to crop diversification and introduction of new crops, especially horticulture.
- There is strong aptitude among stakeholders for training workshops and understanding of the linkages in practice and policy.
- Arrangements such as the Geneva EAC Forum can be very useful in improving the capacity of EAC delegates for better participation in WTO and other negotiations by providing them a space to come together as well as substantive notes/papers on relevant issues, and by linking them to their capitals/grassroots.
- In-built flexibilities – as is the case with PACT EAC – help in the effective implementation of the project to achieve its objectives.
- The three-year duration is too little to create policy and practice changes. Such projects should be at least of a duration of 5-6 years.

4.2 Recommendations

Relevance

- Lay more emphasis on activities at the grassroots level, especially supporting smallholder farmers to improve their food security and trade through adopting mitigation and adaptation measures to climate change while continuing to improve the policy framework to support local communities in their efforts.
- Continue to bring on board other regional stakeholders such as the East African Business Council, EAGC, and the EAC civil society Forum.

Project design and approach
Need for deeper consultations with grassroots communities and local civil society organizations in the design of similar projects in future

Efforts should continue to improve coordination with the EAC Secretariat while engaging more with other regional stakeholders such as the East African Business Council, EAGC, and the EAC Civil Society Forum.

**Effectiveness & Impacts**

- Improvement and efforts should be made for increased engagement of the EAC Secretariat for future similar projects while keeping in mind the inherent problems in this respect.
- More efforts should be put on research studies to address specific needs of different stakeholders, revision or upgrading of training manuals, and addressing the needs of EAC WTO delegates.

**Efficiency**

- More resources should be provided for EAC Geneva Forum and for advocacy campaigns at the national level in future such projects.
- In future, particularly with ‘Trusted and Tested Partners’, the disbursement of funds to project partners can be improved by reducing the number of agreements to one or at most two. Therefore, Sida should consider relaxing its conditions for financial reporting and audits from “Tried, Tested and Trusted Partners”.

**Sustainability**

- To ensure sustainability and ownership, the stakeholders should be involved in the design of future similar projects.
- Selection of stakeholders to participate in project activities should be based on detailed analysis of stakeholders.

The PACT EAC Project is a unique and complex project that requires many issues to be addressed by diverse stakeholders at national, regional and multilateral levels. The three year period was insufficient to realize the project’s objectives although the project has made some good progress in achievement of the target outcomes. To build on achievements made, and to respond to the capacity building needs of the EAC stakeholders on trade-climate change-food security linkages in view of the important international developments, the evaluation team strongly recommends that Sida considers a second phase of the project.

**Recommendations**

The main recommendations that have emerged from the external evaluation include:

- PACT EAC project should be extended for another 3-5 years to ensure that the impact created thus far is built upon for long term policy and practice changes.
- There should be deeper consultations with grassroots communities and local civil society organizations in the design of similar projects.
- Efforts should continue to improve coordination with the EAC Secretariat while engaging more with other regional stakeholders such as the East African Business Council, EAGC, and the EAC Civil Society Forum.
Council, EAGC, and the EAC Civil Society Forum.

- More resources should be provided for EAC Geneva Forum and for advocacy campaigns at the national level in future such projects.
- More efforts should be put on research studies to address specific needs of different stakeholders, revision or upgrading of training manuals, and addressing the needs of EAC WTO delegates. The synergies created between regional and multilateral levels need to be built upon and consolidated so that the two-way flow of information and analysis between Geneva and countries/region can be optimized with a view to strengthening links between grassroots aspirations/concerns and multilateral discussions/negotiations.
ANNEX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

An External Evaluation of the Project:
Promoting Agriculture-Climate-Trade linkages in the East African Community (PACT EAC Project)

By CUTS International Geneva

1. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The CUTS International, Geneva (from hereon called CUTS) project on Promoting Agriculture-Climate-Trade linkages in the East African Community (from hereon called PACT EAC Project) has been supported by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (from hereon called Sida) during the period 2011-2014 through a grant under Sida contribution number 51050003.

The project has two separate but synergetic segments for human and institutional capacity building of East African Community (EAC) stakeholders so that they are able to take better advantage of international trade opportunities for their growth and development and poverty reduction while dealing with the impact of climate change on food security. During the implementation of the project, synergies created at the national, EAC and multilateral level among stakeholders have generated a greater level of convergence between the two components. This convergence is reflected in the revision and merging of the two earlier logical framework approach (LFA) matrices or log-frames under the project into a single one.

The main aim of this assignment is to evaluate whether the project has fulfilled its objectives. This includes raising awareness and creating capacities among stakeholders; identifying and considering relevant trade, agriculture and climate change linkages; increasing ability of stakeholders to identify options for advocating policy change; building the capacity of the EAC Geneva Missions in the WTO discussion; increasing coordination and coherence. In addition, CUTS is looking for an analysis and description of what has worked well, and suggestions for improvements to similar future projects.

The final evaluation should provide CUTS and Sida decision-makers with sufficient information to:

a. make an overall assessment about the performance of the project, paying particular attention to the impact of the project’s interventions against its objectives;

b. Identify key points of learning (lessons learnt), best practices and propose practical recommendations to inform future programming of similar projects for both CUTS and Sida.

2. INTERVENTION BACKGROUND

With about 40 million undernourished people, food security is already one of the main challenges in the East African Community where food production is affected by extreme weather events. In the next decades, the situation is expected to further aggravate as climate change worsens in a region where as many as four in five people rely on agriculture for a living. If Sub-Saharan Africa is not to become the home of an additional 600 million hungry people, early action and adaptation of sound policies harnessing the potential role of trade is a must.

Trade can be an instrument to impact food security positively when a free flow of products leads to
greater production efficiency, larger available quantities and lower prices. However, trade can also have negative impacts on food security when subsidized food imports displace domestic production and when international trade rules and agreements impede the access to and utilization of all the needed policy tools. Climate change is linked to trade because different patterns of production, especially in agriculture, will emerge that in turn will result in changed trade relationships between countries. EAC countries, for example, will have to import more food in the next years or build up their own capacity to produce. Unfortunately, the linkages between trade, climate change, and food security are little understood and the respective policies are often developed and implemented independently of each other. Hence, there has been a need to build the capacity of EAC stakeholders to better understand the climate change - food security - trade linkages in policy and practice.

Therefore, CUTS International Geneva, a research-based NGO, and its partners throughout the region have undertaken the PACT EAC project which consists of two separate but synergetic segments for human and institutional capacity building of the EAC stakeholders to take better advantage of international trade for their growth, development and poverty reduction, particularly in the context of climate change. The two segments have focused on issues related to trade - climate change - food security linkages in the EAC, and WTO discussions/negotiations in Geneva, respectively. As the development and implementation of regional and national policies by the EAC countries related to trade, food security, and climate change takes place in the context of complex and evolving global regimes dealing with these issues (at the WTO, UNFCCC, FAO, and others), the project has connected the EAC capital-based stakeholders to the negotiations and discussions undertaken in Geneva.

The regional/national and the multilateral segments of the project have come together to form one coherent project with both segments supporting each other. This is also reflected in the revised result areas and new and combined log frame or LFA matrix.

The new revised result areas of the project are:

1. Increased knowledge and capacity on trade, climate change and food security linkages by stakeholders so they are able to identify their own policy options, make recommendations and advocate for change;
2. Improved capacity of the EAC Geneva Missions in the WTO discussions and negotiations on issues of interest to them; and,
3. Improved/enhanced coordination between and across stakeholders at national, regional and multilateral levels.

CUTS always takes a multi-stakeholder approach in its projects' implementations. Therefore, the success of this project has depended on the capacity and commitment of all stakeholders - the EAC Secretariat, the EAC Governments, other institutions, civil society, farmers' organizations, the academia, the private sector, and the EAC WTO Geneva Missions.

The methodology to achieve the project results has been an organically integrated research, advocacy, networking, and training approach (RAN-T). In the EAC region different activities have been undertaken, such as the collaborative and evidence-based research through local partners on the issue linkages (climate change, food security, trade); training of all relevant stakeholders; establishment and functioning of regional and national multi-stakeholder networks consisting of representatives from the EAC governments, the EAC Secretariat, private sector,
farmers' organizations and civil society; different events have been organized, which have provided networking opportunities; and advocacy and dissemination to improve awareness and understanding of relevant issues among all stakeholders.

The segment related to the multilateral level (Geneva and the World Trade Organization) has consisted of the EAC Geneva Forums taking place every two months that have built capacity of the EAC country WTO negotiators in their discussions and negotiations at the WTO according to their expressed needs. The capacity has been built by giving the EAC Geneva Missions a Forum to come together and exclusively discuss WTO issues that matter to the EAC countries; by providing each Forum meeting with technical WTO-related notes and with stakeholders' view-point update notes from each of the EAC Country Partners on a specific issue. This segment has accentuated on the proven strengths of CUTS in Geneva to specifically complement the needs of the EAC countries in their day-to-day work and established a durable and effective support mechanism for EAC countries in Geneva with links to the grassroots.

Most of the project activities, such as National Reference Group meetings in each country, regional meetings and training workshops, provisions of update notes to Geneva Forums, commissioning the research papers, etc have been undertaken in collaboration with the Country Partners in each of the EAC countries. These project partners are Action Développement et Intégration Régionale (ADIR) in Burundi; CUTS Africa Resource Centre, Nairobi, in Kenya; Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF) in Tanzania; Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute (SEATINI) in Uganda; and, Rwanda Civil Society Forum (RCSP) in Rwanda. Moreover, valuable support related to project activities, particularly research and advocacy, has been provided by CUTS Jaipur, India.

For more details, please check the following website: http://www.cuts-geneva.org/pacteac/

4. OVERALL AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The goal of the evaluation is to assess the overall performance of the project.

There are two overall objectives of this exercise:

1. To identify how effectively the project has been implemented in the period from the initiation of the project in 2011, and what the results are.

2. To provide Sida and CUTS with main lessons from the project and recommendations on any possible improvements for future project design, implementation, follow-up and evaluation commensurate to the scope of the project and the existing institutional capacities.

The outcome of this exercise shall reflect the strengths and weaknesses of the current project implementation approaches. It should also suggest ways of enforcing the observed strengths and suggests how to improve on shortcomings.

Under these overall objectives, there are seven specific objectives of the evaluation. These objectives are based on the DAC criteria of relevance,
efficiency, effectiveness, ownership, impact and sustainability. They are to:
Evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the project activities by assessing inputs, outputs and outcomes against the targeted project results;
Evaluate the efficiency of the implementation of various project activities (NRG meetings, training workshops, EAC Geneva Forum meetings, etc.), processes and time tables;
Assess whether the project was cost-efficient overall in light of the overall goals of the project;
4. Assess the extent to which ownership has been ensured. This includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the involvement of stakeholders in project implementation and follow-up;

5. Assess whether results achieved are likely to be sustainable;

6. Formulate recommendations on how to improve the design and implementation, and thereby performance of future phases or similar follow up projects; and,

7. Recommend to Sida whether to continue supporting CUTS on similar future projects or not.

The evaluation may also assess if there is a need for a new phase or project to respond to the continuing needs of the stakeholders.

4. ISSUES TO BE STUDIED

The consultant shall verify, analyse and assess in detail the issues outlined in Annex I and "Layout Structure of the Final Report". The list of issues is indicative and not intended to be exhaustive. The questions/issues refer to the five evaluation criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact).

The consultant is required to use their professional judgement and experience to review all relevant factors and to bring these to the attention of CUTS.

5. EVALUATION GUIDING QUESTIONS

To assist the consultant to understand the purpose of the review, CUTS has identified a number of specific questions regarding the project which the evaluators may consider. Below follows a list of questions which the assignment may attempt to respond to. These are only listed in order to assist the consultant's own reflection. It is emphasized that they do not constitute a checklist and that the consultant should have additional queries, deliver his/her own analysis, and structure the report in the most logical way according to the information gathered and the findings of the analysis made.

Keeping these reservations in mind, the following questions may be of assistance to the consultant:

**Relevance**

- Are the activities undertaken relevant to the needs and priorities of the target groups (including types of activities, their content, participants etc)?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Effectiveness</strong></th>
<th><strong>Impact</strong></th>
<th><strong>Efficiency</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sustainability</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ownership</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To what extent have the outputs and results of the project been achieved?  
- To what extent has the project contributed to a higher degree of understanding, knowledge and capacity regarding trade, agriculture and climate change linkages in the EAC countries?  
- To what extent has the project contributed to a higher degree of understanding and knowledge regarding the WTO discussions and negotiations on issues of interest to the EAC Missions in Geneva?  
- Has the project contributed to the Improvement and/or enhancement coordination and coherence between stakeholders at national, regional and multilateral levels in the areas covered by the project?  
- What have been the challenges, lessons learnt, and best practices in implementing the project?  
- Based on the implementation model, what is working, what is not working, and what areas need to be improved?  
| To what extent have the outputs and results of the project been achieved?  
- To what extent has the project contributed to putting trade, agriculture and climate change linkages in the national and regional agendas?  
- To what extent has the project alleviated the needs of the EAC Geneva Missions and the stakeholders in the EAC region?  
- What are the success factors and lessons learned? Where this has not occurred fully, what are the constraints and consequent lessons for the future?  
| Assess the cost-efficiency of different types of activities.  
- Were the project inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc) converted into results in required quantity, quality and time?  
- Have synergies with other initiatives been used, unnecessary duplication avoided, and timing coordinated?  
- Is this type of project cost-efficient?  
| Are some of the project benefits/outputs likely to be sustained after the end of the project?  
- To what extent will the benefits of the project continue when donor funding may cease?  
- What are the major factors which can influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of this project?  
- Did the projects produce any sustainable changes - positive/ negative, intended/un-intended on the target groups?  
- What efforts have been made to ensure the sustainability of positive results?  
| Were the participants in the events and activities selected the most relevant ones? Do they together represent a broad spectrum of stakeholders?  
- Were the activities implemented in a participatory and empowering manner?  
- To what extent did stakeholders influence the agenda and implementation of the activities?  
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in follow-up?  

---

1 It is the measure of the extent of the achievement of the project against the target objectives.
2 It measures whether or not project implementation has contributed to the change in the situation of the problem it was trying to address.
3 Whether the resources used for the activities are appropriate in terms of output or they are cost-effective.
How involved were country-based stakeholders, the EAC Secretariat and Geneva Missions in the implementation of the project?

How appropriate and effective was the project design for 1) cooperation and coordination at the national, regional and multilateral level; 2) for capacity building; 3) and for increasing knowledge?

What type of capacity was built?

Was the content of the capacity building the most adequate and of sufficient quality to reach the stated outcomes?

6. METHODOLOGY

It is suggested that the assignment is implemented in the form of a desk-study, and interviews/questionnaires. CUTS is open to suggestions for methodological improvements from the consultant. However, this is not a requirement if the consultant judges these Terms of Reference to be manageable, sufficiently clear, and appropriate to produce the required evidence.

A detailed description of evaluation methods proposed by the consultant should be part of the expression of interest.

There is a need for the evaluators to be in close contact with CUTS, project partners, selected stakeholders, and Geneva Missions. However, the evaluators shall show tact and discretion in contacting these actors. While these contacts are necessary to fulfill the evaluation tasks, the evaluators shall endeavor to minimize the disruption caused by the evaluation and ensure that no unnecessary burden is put on either CUTS, project partners, selected stakeholders nor on Geneva Missions. This aspect shall be kept in mind by the consultant in the proposed methodology and during the implementation of this assignment.

A possible approach, including three primary tasks, is described below.

**Task 1: Study available materials**

The Evaluator shall:
Study all available documentation, including the project proposal; the Agreement between Sida and CUTS; project progress reports (narrative and financial) from Country Partners; PAC, RAM and training workshop reports; interim reports to Sida (2011/2012, 2012/2013); the PACT EAC interim impact assessment report (2013); evidence of impact gathered by the project and used in the preparation of the above-mentioned reports as well as during the last phase of the project (e.g.
feedback, surveys, carried out); project audit reports; minutes of annual review meetings between Sida and CUTS; minutes of the meetings and documents of CUTS including minutes of the meetings of governing organs of the project;

Others include: information available through the websites of PACT EAC and CUTS and its partners, the EAC, the WTO, relevant press releases, and EAC countries' national media; and, any other relevant documentation.

Task 2: Conduct interviews and possibly send questionnaires

The Evaluator shall:

Conduct interviews with the target beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders in the EAC countries (including, but not limited to, farmers associations, relevant Government departments, the private sector, civil society), the EAC Secretariat, EAC country Geneva Missions, staff of CUTS, staff of country partners involved in project implementation, researchers, trapca, and Sida.

Some of these interviews can be undertaken in person (e.g. in Geneva or in the EAC), others by telephone or e-questionnaires. As indicated above, evaluation methods proposed by the evaluator should be part of the expression of interest response.

Task 3: Draft Reports

The Evaluator shall submit an inception report, and both a draft and a final report. Sida and CUTS will review the reports.

7. SCHEDULE, WORKPLAN AND BUDGET

The Assignment is to be implemented during March-June 2014. The consultancy is expected to be completed latest by mid-June 2014. The maximum available budget is CHF 35000.00 (Swiss Francs thirty five thousand), covering both fees and reimbursable costs.
The key milestones are expected to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for consultancy issued by CUTS</td>
<td>20 February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and financial proposals (including interpretation of ToR) submitted to CUTS</td>
<td>6 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of technical and financial proposals by CUTS and Sida</td>
<td>13 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection and professional services contract finalised</td>
<td>20 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Inception Report and data collection tools to CUTS. Indicators review meetings with CUTS.</td>
<td>27 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on the Inception Report and data collection tools by CUTS (after consulting Sida)</td>
<td>3 April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of first draft report and presentation to CUTS and Sida</td>
<td>8 May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on Interim report to consultant by Sida, and CUTS</td>
<td>22 May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report from consultant</td>
<td>5 June 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. REPORTING

A short Inception Report shall be submitted within 1 week after the award of contract, and include:

- Methods and methodology to use;
- List of suggested people to interview, properly referenced;
- Work plan and timelines (within the timeframe provided by CUTS).

A Draft Report shall be submitted no later than 8 May 2014 and CUTS and Sida shall provide comments on the Draft Report no later than 22 May 2014.

The Final Report shall be submitted by 5 June 2014. All reports shall be submitted to Protase Echessah (protase.echessah@gov.se) and to Rashid S. Kaukab (rsk@cuts.org).

While the Inception and Draft Reports will be submitted electronically, the Final Report shall be submitted to the Embassy of Sweden, Nairobi and CUTS in hard copies (3 copies to each) as well as in electronic format.
As part of the Assignment, the consultants shall make themselves available to CUTC for discussions and review of the project indicators at the time of submission of the Inception report, and to Sida and CUTC for a presentation of observations, recommendations, and preliminary conclusions, if so requested by CUTS and Sida, and at a mutually agreed time(s).

The Reports shall be written in English. The evaluator shall, as far as possible, adhere to the terminological conventions of the OECD/DAC Glossary on Evaluation and Results-Based Management. The Final Report shall be of a maximum length of 30 pages, excluding Annexes. An Executive Summary of a maximum length of 3 pages which contains the main findings shall be included in the report. Subject to Sida's decision, the report may be published. The report must therefore be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing.

Once the final report has been approved, the consultant is responsible to commission and ensure that the report is proof-read and formatted.

9. PROFILE OF CONSULTANT

The person/persons proposed must have excellent knowledge in spoken and written English and have experience, including fluency in trade, agriculture, climate change, and development issues to be able to make accurate judgements about the relevance of the project. They must have experience in the East African Community. In addition, the team shall have an understanding of the general ambitions, objectives and values of Swedish development co-operation.

The evaluation team will be composed of experts with the following profile and qualifications:

a) The experts must have university degrees in the fields of trade, agriculture, economics, climate change, social sciences or a related area;
b) A good knowledge of international and regional trade issues, preferably in Africa and including agricultural/trade policy-making in Africa, especially in the EAC region and in the WTO context;
c) At least one of the team members must have 10 years of proven relevant professional experience of which at least 5 years should be in managing project evaluations (evaluation methods and techniques, such as the logical framework methodology, Results-Based Management) and other work experience adequate for the project as set out in these terms of reference.
d) Knowledge of French and Kiswahili languages are an added advantage.
Furthermore, it is a requirement that all individuals (evaluators) to be involved in this assignment are independent of the evaluated activities, including, but not limited to, project design, management and past reviews, CUTS, as well as the public and private organizations/companies/NGOs, and that they have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

The proposal must include for the team:

a) A description in the form of Curriculum Vitae for the person who is to be responsible for the performance of the project. The CV must contain a full description of the person’s theoretical qualifications and professional work experience. The CV must be signed by the person proposed.

b) Two written specifications of previously performed similar projects by the proposed person.

The proposal must include for the rest of the proposed personnel:

a) A description in the form of Curriculum Vitae for the personnel who is/are to participate in the performance of the project. The CV must contain a full description of the person’s or persons’ theoretical qualifications and professional work experience.

10. AWARD CRITERIA

The following criteria will be considered when selecting the potential consultant.

Technical Evaluation

Demonstrated understanding of the Terms of Reference (Criterion Total Marks - 40)

- Comments to the Terms of Reference with demonstrated understanding of requirements (25);
- Technical Response - proposed methodology and approach; (10) and,
- Proposed Work-plan (5)

Consultant(s) relevant qualifications, knowledge, expertise and experience (Criterion Total Marks - 40)

- Key Expert (30 Marks)
- Other Experts (10 Marks)

Experience in Similar Assignments and Eastern Africa Region (Criterion Total Marks - 20)
Experience with Project Evaluation at Regional/International Level (15)
Knowledge of Eastern Africa Region (5)

Financial Evaluation

The maximum available budget for this exercise is CHF 35,000.00 and hence any proposal exceeding this amount will not be considered. The financial proposal will include itemised details of fees and reimbursable costs.

Final Selection

The contract will be awarded to the consultant/s whose technical offer has the highest score, provided its financial proposal does not exceed CHF 35,000.00.

11. EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

All interested consultants/firms are requested to send their technical and financial proposals. 
**Deadline for application:** 6 March 2014 (midnight, CET)
**Please send your application by email to Rashid S. Kaukab: rsk@cuts.org, and Protase Echessah protase.echessah@gov.se**

12. CONTACT

CUTS International, Geneva
Rashid S. Kaukab
Director
Tel: +41.22.734.6080 Email: rsk@cuts.org
ANNEX I: LAYOUT STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT

The final report should not be longer than 30 pages. Additional information on overall context, programme or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to annexes.

The cover page of the report shall carry the following text:

"This evaluation is supported by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the Swedish Government"

Generic Format for Evaluation Reports

This format is intended to help guide the structure and main contents of the evaluation report. It is not compulsory, but should be used if there is no particular reason for doing otherwise.

By following a uniform format, evaluation reports tend to be easier to read and use. The format may be included as an Appendix to the contract with the consultant, thus providing early instructions how the report may be prepared.

Report structure

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Summary of the review, with particular emphasis on main findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. The executive summary provides a synopsis of the review and its purpose, emphasising main findings, evaluative conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. Descriptions of methodology should be kept to a minimum. The summary should be self-contained and self-explanatory. Special care should be taken to prepare the executive summary, as it may be the only part of the report that some people have time to read.

INTRODUCTION

Presentation of the review's purpose, questions and main findings. The introduction presents the background and overall purpose of the evaluation, including how and by whom it is intended to be used, as well as the evaluation criteria employed and the key questions addressed. It also outlines the structure of the report and provides guidance to readers.

THE EVALUATED INTERVENTION

Description of the evaluated intervention, and its purpose, logic, history, organisation and stakeholders. This chapter describes the main characteristics of the evaluated intervention and its location, history, organisation and
stakeholders. It should cover the focal problem addressed by the evaluated intervention, the objectives of the invention and its logic of cause and effect. A description of activities carried out and key outputs delivered should be included.

The chapter should also cover the policy and development context of the evaluated intervention, including the assumptions about external factors that were part of intervention planning. When preparing the chapter, the evaluators should summarize the findings and conclusions of any earlier evaluations of the same intervention.

**Findings**
Factual evidence, data and observations that are relevant to the specific questions asked by the review. Findings are empirical data and inferences from such data that the evaluators present as evidence relevant to the review questions. They are the facts of the matter, in other words. In the findings chapter, this body of evidence is systematically presented so that readers can form their own opinion about the strengths and weakness of the conclusions of the review. The quality of the findings - their accuracy and relevance - should be assessed with reference to standard criteria of reliability and validity.

**Evaluative Conclusions**
Assessment of the intervention and its results against given review criteria, standards of performance and policy issues. Evaluative conclusions are the evaluators' concluding assessments of the intervention against given review criteria, performance standards and policy issues. They provide answers as to whether the intervention is considered good or bad, and whether the results are found positive or negative. Note that the distinction between findings and evaluative conclusions is somewhat artificial. Evaluative conclusions are often best presented together with the underlying findings on which they are based. In many cases, it makes sense to combine the presentation of findings and evaluative conclusions in one chapter.

**Lessons Learned**
General conclusions that are likely to have a potential for wider application and use. Lessons learned are findings and conclusions that can be generalised beyond the evaluated intervention. In formulating lessons, the evaluators are expected to examine the intervention in a wider perspective and put it in relation to current ideas about good and bad practice.

**Recommendations**
Actionable proposals to the review's users for improved intervention management and policy. Recommendations indicate what actions the evaluators believe should be taken on the basis of the review. Recommendations to CUTS
and Sida may cover the whole spectrum, including resource allocation, financing, planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.

Recommendations should always identify their respective addressees and be tailored to the specific needs and interests of each addressee. They should be simply stated and geared to facilitate implementation.

APPENDICES

Terms of reference, methodology for data gathering and analysis, references, etc. The report should include an Appendix describing how the review was carried out. The Appendix should cover standard methodology topics, including research design, sampling and data collection methods and analytical procedures. It should discuss the limitations of the selected methods as well as their strengths.
ANNEX 2: ORIGINAL AND REVISED BUDGET

PACT EAC: Budget and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment 1</th>
<th>Using Trade to face the Challenge of Climate Change on Food Security in EAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Policy Analysis and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.1.1</td>
<td>Fee to project country research teams (5 teams at CHF 30’000 per team per year of work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300,00 00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.1.1.a</td>
<td>Third party charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.00 00.00</td>
<td>0.00 00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.1.2</td>
<td>Honorarium to CUTS Jaipur staff for inputs related to research, advocacy, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180,00 00.00</td>
<td>180,00 00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.1.3</td>
<td>Printing and distribution cost of five country research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>studies (500 copies each) 5*6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.1.4</td>
<td>Printing and distribution cost of 12 briefing papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(500 copies each) 12*2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.1.5</td>
<td>Horizontal study on trade policy and trade politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and its relationship with climate change and food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>security issues in the EAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.1.6</td>
<td>Project Coordinator and Research Manager at CUTS GRC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Awareness-Raising, Advocacy and
<p>| Networking | Inception meeting (one meeting, two days) about 40 | 50,00 | 0.00 | 50,00 | 0.00 | 47,45 | 8.52 | 2,541. 48 | 60.00 | 50,060. 00 |
| 5400.P. 4.1.2.1 | outstation participants | |
| | Regional Annual Meeting (three meetings, two days each) about 40 outstation participants | 150,00 | 0.00 | 150,00 | 0.00 | 56,17 | 4.77 | 49,99 | 9.94 | 106,174 .71 |
| 5400.P. 4.1.2.2 | Development and maintenance of interactive website &amp; establishment of Regional E-network. | 50,00 | 0.00 | 60,00 | 0.00 | 18,52 | 6.00 | 14,97 | 4.00 | 16,49 | 9.87 | 49,999. 87 |
| 5400.P. 4.1.2.3 | International Conference in 3rd year in Geneva (2 days with 40 international participants) | 100,00 | 0.00 | 100,00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 5400.P. 4.1.2.4 | 30 Advocacy messages (including | 45,00 | 0.00 | 50,00 | 0.00 | 9,575 | .25 | 16,42 | 5.65 | 17,99 | 6.70 | 43,997. 60 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5400.P. 4.1.2.6</th>
<th>Participation of CUTS staff members in various</th>
<th>72,00</th>
<th>50,00</th>
<th>783.0</th>
<th>11,58</th>
<th>19,15</th>
<th>31,528.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>internationa l meetings for advocacy (e.g. related to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>food security at FAO Rome and elsewhere, related to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trade in Geneva and elsewhere and related to climate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.2.7</td>
<td>Project Director and Project Coordinator at CUTS GRC</td>
<td>198,00</td>
<td>198,00</td>
<td>15,25</td>
<td>66,00</td>
<td>82,99</td>
<td>164,251.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.2.8</td>
<td>Project Manager and Project Assistant at CUTS ARC</td>
<td>144,00</td>
<td>144,00</td>
<td>12,96</td>
<td>47,56</td>
<td>47,15</td>
<td>107,675.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Training (and Networking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.3.1</td>
<td>Development of training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.3.2</td>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.3.3</td>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Training workshops in 2nd (one) and 3rd years (two) of 2 days each with about 40 participants</td>
<td>National Training workshops in 2nd (5 - one in each EAC country) and 3rd year (5 - one in each EAC country) in project country (10 workshops of 2 days each with 40 participants)</td>
<td>Revision and updating of training programme/materials (3 experts<em>10 man days each</em>500CHF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; material</td>
<td>(3 experts<em>40 man days each</em>CHF 500)</td>
<td>150,000.00 150,000.00</td>
<td>200,000.00 200,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60,00 0.00 60,00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>15,00 0.00 20,00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,49 9.50 31,59 0.57</td>
<td>5,000.00 0.00 80,98 2.59</td>
<td>0.00 0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62,090.07</td>
<td>42,773.46</td>
<td>85,982.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.3.5</td>
<td>Organization of 2 National Reference Group (NRG)</td>
<td>225,0</td>
<td>225,0</td>
<td>112,4</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>65.97</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meetings every year in each country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.3.6</td>
<td>Third party charges</td>
<td>360.0</td>
<td>360.0</td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel of CUTS staff for training activities</td>
<td>75,00</td>
<td>60,00</td>
<td>3,828.65</td>
<td>7,260.29</td>
<td>11,088.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.3.7</td>
<td>Project Director, Project Coordinator and Research</td>
<td>333,0</td>
<td>333,0</td>
<td>11,60</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>111,1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager at CUTS GRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.3.8</td>
<td>Project Manager and Project Assistant at CUTS ARC</td>
<td>144,0</td>
<td>144,0</td>
<td>15,55</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>44,34</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Miscellaneous expenses related to segment one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.4.1</td>
<td>Overheads (10% of total direct costs)</td>
<td>282,6</td>
<td>282,6</td>
<td>28,56</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>87,63</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.4.2</td>
<td>External evaluation</td>
<td>35,00</td>
<td>35,00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 2</td>
<td>5400.P. 4.1.4.3</td>
<td>Response to requests by participating stakeholders (5% of Total Direct Cost)</td>
<td>141,300.00</td>
<td>161,300.00</td>
<td>33,215.50</td>
<td>37,591.23</td>
<td>70,811.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Segmen</strong> t 2</td>
<td><strong>Assisting EAC Geneva Missions in Better Participation in the WTO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P.</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Project Director in Geneva (16% time)</td>
<td>108,000.00</td>
<td>108,000.00</td>
<td>9,405,00</td>
<td>36,000.00</td>
<td>21,763.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P.</td>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>Research Manager in Geneva (50% time)</td>
<td>135,000.00</td>
<td>135,000.00</td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
<td>49,500.00</td>
<td>4,959.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P.</td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>Project Assistant in Nairobi (full time)</td>
<td>72,000.00</td>
<td>72,000.00</td>
<td>4,250.00</td>
<td>12,516.60</td>
<td>20,609.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P.</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>Hospitality for 18 Forum meetings at Geneva</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
<td>205.15</td>
<td>1,125.45</td>
<td>331.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P.</td>
<td>4.2.5</td>
<td>Travel of EAC representative/selected stakeholders to Geneva</td>
<td>62,400.00</td>
<td>62,400.00</td>
<td>19,906.00</td>
<td>1,435.00</td>
<td>6,255.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400.P. 4.2.6</td>
<td>Payment to country partners for providing regular feedback and inputs from the region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108,000.00 108,000.00 12,000.00 36,108.84 40,766.63 88,875.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5400.P. 4.2.6.2</th>
<th>Third party charges feedback and inputs from the region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.00 0.00 368.00 0.00 460.00 916.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5400.P. 4.2.7</th>
<th>Response to requests by participating stakeholders Feedback and inputs from the region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,000.00 50,000.00 10,532.85 21,032.85 31,565.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5400.P. 4.2.8</th>
<th>Overhead (10% of budget) Feedback and inputs from the region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49,440.00 49,440.00 7,710.00 16,160.00 16,440.00 40,318.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Common Expenses on Two Segments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5400.P. 4.3.5.1</th>
<th>Honoraria to PAC members (5000 per member per year) Feedback and inputs from the region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150,000.00 111,931.42 18,300.63 8,225.95 35,587.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5400.P. 4.3.5.2</th>
<th>Annual audit by external, certified auditors Feedback and inputs from the region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,000.00 20,000.00 7,976.00 6,048.00 14,024.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5400.P. 4.3.5.3</th>
<th>Costs of climate compensati Feedback and inputs from the region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,500.00 21,500.00 121.00 2,004.00 804.60 2,929.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>5400.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on related to project air travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing of recommendations by Ernst and Young</td>
<td>15,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,020.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank account charges</td>
<td>4,060,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on bank account</td>
<td>233.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>612.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CUTS GENEVA RESOURCE CENTRE

AUDIT MEMORANDUM

OCTOBER 1, 2011 TO MARCH 31, 2012

FOR THE

PROJECT PACT EAC – AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL REPORT
I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The objective of this document is to bring additional information to the audit report and to present the type of work performed and the related findings.

II. AUDIT STANDARDS

This audit is carried out in accordance with international audit standards issued by the International Organization Federation of Accountants (IFAC). In particular we performed our audit work in accordance with ISA 805 and expressed our audit opinion in that respect.

We confirm that we are an external, independent and qualified auditor. Mazars as a company is member of the Swiss Institute of Certified Accountants, member itself of IFAC and the persons in charge of this audit are Swiss Certified Accountant and licensed audit experts by the Swiss Audit supervisory authority.

III. SCOPE OF THE AUDIT

This audit is performed according to the agreement between SIDA and CUTS GRC related to the project "Assistance to EAC Countries and Secretariat: Trade-Climate Change – Food Security Linkages and Multilateral Trade Negotiations".

Our report shall express an opinion on whether the submitted Annual Financial report prepared by CUTS Geneva Resource Centre is in accordance with CUTS GRC’s accounting records and SIDA’s instructions for reporting according to ISA 805.

IV. COMPLIANCE WITH THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE AGREEMENT

CUTS GRC complies with the terms and conditions of the agreement except for the staff estimation of hours which is not formally documented, Sida’s instructions requiring a system that allows the time anyone working on the project to be followed and audited.

We have made recommendations that can improve the internal control system and the quality of the reporting.
V. COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS AND REGULATIONS REGARDING ACCOUNTING AND TAXES

CUTS GRC is a not-for-profit, international, non-governmental organisation. CUTS GRC is constituted in accordance with article 60 ss of the Swiss Civil Code and is not submitted to supervision by Swiss governmental bodies.

According to Swiss law, CUTS is not compelled to follow specific accounting regulations. We nevertheless verified if the significant accounting policies as described in the notes to the Financial statements are complied with and are consistent with professional standards.

We have come across no exception concerning the accounting standards or regulations.

CUTS GRC submits yearly a tax form for Geneva authorities but as a not-for-profit organisation is not submitted to specific taxes.

Nothing came to our attention that would show that CUTS does not declare thoroughly the staff salaries to social insurances or that CUTS GRC does not pay the necessary contributions to these insurances.

VI. QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENTATION – BY NATURE OF EXPENSE

Overall the reported expenditure is supported by sufficient documentation. The link between the accounts and the supporting documentation such as invoices and with the payments is guaranteed.

We performed the following tests by nature of expense:

Staff salaries and human resources costs

We verified that no fictitious salaries have been spent on the basis of work contracts and on the basis of the list of human resources. Moreover we met all the human resources who are on CUTS GRC payroll. We ensured that salaries paid are in line with contracts and banking statements.

Work performed on the project is materialized through various elements such as papers, reports, meeting held, the existence of an internet site, documentation produced that we obtained.
Finding

Time spent on the various tasks is allocated by human resource and by month by percentage on the various budget lines. This allocation is not supported by a formal documentation of the tasks performed during a period.

Recommendation

We recommend to improve the documentation of task performed by person and by period. The level of details of this time sheeting is to be defined by the management.

Management comments

The recommendation is well noted. Given the limited human and technical resources available with CUTS, the management has focused on establishing an ERP system in place and transferring all its accounting process to that electronic medium. It has also established various administrative and financial internal controls such as policies related to travel, procurement, anti-fraud, donor-recipient relationship etc. Similarly, a system to record and allocate time spent by staff on various project tasks by months and by percentage of various budget lines has been instituted which will be further refined and strengthened as recommended.

Travel expenditures – meeting or events costs

We verified on the basis of invoices the justification of travel expenditures. We assessed the plausibility of the costs incurred (flights, accommodation or other expenditure).

Tests have been performed on a sample basis. Each account has been tested.

Office costs - overheads

No specific or direct office costs are allocated to the project. We assessed the plausibility of the various office costs by nature, the rent representing around 80% of these office costs.

Nothing came to our attention that would indicate that these charges are not justified.

We checked the allocation made by percentage on the project. Findings on this topic are described hereafter.
VII. QUALITY OF THE FINANCIAL REPORTING

The financial report in appendix 1 presents the allocation of expenditure for the period. This report was the basis for our audit work.

We tested the compliance of this report with the accounting records of CUTS GRC and can conclude that this report is fully compliant with CUTS GRC accounts.

Finding

According to annex 6 – SIDA’s instructions for reporting, the financial report shall contain additional explanatory information in the notes and specify the basis of accounting used and, as well, the principle for the allocation of payroll expenses.

Recommendation

The Financial report should contain in the notes additional explanatory information at least the specification of the accounting basis used and the principle for the allocation of payroll expenses.

Management comments

The Financial report as appended to the auditor’s report has been amended according to the recommendation.

VIII. FINDINGS / COMMENTS BY BUDGET LINE

We present hereafter by budget line:

- The amount budgeted for the period according to the agreement
- The amount budgeted for the period by CUTS GRC (this amount is an estimation based on the availability of the resources for the period)
- The amount paid or allocated to the project.

SEGMENT 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2011-12 (agreement)</th>
<th>Budget for the period (financial report)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Honorarium to CUTS Jaipur staff for inputs related to research, advocacy and networking</td>
<td>60'000</td>
<td>30'000</td>
<td>30'000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expense related to the CUTS Jaipur staff costs. This amount represents six months of activity on the project. Amount is in accordance with the agreement signed with Jaipur and in line with the budget. People working for the project are namely defined in the agreement.

Finding

The quarterly report, due for April 2012 has not been obtained so far. An audit report of CUTS Jaipur has not been obtained so far.

Recommendation

A quarterly report, due for April 2012 is to be obtained
An audit report of CUTS Jaipur is as well to be obtained.

Management comments

Quarterly report and audit report have since been obtained.

We present hereafter, for segment 1, the various lines linked to staff salaries of CUTS GRC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2011-12 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Project Coordinator and Research Manager at CUTS GRC</td>
<td>75'000</td>
<td>10'000</td>
<td>9'726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Development and maintenance of interactive website &amp; establishment of Regional E-network</td>
<td>25'000</td>
<td>18'000</td>
<td>18'526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>30 advocacy messages (including printing and distribution), 10 each year</td>
<td>15'000</td>
<td>11'000</td>
<td>9'575.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Project Director and Project Coordinator at CUTS GRC</td>
<td>66'000</td>
<td>10'000</td>
<td>15'252.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Project Director, Project Coordinator and Research Manager at CUTS GRC (training and networking)</td>
<td>111'000</td>
<td>14'000</td>
<td>19'130.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>292'000</td>
<td>63'000</td>
<td>72'210.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main activities performed have been:
Preparation of a comprehensive implementation plan for the efficient implementation of all project activities, including elaboration of the role of various partners/stakeholders
Identification of country partners and signing of contracts with each of them
Development of various drafts for country research studies and their revisions based on comments from various stakeholders
Identification and finalisation of country research teams, consisting of experts on climate change, trade and food security
Elaboration of terms of reference for country research teams
Setting up of the research methodology
Development of a questionnaire to assess training needs of stakeholders and its finalisation after seeking comments/inputs from stakeholders
Conduct of training needs assessment in each country through the questionnaire
Preparation of a comprehensive training needs assessment based on questionnaire results
Establishment of Project Advisory Committee (PAC)
Organisation of the first meeting of the PAC
Organisation of the project inception meeting in Tanzania
Development of guidelines for the establishment of National Reference Groups (NRGs) in all the five countries
Working with partners to establish the country NRGs
Development and setting up of a specific internet site
4 media advocacy messages produced between December 2011 and March 2012
Organisation of bi-monthly meetings of EAC Geneva Forum
Preparation of Country Update Notes for each EAC Geneva Forum meeting
Preparation of EAC Geneva Forum Digest after each Forum meeting
Dissemination of Forum meeting inputs and outputs through country partners
Preparation of regular reports for the PAC as well as for CUTS management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2011-12 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Inception meeting (one meeting, two days) about 40 outstation participants</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>47,548.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charges linked to the Project Inception meeting in Arusha.
Amount in the agreement allocated for the organization by Cuts Nairobi verified.
Existence of receipts for charges linked with the meeting verified.
Budget of the agreement is not exceeded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2011-12 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Participation of Cuts staff members in various international meetings for advocacy (e.g., related to food security at FAO Rome and elsewhere, related to trade in Geneva and elsewhere and related to climate)</td>
<td>15’000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>783.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charges linked to the participation of the staff in meetings. Existence of the receipts of the charges verified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2011-12 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Project Manager and Project Assistant at Cuts ARC Nairobi</td>
<td>48’000</td>
<td>16’000</td>
<td>12’960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Project Manager and Project Assistant at Cuts ARC Nairobi (training and networking)</td>
<td>48’000</td>
<td>16’000</td>
<td>15’555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>96’000</td>
<td>32’000</td>
<td>28’515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary of project manager of CUTS ARC Nairobi and project assistants. Amounts of the global budget verified on the basis of the agreement made on 16 November 2011. Existence of the agreement verified. Salaries in line with the agreement (Total: 30’000 CHF) Budget not exceeded.

Activities performed were focused on research, advocacy, networking and training, in particular support was given to Rwanda. These activities aimed at laying a strong foundation for the efficient and timely delivery of all project activities and outputs in the region. CUTS ARC Nairobi staff, for example, provided comments on drafts of research ToR and methodology, training needs assessment questionnaire, advocacy messages, and project work plan. It also remained in regular touch with country partners in Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda to assist them where needed, helped in the identification of country research teams, undertook advocacy and networking activities in Kenya and in the region, and organised the project inception meeting in Arusha.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2011-12 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Overheads (10 % of total direct costs)</td>
<td>85'200</td>
<td>32'000</td>
<td>36'203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of CUTS GRC overheads for the financial year (direct costs + office costs): CHF 324'474.60

10 % represents CHF 32'447, therefore an excess towards the budget of CHF 37'56.

SEGMENT 2: ASSISTING EAC GENEVA MISSIONS IN BETTER PARTICIPATION IN THE WTO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2011-12 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Director in Geneva (16 % time)</td>
<td>36'000</td>
<td>4'000</td>
<td>9'405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These salaries represent the equivalent of one month time spent on the project. This is in line with the budget line according to the agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2011-12 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project assistant in Nairobi (full time)</td>
<td>24'000</td>
<td>2'000</td>
<td>4'250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These staff salaries represent the actual salary of this project assistant for five months.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2011-12 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hospitality for 18 Forum meetings in Geneva</td>
<td>3'000</td>
<td>1'600</td>
<td>6'723.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hospitality is linked to the bi-monthly EAC Geneva Forum meetings.

Finding

This budget line contains, by mistake, an amount of CHF 6'518 representing accommodation for out-of-Geneva participants to the first EAC Geneva Forum meeting and participation in the 8th WTO Ministerial Conference. This amount should have been recorded under the budget line 5 of segment 2.

Recommendation

Amount to reclassify.

Management comments

The amount has been reclassified in the revised financial statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2011-12 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Travel of EAC representatives / selected stakeholders to Geneva to attend relevant WTO meetings</td>
<td>20'800</td>
<td>20'800</td>
<td>13'388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check of the invoices. Amounts justified and consistent with participants and dates.

See as well the finding under line 4. This amount should total CHF 19'906 instead of CHF 13'388.
An amount under the same budget line of 88 CHF is also to be taken into account – not material.

Payments made to country partners in Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, and Uganda of CHF 3'000 each. Consistent with the 2 agreements signed with each of the partners (see as well chapter IX of this memorandum)

Total of direct costs paid for the period under segment 2: CHF 45'854.15
10 % represents CHF 4'585, therefore an excess towards the budget of CHF 3'125.

**COMMON EXPENSES ON TWO SEGMENTS**

This expenditure is related to the flights tickets, accommodation, and meals etc allowances for PAC members to attend the PAC meeting and project Inception meeting in Arusha.
Amounts are justified by the invoices.
Consistent with the invoice paid and the flights. This amount is low compared to the flights because the compensation linked to the flights related to project inception meeting in Arusha has been paid in April 2012 (EUR 634.52) – cash basis accounting method. Consistent with the accounting principles.

IX. AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS

CUTS Geneva Resource Centre channels funds to the following organisations. With each of them we insured that:

- a written agreement has been signed,
- roles and responsibilities are clearly defined
- conditions for the use of funds are clearly stated
- activity reports or other documents have been produced
- audits have been performed.

**Action Développement et Intégration Régionale, Bujumbura, Burundi (ADIR)**

Agreement of January 25, 2012 (CHF 1’800)
Agreement of November 10, 2011 (CHF 1’200)

**Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF), Dar es Salaam, Tanzania**

Agreement of January 25, 2012 (CHF 1’800)
Agreement of November 10, 2011 (CHF 1’200)

**Agency for Cooperation in Research and Development (ACORD), Kigali, Rwanda**

Agreement of January 25, 2012 (CHF 1’800)
Agreement of November 11, 2011 (CHF 1’200)

**Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute (SEATINI), Kampala, Uganda**

Agreement of January 25, 2012 (CHF 1’800)
Agreement of November 16, 2011 (CHF 1’200)
CUTS INTERNATIONAL

AUDIT MEMORANDUM

APRIL 1, 2012 TO MARCH 31, 2013

FOR THE

PROJECT PACT EAC – AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL REPORT
I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The objective of this document is to bring additional information to the audit report and to present the type of work performed and the related findings.

This document was discussed with Mr. Rashid S. Kaukab, Director of CUTS International.

II. AUDIT STANDARDS

This audit is carried out in accordance with international audit standards issued by the International Organization Federation of Accountants (IFAC). In particular we performed our audit work in accordance with ISA 805 and expressed our audit opinion in that respect.

We confirm that we are an external, independent and qualified auditor. Mazars as a company is member of the Swiss Institute of Certified Accountants as well as of the IFAC and the persons in charge of this audit are Swiss Certified Accountants and licensed audit experts by the Swiss Audit supervisory authority.

III. SCOPE OF THE AUDIT

This audit is performed according to the agreement between SIDA and CUTS International related to the project "Assistance to EAC Countries and Secretariat: Trade- Climate Change – Food Security Linkages and Multilateral Trade Negotiations".

Our report shall express an opinion on whether the submitted Annual Financial report prepared by CUTS International is in accordance with CUTS's accounting records and SIDA's requirements for financial reporting according to ISA 805.

IV. COMPLIANCE WITH THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE AGREEMENT

CUTS International complies with the terms and conditions of the agreement without any exceptions. Following the previous audit, we point out that staff estimations of hours were not sufficiently documented. SIDA requires a system that allows the time of each person working on the project to be followed and audited.

During the financial year under review, we noticed that CUTS International took the appropriate actions by the recording the time spent by every employee on a project by way of a time sheet.
V. **COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS AND REGULATIONS REGARDING ACCOUNTING AND TAXES**

CUTS International is a not-for-profit, international, non-governmental organisation. CUTS International is constituted in accordance with article 60 ss of the Swiss Civil Code and is not submitted to supervision by Swiss governmental bodies.

According to Swiss law, CUTS International is not obliged to follow specific accounting regulations. We nevertheless verified if the significant accounting policies as described in the notes to the financial statements comply and are consistent with professional standards.

We did not come across any exception concerning the accounting standards or regulations.

CUTS International submits yearly a tax form to the Geneva fiscal authorities but as a not-for-profit organisation is not subject to any taxes.

Nothing came to our attention that would show that CUTS International does not declare thoroughly the staff salaries to social insurances or does not pay the necessary contributions to these insurances.

VI. **QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENTATION – BY NATURE OF EXPENSE**

Overall, the reported expenditures are supported by sufficient documentation. The link between the accounts and the supporting documentation such as invoices and payments is ensured.

We performed the following tests by nature of expenses:

**Staff salaries and human resources costs**

We verified that no fictitious salaries have been paid out on the basis of work contracts and on the basis of the list of human resources. Moreover, we met all the human resources who are on CUTS International payroll. We ensured that salaries paid are in line with contracts and bank statements.

Work performed on the project is materialized through various elements such as papers, reports, minutes of meetings held, the existence of an internet site, documentation produced that we obtained.
Area of improvement

As a result of our audit procedures, we did not come across major issues. However, according to SIDA's requirements, work performed should be easily followed for an audit. Therefore, we recommend describing more precisely the tasks performed by the employees.

Management comments

We have implemented the recommendation of the last year and instituted a system to record and allocate staff time. The current recommendation is well noted as it is a further and good improvement. CUTS International will apply it by describing monthly the tasks performed by the employees.

Travel expenditures – meeting or events costs

Based on a walkthrough test, we verified the justification of travel expenditures. We assessed the plausibility of the costs incurred by reconciling with the supporting documentation (flight tickets, invoices, accommodation or other expenditures).

Office costs - overheads

We verified the correct allocation of overheads according to SIDA's requirements. We assessed the plausibility of the various office costs by nature, the rent representing around 95% of these office costs.

Moreover, we verified the overheads with the supporting documentation.

Nothing came to our attention that would indicate that these charges are not justified.

VII. Quality of the financial reporting

The financial report in appendix 1 presents the allocation of expenditures for the period under review. This report was the basis for our audit work.

We tested the compliance of this report with the accounting records of CUTS International and SIDA's requirements and can conclude that this report is fully compliant with CUTS International accounts and SIDA's requirements.

According to annex 6 – SIDA’s requirements, cumulative activity from inception of the programme should be compared with cumulative agreed budget, if possible (good practice). Instead, the management has chosen to report actual expenses and agreed budgets for the period.
Explanatory notes of reported activities and related costs, as well as explanatory information of the financial report appear sufficient and adequate.

VIII. FINDINGS / COMMENTS BY BUDGET LINE

We present hereafter by budget line:

- The amount budgeted for the period according to the agreement
- The amount budgeted for the period by CUTS International (this amount is an estimation based on the availability of the resources for the period)
- The amount paid or allocated to the project.

SEGMENT 1 USING TRADE TO FACE THE CHALLENGE OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON FOOD SECURITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Budget for the period (Financial report)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Fee to project country research teams (6 teams at CHF 30'000 per team per year of work)</td>
<td>150'000.00</td>
<td>150'000.00</td>
<td>168'376.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Honorarium to CUTS Jaipur staff for inputs related to research, advocacy and networking</td>
<td>60'000.00</td>
<td>60'000.00</td>
<td>60'000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Printing and distribution cost of five country research studies (500 copies each) 5'6000</td>
<td>30'000.00</td>
<td>30'000.00</td>
<td>30'068.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Horizontal study on trade policy and trade politics and its relationship with climate change and food security issues in the EAC</td>
<td>50'000.00</td>
<td>25'000.00</td>
<td>5'000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments

1.1. It relates to 5 country research teams after reallocations of three budget lines. Excess of 18'376.77 was accepted by SIDA to improve the quality of the research. Evidence of approval has been checked.

1.2. Expense related to the CUPS Jaipur staff costs. This amount is in accordance with the agreement signed with Jaipur and in line with the budget. People working for the project are namely defined in the agreement. Various activities performed by CUPS Jaipur as in the narrative reports included:

- Providing comments on research methodology, various drafts of country research studies, and the draft ToR of 6th research study
- Formatting, laying out, and printing the five country research studies, and their transportation to Geneva and project countries
- Commenting on draft national and regional training manuals
- Commenting on advocacy methodology and draft national advocacy strategies
- Assisting in networking and advocacy activities
- Making available its data bases and other resources as needed

We present hereafter, for segment 1, the various lines linked to staff salaries of CUPS International:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget Line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUPS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Project Coordinator and Research Manager at CUPS GRC</td>
<td>75'000.00</td>
<td>75'273.03 *</td>
<td>75'273.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Development and maintenance of interactive website &amp; establishment of Regional E-network</td>
<td>12'500.00</td>
<td>14'974.00 *</td>
<td>14'974.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>30 advocacy messages (including printing and distribution), 10 each year</td>
<td>15'000.00</td>
<td>16'425.65 *</td>
<td>16'425.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Project Director and Project Coordinator at CUPS GRC</td>
<td>66'000.00</td>
<td>66'000.00</td>
<td>66'000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Postponed from last year budget unused.

2.7 Actual staff salaries for project Director are in accordance with the agreement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Costs of organizing Regional Annual Meeting in Kigali</td>
<td>50'000.00</td>
<td>50'000.00</td>
<td>56'147.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Development of training program &amp; material (3 experts<em>40 man days each</em>CHF 500)</td>
<td>30'000.00</td>
<td>31'000.00 *</td>
<td>30'499.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>National Training workshops in 2nd (5 - one in each EAC country) and 3rd year (5 - one in each EAC country) in project country (10 workshops of 2 days each with 40 participants)</td>
<td>100'000.00</td>
<td>5'000.00</td>
<td>5'000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Organization of 2 National Reference Group (NRG) meetings every year in each country</td>
<td>75'000.00</td>
<td>112'500.00 *</td>
<td>112'468.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Travel of CUTS staff for training activities</td>
<td>25'000.00</td>
<td>13'000.00</td>
<td>3'828.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Project Director, Project Coordinator and Research Manager at CUTS GRC (training and networking)</td>
<td>111'000.00</td>
<td>111'000.00</td>
<td>111'100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Postponed from last year budget unused.

2.2 Excess of 6'174.77 accepted by SIDA as long as the global budget is not overspent.

3.5 Cost of organization of meetings: first one relates to researches that have been conducted, the second one was based on final publication of researches and advocacy actions to be taken (linked with the research). Generally, different meetings are regrouped in order to avoid travel expenses.

3.7 Budget exceeded by 100.-CHF, which is not significant.

As for prior year, the main activities performed were as follows:

- Preparation of a comprehensive implementation plan for the efficient implementation of all project activities, including elaboration of the role of various partners/stakeholders
- Identification of country partners and signing of contracts with each of them
- Development of various drafts for country research studies and their updates based on comments from various stakeholders
- Publication, launch and dissemination of five country research studies
- Identification and finalisation of research team for the horizontal study, consisting of experts on the political economy of climate change, trade and food security
- Elaboration of terms of reference for research team for the horizontal study
- Setting up of the research methodology
- Finalisation of a comprehensive training needs assessment based on questionnaire results
- Identification of an appropriate institution to prepare the training manuals, signing of contract
- Preparation of ToR for the five national and one regional training manuals
- Preparing drafts of one regional and five national training manuals, and their revisions after various comments
- Preparation of national training workshops
- Expansion of Project Advisory Committee (PAC)
- Organisation of the PAC’s meeting
- Organisation of the project inception meeting in Tanzania
  - Working with partners to establish, expand and efficient-functioning of the country NRGs
  - Organisation of ten NRG meetings (2 meetings in each country)
  - Preparation and dissemination of NRG meeting reports
  - Organisation of first Regional Annual Meeting, and preparation and dissemination of its report
- Development, setting up, and functioning of a specific internet site
- 12 media advocacy messages produced between April 2012 and March 2013
- Organisation of bi-monthly meetings of EAC Geneva Forum
- Preparation of WTO Issue and Country Update Notes for each EAC Geneva Forum meeting
- Preparation of rapid response notes as requested by EAC Geneva delegates to assist in their participation in the WTO Bali Ministerial preparatory process
- Preparation of EAC Geneva Forum Digest after each Forum meeting
- Dissemination of Forum meeting inputs and outputs through country partners
- Preparation of regular quarterly reports for the PAC as well as for CUTS management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Inception meeting (one meeting, two days) about 40 outstation participants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2'541.48 *</td>
<td>2'541.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Postponed from last year budget unused

Charges linked to the Project Inception meeting in Arusha.
Amount in the agreement allocated for the organization by Cuts Nairobi verified last year.
Existence of receipts for charges linked with the meeting verified.
Remaining amount of the budget has been used during the accounting period under review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget Line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Participation of CUTS staff members in various international meetings for advocacy (e.g., related to food security at FAO Rome and elsewhere, related to trade in Geneva and elsewhere and related to climate)</td>
<td>24'000.00</td>
<td>25'000.00 *</td>
<td>11'589.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Postponed from last year budget unused
Charges linked to the participation of the staff to meetings. Existence of the receipts of the charges verified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget Line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Project Manager and Project Assistant at CUTS ARC Nairobi</td>
<td>48'000.00</td>
<td>48'000.00</td>
<td>47'560.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Project Manager and Project Assistant at CUTS ARC Nairobi (training and networking)</td>
<td>48'000.00</td>
<td>48'000.00</td>
<td>44'341.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96'000</td>
<td>96'000</td>
<td>91'902.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salaries of project manager of CUTS ARC Nairobi and project assistants comply with the budget.

Activities performed were focused on research, advocacy, networking and training, in particular, support was given to Burundi and Rwanda. These activities aimed at ensuring efficient and timely delivery of all project activities and outputs in the region. CUTS ARC Nairobi staff, for example, provided comments on the drafts of research ToR and methodology, country research studies, training needs assessment, national and regional training manuals, advocacy messages, and project work plan. It also remained in constant touch with country partners in Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda to assist them when needed, helped in the identification of country NRG members, undertook advocacy and networking activities in Kenya and in the region, and organised the project inception meeting in Arusha as well as the first regional annual meeting in Kigali.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget Line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Overheads (10% of total direct costs)</td>
<td>86'950.00</td>
<td>88'023.93</td>
<td>87'630.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of CUTS International overheads for the financial year (direct costs + office costs): CHF 883'713.26 (2011-2012: CHF 324'474.60).
SEGMENT 2: ASSISTING EAC GENEVA MISSIONS IN BETTER PARTICIPATION IN THE WTO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Director in Geneva (16 % time)</td>
<td>36'000.00</td>
<td>36'000.00</td>
<td>36'000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Research Manager in Geneva (50% time)</td>
<td>45'000.00</td>
<td>45'000.00</td>
<td>45'000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual salary for time spent on the project. This is in line with the budget line according to the agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project assistant in Nairobi (full time)</td>
<td>24'000.00</td>
<td>24'000.00</td>
<td>12'516.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3: Actual staff salaries for project assistant was lower than as per the agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hospitality for 18 Forum meetings in Geneva</td>
<td>3'000.00</td>
<td>3'000.00</td>
<td>1'125.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hospitality is linked to the bi-monthly EAC Geneva Forum meetings. During the period under review, 7 hospitality meetings were held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Travel of EAC representatives / selected stakeholders to Geneva to attend relevant WTO meetings</td>
<td>20'800.00</td>
<td>21'684.00 *</td>
<td>1'435.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Postponed from last year budget unused

Verified invoices. Amounts are justified and consistent with participants and dates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Payment to country partners for providing regular feedback and inputs from the region</td>
<td>36'000.00</td>
<td>38'000.00 *</td>
<td>36'108.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Postponed from last year budget unused

Payment made to country partner in Tanzania, Uganda, Burundi and Rwanda. Expenses are consistent with the Memorandum of agreement (Chapter IX).

**Finding**

Last payment for Tanzania was delayed (2'100 CHF) because they didn’t fulfil all the engagement. Payment was made in April 2013.

**Recommendation**

We recommended to adjust by recording the payment in liability.

**Management comments**

The amount has been recorded in the revised financial statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Overheads (10 % of total direct costs)</td>
<td>16'480.00</td>
<td>16'908.89</td>
<td>16'165.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of direct costs paid for the period under review: 179'694 CHF (2011: CHF 45'854.15)

**COMMON EXPENSES ON TWO SEGMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Honoraria to PAC members (5'000 per member per year)</td>
<td>50'000.00</td>
<td>57'464.66 *</td>
<td>18'300.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Postponed from last year budget unused
This line includes travel and accommodation expenses of the PAC members when attending the PAC meetings. Amounts are justified by invoices. Budget has been respected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for 2012-13 (agreement)</th>
<th>Amount budgeted for the period (CUTS Geneva)</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Cost of climate compensation related to project air travel</td>
<td>5'500.00</td>
<td>8'679.00 *</td>
<td>2'004.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Postponed from last year budget unused

Tax paid with regard to the number of flights and related distances during one year. These expenses are supported by invoices received.

**IX. AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS**

CUTS International channels funds to the following organisations. For each of them, we insured that:

- a written agreement has been signed.
- roles and responsibilities are clearly defined
- conditions for the use of funds are clearly stated
- activity reports or other documents have been produced
- audits have been performed.

**Action Développement et Intégration Régionale, Bujumbura, Burundi (ADIR)**

Agreement dated March 25, 2012 (CHF 2'400)
Agreement dated July 9, 2012 (CHF 2'400)
Agreement dated October 1, 2012 (CHF 2'400)
Agreement dated January 11, 2013 (CHF 2'400)

**Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF), Dar es Salaam, Tanzania**

Agreement dated March 25, 2012 (CHF 2'100)
Agreement dated July 9, 2012 (CHF 2'100)
Agreement dated October 1, 2012 (CHF 2'100)
Agreement dated January 11, 2013 (CHF 2'100)

**Agency for Cooperation in Research and Development (ACORD), Kigali, Rwanda**

Agreement dated March 25, 2012 (CHF 2'400)
Agreement dated July 9, 2012 (CHF 2'400)
Agreement dated October 1, 2012 (CHF 2'400)
Agreement dated January 11, 2013 (EUR 6'800)
Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute, (SEATINI), Kampala, Uganda

Agreement dated March 25, 2012 (CHF 2’100)
Agreement dated July 9, 2012 (CHF 2’100)
Agreement dated October 1, 2012 (CHF 2’100)
Agreement dated January 11, 2013 (CHF 2’100)

For each of these agreements we noted that the documents were produced.

We checked that payments were systematically made on bank accounts of the organisation and not on individual bank accounts.

Area of improvement

For 3 country partners (Kenya, India and Tanzania) as well as CUTS, Jaipur, India, we obtained an audit report. We have nothing particular to mention.

For 3 country partners (Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda), audit reports have not been received. According to the agreement, we must have an audit report for the current year.

Recommendation

Taking into account the relatively small amounts and to avoid disproportionate costs, we recommend to wait for the annual audits of these entities and obtain the reports.

Management comments

Cuts International will keep the pressure on Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda country partners to submit copies of their regular audits which they have committed to provide as soon as these audits are performed.
X. Compliance with CUTS International Broad Guidelines for Staff - International Travel and Allowances 2012

Our tests did not show that the guidelines of CUTS international related to international travel and allowances were not followed.

★★★★★

Geneva, June 10, 2013

MAZARS SA

Lionel Cazali
Licensed Audit Expert

Daniel Dumas
Licensed Audit Expert
(Auditor in charge)
ANNEX 4: DETAILED EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The review was executed in a participatory manner in order to ensure maximum interaction between the consultants, implementing agencies, relevant stakeholders; government officials, private sector organizations, and in target beneficiaries of the project. The assessment therefore targeted stakeholders at the various levels of project implementation. The methodology involved review of relevant secondary data and information, identification of stakeholders, primary data collection and analysis and report writing.

4.1 Review of Secondary Information

The review involved a study of all available documentation, including the project proposal; the Agreement between Sida and CUTS; project progress reports (narrative and financial) from Country Partners; PAC, RAM and training workshop reports; interim reports to Sida (2011/2012, 2012/2013); the PACT EAC interim impact assessment report (2013); evidence of impact gathered by the project and used in the preparation of the above-mentioned reports as well as during the last phase of the project (e.g. feedback, surveys, carried out); project audit reports; minutes of annual review meetings between Sida and CUTS; minutes of the meetings and documents of CUTS including minutes of the meetings of governing organs of the project; information available through the websites of PACT EAC and CUTS and its partners, the EAC, the WTO, relevant press releases; EAC countries’ national media; and, any other relevant documentation.

A review of existing data and information offered the evaluation team several benefits, such as: refining of specific evaluation objectives, identification of potential informants for interviews, further clarification, and summarizing what is known versus what remains to be answered in the field. It also assisted the consultants to understand the historical evolution and performance of the project through its documentation and the context within which the project was developed.

4.2 Identification of Stakeholders for Interviews

The consultants consulted with the country-based stakeholders, the EAC Secretariat and Geneva Missions, CUTS and Sida to identify relevant stakeholders to be interviewed and participate in the evaluation. The stakeholders included:

i. CUTS Hqs in Geneva, Switzerland;
ii. EAC Country Geneva Missions (Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda);
iii. Action Développement et Intégration Régionale (ADIR) in Bujumbura, Burundi;
iv. CUTS Africa Resource Centre in Nairobi, Kenya;
v. Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD) in Kigali, Rwanda;
vi. Rwanda Civil Society Forum (RCSP), Kigali, Rwanda
vii. Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF) in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania;
viii. Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute (SEATINI) in Kampala, Uganda;
ix. Sida;
x. East African Community (EAC);
xii. Government Ministries of Agriculture, Trade and Environment;
xii. Trade Policy Training Centre in Africa (trapca);
xiii. Civil Society Organizations
Other organizations operating in the East African region.

4.3 Primary Data Collection and Analysis

4.3.1 Primary Data Collection

The primary data collection involved visits by the consultants to the participating countries and organizations including CUTS Geneva office, CUTS Africa Resource Centre and EAC Country Geneva missions. Where the visits were not possible, the interviews were conducted through the telephone and emails (e-questionnaire).

A structured questionnaire was prepared and sent to the identified respondents in advance. The consultants administered the questionnaire to the selected respondents. In addition, the questionnaires were sent to selected respondents, some of whom completed and sent them back to the consultants. The questionnaire was important because it provided quantitative data and information regarding the implementation of the project activities.

4.3.2 Data Analysis

The first step in data analysis was data scrutiny to ensure accuracy and reliability of the data. The data analysis focused mainly on descriptive statistics of the key variables and indicators. The findings were presented in tables and appropriate figures.

4.4 Submission of the Draft Report

The evaluation team submitted the draft report to CUTS, Sida and other key stakeholders for review. The purpose was to get feedback on the factual basis of the evaluation, findings, conclusions and recommendations. Based on the comments and inputs of the participants, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the report to incorporate the relevant comments and inputs.
ANNEX 5: QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PAC EAC PROJECT EVALUATION

The Questionnaire is to be completed by the various stakeholders involved (Directly Or Indirectly) in the PACT EAC Project: Country Partners (CP), EAC Stakeholders (ES), Delegates (D). Each stakeholder is required to fill the appropriate part of the questionnaire.

PLEASE FILL THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND RETURN IT TO eowassociates@gmail.com or elisha@eowassociates.com by 10th May, 2014.

1. Identification Details (for Country Partners, EAC Stakeholders & Delegates)
   1.1 Name of Respondent: ___________________________________________
   1.2 Sex of Respondent: Male: ___________ Female: _________________
   1.3 Country: ____________________________________________________
   1.4 Name of organization _________________________________________
   1.5 Position in organization _______________________________________
   1.6 Postal Address: ______________________________________________
   1.7 Telephone(s): ________________________________________________
   1.8 E-mail(s): ____________________________________________________

2. Understanding of Climate Change-Food Security-Trade Linkages

2.1 Did you attend/participate in any of the following workshops and meetings organized by the project: (for EAC Stakeholders & Delegates)
   a) National Reference group meetings? 1=Yes____ 2= No____
   b) Regional Annual Meetings? 1=Yes____ 2= No____
   c) National training workshops? 1=Yes____ 2= No____
   d) Regional training workshops? 1=Yes____ 2= No____
   e) Project Inception Meeting? 1=Yes____ 2= No____
   f) Any Other (Specify)__________________________________________
2.2 If yes to any of the above, how do you rate the usefulness of the above workshops and meetings? (for EAC Stakeholders & Delegates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Usefulness</th>
<th>Rating (Tick)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 If useful, for which of the following:

a) For policy formulation _______________________________

b) For knowledge and information _________________________

c) For undertaking research ______________________________

d) For collaboration with other stakeholders _______________

e) Any other (specify) ___________________________________

2.4 If you have attended any project training workshops, has your ability to develop/revise policies to be holistic (climate change-food security-trade linkages) increased? (for Country Partners, EAC Stakeholders & Delegates)

1=Yes _______ 2= No _______

2.5 What was your level of understanding of climate change-food security-trade linkages before the project and what is it now? (for Country Partners, EAC Stakeholders & Delegates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Understanding</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not understand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 What led to the change in your level of understanding of Climate Change-Food Security-Trade Linkages as indicated above? (Tick where appropriate). (for Country Partners, EAC Stakeholders & Delegates)

Participation in training workshops: ____________________________________________
Availability of high quality training materials: _________________________________
Effective advocacy and networking: ___________________________________________
Participation in project activities: _____________________________________________
Project action alerts/press releases: ___________________________________________
Project Briefing papers: ____________________________________________________
Project Research reports: ____________________________________________________
Any other (specify): ________________________________________________________

2.7 Following your participation in project activities, events and meetings, what new initiatives/activities have emerged? (for Country Partners, EAC Stakeholders & Delegates)

1. __________________________________________________
2. __________________________________________________
3. __________________________________________________
4. __________________________________________________
5. __________________________________________________

2.8 What is your rating of the usefulness of project materials and information? (Tick where appropriate). (for Country Partners, EAC Stakeholders & Delegates)

1=Very useful: __________________________________________________________
2= Useful: ______________________________________________________________
3= Moderately useful: ____________________________________________________
4= Not useful: __________________________________________________________

2.9 Have you been involved in any of the following?

1. Implementation of advocacy campaign activities. 1=Yes ____ 2=No ____
2. Provision of Bi-monthly country notes on WTO related issues. (for Country Partners) 1=Yes ____ 2=No ____
2.10 What has been the impact of the national advocacy campaigns? (Tick where appropriate) (for Country Partners & EAC Stakeholders that has implemented the campaign)

1. Changes in practices and behavior (e.g. climate mitigation and adaptation)_____
2. Changes in Policy ________________________________________________________
3. Any other (specify) ______________________________________________________

2.11 Have you received any project outputs, information and advocacy materials? (for EAC Stakeholders & Delegates)

1=Yes______ 2=No ______

2.12 If yes, which ones? (for EAC Stakeholders & Delegates)

1. ________________________________________________________________
2. ________________________________________________________________
3. ________________________________________________________________
4. ________________________________________________________________

1. Knowledge and Capacity of EAC Geneva missions to Participate in WTO Discussions and Negotiations(ONLY EAC GENEVA MISSIONS TO ANSWER)

1.1 Due to the project, has your capacity/knowledge to participate in WTO discussions and negotiations increased? 1=Yes ______ 2=No ______

1.2 How many topics/issues did you identify for WTO forum meetings? Please list:

1. ________________________________________________________________
2. ________________________________________________________________
3. ________________________________________________________________
4. ________________________________________________________________

1.3 As a result of the project how many written or verbal statements have you presented to the WTO (either individually or group). Please list:

1. ________________________________________________________________
2. ________________________________________________________________
3. ________________________________________________________________
4. ________________________________________________________________
1.4 In which way was the Forum for the delegates been useful?
   a) Creating better connection/collaboration between the delegates ________
   b) Connection/collaboration between the delegates and the capitals ______

1.5 In what way have the forums helped the delegates?
   a) Helped in better connection with each other ____________
   b) Faster initiation into the Geneva trade scene _____________
   c) Learning from the grassroots realities ___________________

1. Project Relevance.
1.1 To what extent was the project relevant to national and regional agricultural, climate change, and trade development policies and strategies with regard to CCFST linkages? (Tick where appropriate). (EAC Stakeholders & Country Partners)

   1= Highly relevant: ______________________________________
   2= Relevant: ____________________________________________
   3= Fairly relevant: _______________________________________
   4= marginally relevant: _________________________________
   5= Not relevant: _______________________________________

1.2 What initiatives/actions at the national and regional levels are consistent with the project? (EAC Stakeholders & Country Partners)
   a) Initiatives/actions at national level
      1. __________________________________________________
      2. __________________________________________________
      3. __________________________________________________
      4. __________________________________________________
   a) Initiatives/actions at regional level
      1. __________________________________________________
      2. _________________________________________
      3. _________________________________________
      4. _________________________________________
1. **Implementation of Project Activities**

1.1 In what manner were the project activities implemented? (Tick where appropriate).  

*(EAC Stakeholders & Country Partners)*

1= Highly participatory and inclusive manner: ____________________________
2= Participatory and inclusive manner: ____________________________
3= Fairly participatory and inclusive manner: ____________________________
4= Marginally participatory and inclusive manner: ____________________________
5= Not in participatory and inclusive manner: ____________________________

1.2 What do you consider to be the major reasons for the various project achievements made so far? (EAC Stakeholders, Country Partners & CUTC)

a) Research studies ____________________________

b) Regional and national meetings ____________________________

c) Training workshops ____________________________

d) Briefing papers ____________________________

e) Advocacy campaigns ____________________________

f) Any Other (Specify) ____________________________

1. **Project Efficiency /Cost-Effectiveness**

1.1 Were the project inputs and services provided by CUTC, such as guidance, financial, and material inputs/services in adequate quantities and at the expected time? (Tick where appropriate). *(Country Partners)*

a) Quantities:

1= Adequate: ____________________________

2= Fairly adequate: ____________________________

3= Marginally adequate: ____________________________

4= Not adequate: ____________________________

b) Time:
1. At the expected time: 

2. Fairly on time: 

3. Marginally: 

4. Not on time 

1.2 How have the project resources been used? (Tick where appropriate). (Country Partners)

1= Cost-effectively: 

2= Fairly cost-effectively: 

3= Marginally cost-effectively: 

4= Not cost-effectively: 

2. Project Sustainability

2.1 Have sustainable changes been created by the project? (EAC Stakeholders, Country Partners & Delegates) (Tick where appropriate).

1= Positive changes: 

2= Negative changes: 

3= Unintended changes: 

4= No changes: 

2.2 If the answer in 7.1. is 1,2 or 3, what are the key changes?

a) Positive changes:

1. 

2. 

3. 

a) Negative changes:

1. 

2. 

3. 

a) Unintended changes:
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________

2.3 What major factors are likely to influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project benefits/outputs? (EAC Stakeholders & Country Partners)

a) Achievement of sustainability:
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________

a) Non-achievement of sustainability:
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________

2.4 Has the PACT EAC project helped to build your institutions capacity or knowledge? (for Country Partners)
1=Yes _______ No _______

3. Project Impact
3.1 What are the major immediate effects of the project? (EAC Stakeholders & Country Partners)
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________
5. __________________________________________

8.2 Have the stakeholders started coordinating/collaborating on any issues due to the NRG
meetings, training workshops, advocacy campaigns? (EAC Stakeholders & Country Partners)

1=Yes __________ 2=No ___________

8.3 If yes, provide examples.
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________
5. __________________________________________

8.4 Have the articles written by the media on Climate Change-Food Security-Trade (CCFST) had any impact on the national communities? (for Media people, Country Partners and EAC Stakeholders)

1=Yes __________ 2=No ___________

8.5 If yes, provide examples.
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________
5. __________________________________________

1. **Lessons Learnt**

1.1 What are the major lessons learnt from the project? (EAC Stakeholders & Country Partners)

1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________
1. **Recommendations**

1.1 What recommendations would you make to improve similar future projects? (EAC Stakeholders, Country Partners & Delegates)

1. ______________________________________________________________________

2. ______________________________________________________________________

3. ______________________________________________________________________

4. ______________________________________________________________________

5. ______________________________________________________________________
## ANNEX 6: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS MET/CONSULTED DURING CONSULTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Burundi</strong></td>
<td>Action Développement et Intégration Régionale (ADIR)</td>
<td>MANIRANKUNDA Godefroid</td>
<td>Legal representative</td>
<td><a href="mailto:godefroidmanir@yahoo.fr">godefroidmanir@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Tanzania</strong></td>
<td>ESRF - Economic and Social Research Foundation</td>
<td>BAREGU Solomon</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbaregu@esrf.or.tz">sbaregu@esrf.or.tz</a> <a href="mailto:sbaregu@gmail.com">sbaregu@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Kenya</strong></td>
<td>CUTS Africa Resource Centre, Nairobi</td>
<td>LUTHER Munu Martin</td>
<td>Assistant Programme Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mml@cuts.org">mml@cuts.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Uganda</strong></td>
<td>Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute (SEATINI)</td>
<td>NALUNGA Jane</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jnalunga09@gmail.com">jnalunga09@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Uganda</strong></td>
<td>Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute (SEATINI)</td>
<td>KIIZA Africa</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akiiza@seatiniuganda.org">akiiza@seatiniuganda.org</a> <a href="mailto:aakiriza@gmail.com">aakiriza@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Rwanda</strong></td>
<td>Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development</td>
<td>MUNYENTWARI Francois</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fmunyentwari@gmail.com">fmunyentwari@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Email address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ACORD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rwanda</td>
<td>EACSOF</td>
<td>SEBAHIZI Prudence</td>
<td>National Coordinator current project partner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sebaprunce@yahoo.fr">sebaprunce@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kenya</td>
<td>CUTS Africa Resource Center</td>
<td>ONYANGO Clement</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cvo@cuts.org">cvo@cuts.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kenya</td>
<td>CUTS Africa Resource Center</td>
<td>Munu Martin</td>
<td>Assistant Programme Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mml@cuts.org">mml@cuts.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kenya</td>
<td>CUTS International</td>
<td>Martha Getachew Bekele</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mgb@cuts.org">mgb@cuts.org</a>, +254 2038621 49/50, 20 232 911 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Switzerland</td>
<td>CUTS International Geneva</td>
<td>KAUKAB Rashid S.</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rsk@cuts.org">rsk@cuts.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Switzerland</td>
<td>CUTS International Geneva</td>
<td>JOOSEP Krista</td>
<td>Assistant Programme Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kj@cuts.org">kj@cuts.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Switzerland</td>
<td>CUTS International Geneva</td>
<td>MUKIIBI Julian</td>
<td>Senior Programme Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jm@cuts.org">jm@cuts.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Switzerland</td>
<td>CUTS International Geneva</td>
<td>GROLLIER Julien</td>
<td>Assistant Programme Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jg@cuts.org">jg@cuts.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79 973788, <a href="mailto:adelint1@yahoo.fr">adelint1@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 16. Burundi    | Ministère de l’Agriculture et de l’Elevage Cabinet | NZITUNGA Isaac    |                                | /
<p>|                |                                                   |                   |                                               | 77 02 4712 / 79 91 78 10, <a href="mailto:nzitungai@yahoo.fr">nzitungai@yahoo.fr</a> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Burundi</td>
<td>Ministère du Commerce, de l'Industrie, des Postes et du Tourisme Cabinet</td>
<td>GAHINYUZA Gentille</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>79 56 19 71 <a href="mailto:gahigenty@yahoo.fr">gahigenty@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Burundi</td>
<td>Ministère à la Présidence chargé des Affaires de la communauté Est-Africaine</td>
<td>KIROMEZI Barnabas</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>77 753748 <a href="mailto:kiromezibasi@yahoo.fr">kiromezibasi@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Burundi</td>
<td>Ministère de l'Eau,</td>
<td>KARIMUMURYANGO</td>
<td>Directeur Projet POPs</td>
<td>79 935801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Email address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Environnement, Aménagement du Territoire et de l’Urbanisme</td>
<td>Jérôme</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:karimumuryango@gmail.com">karimumuryango@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Ministère de l’Energie et des Mines Université du Burundi</td>
<td>NDUGARITSE Aloys</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>79 94 43 06 / 22 22 65 79 <a href="mailto:aloysndugaritse@yahoo.fr">aloysndugaritse@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Commerce et Intégration Régionale IDEC</td>
<td>NIYONGABO Ephraîm</td>
<td>Chercheur</td>
<td>79 486820 <a href="mailto:ephremniyongabo@yahoo.fr">ephremniyongabo@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>CFCIB</td>
<td>NININAHAZWE Eddy Claude</td>
<td>Secrétaire Général de la chambre Sectorielle des TIC</td>
<td>79 563603 <a href="mailto:nineddyc@yahoo.fr">nineddyc@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>CFCIB Chambre des Commerçants du Burundi</td>
<td>SIBOMANANA Pacifique</td>
<td>Secrétaire exécutif</td>
<td>79 958619 /75 958619 <a href="mailto:sibopaci2@yahoo.fr">sibopaci2@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>AGAKURA ASBL Jeunesse Providence.</td>
<td>KEZAMUTIMA Metuschellha</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>77 741661 <a href="mailto:metuschellah@yahoo.com">metuschellah@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Organisation pour la Lutte Contre les Malversations Economiques (OLUCOME)</td>
<td>BARARUNYERETSE Prudence</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>79 904836/77 711407 <a href="mailto:prudenceba@yahoo.fr">prudenceba@yahoo.fr</a> <a href="mailto:prudencebara@gmail.com">prudencebara@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Ministry of</td>
<td>BAMWENDA G.</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gratian.bamwenda@gmail.com">gratian.bamwenda@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Email address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>BAGUMHE Elias Peter</td>
<td>Principal Economist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbamwenda@yahoo.com">mbamwenda@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TMEA</td>
<td>MUNA Rebecca</td>
<td>National Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:peterbagumhe@yahoo.com">peterbagumhe@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Tanzania Cso Trade Coalition</td>
<td>LUNOGELO Hoseana Bohela</td>
<td>Executive Director, Esrf</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lunogelo@esrf.or.tz">lunogelo@esrf.or.tz</a>, <a href="mailto:ed@esrf.or.tz">ed@esrf.or.tz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Country Partner</td>
<td>MASHINDANO Oswald</td>
<td>Lecturer, UDSM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:omashindano@esrf.or.tz">omashindano@esrf.or.tz</a>, <a href="mailto:omashindano@gmail.com">omashindano@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Academia / Research</td>
<td>NYAKUNDI Ongubo</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td><a href="mailto:onyakundi@mfa.go.ke">onyakundi@mfa.go.ke</a>; <a href="mailto:ongubon@gmail.com">ongubon@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Ministry of Trade</td>
<td>NYAKUNDI Ongubo</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td><a href="mailto:onyakundi@mfa.go.ke">onyakundi@mfa.go.ke</a>; <a href="mailto:ongubon@gmail.com">ongubon@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>KERE Paul</td>
<td>Director, Policy Formulation, Interpretation and Implementation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pkere@environment.go.ke">pkere@environment.go.ke</a>; <a href="mailto:pagkere@yahoo.com">pagkere@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>Dr. OBORA Michael</td>
<td>Head, Climate Change Unit</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michaelobora@yahoo.com">michaelobora@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>EAC Ministry</td>
<td>NYAMBATI Kennedy</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Regional Integration</td>
<td><a href="mailto:knyambati@yahoo.com">knyambati@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Kenya Small Scale Farmers Federation</td>
<td>LAVI Justus</td>
<td>General Secretary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jlmwololo@yahoo.com">jlmwololo@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Kenya Climate Justice Women Champions</td>
<td>M. KIBE Cecilia</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kibe@kcjwc.org">kibe@kcjwc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>University of Nairobi</td>
<td>Prof. OKELO Jasper</td>
<td>Chair, WTO Chairs Programme</td>
<td>+254 735317166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>APSEA</td>
<td>OKATCH Felix</td>
<td>Multilateral Trade Expert</td>
<td><a href="mailto:okatchfelix@yahoo.com">okatchfelix@yahoo.com</a>; <a href="mailto:okatchfe-lix@gmail.com">okatchfe-lix@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Makerere</td>
<td>NDEBESA Mwambutsya</td>
<td>Head of Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pattnde@gmail.com">pattnde@gmail.com</a>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Email address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Studies Department,</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ndebesam@yahoo.com">ndebesam@yahoo.com</a> +256-752-635496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:abumoki@cabinetsecretariat.go.ug">abumoki@cabinetsecretariat.go.ug</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:abumoki@yahoo.com">abumoki@yahoo.com</a> +256-772-844195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Cabinet Secretariat</td>
<td>MOKI Abubaker Mohammed</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wobulenzi District Farmers Federation</td>
<td>KIRABIRA George</td>
<td>Farmer/ coordinator</td>
<td>+256-772-585988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Uganda Manufacturers Association</td>
<td>OKETCHO Mike Lawrence</td>
<td>Manager Policy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike.oketcho@gmail.com">mike.oketcho@gmail.com</a> + 256-755-255809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Climate change Unit, Ministry of Water</td>
<td>ISABIRYE Paul</td>
<td>Asst. Commissioner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul_isabirye@yahoo.com">paul_isabirye@yahoo.com</a> +256-772-592032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>NABAKOOZA Lydia</td>
<td>Business reporter</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nabakoozal@gmail.com">nabakoozal@gmail.com</a>; <a href="mailto:nabakoozalydia@yahoo.com">nabakoozalydia@yahoo.com</a> +256-772-005626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>OLANYO Joseph</td>
<td>Business writer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jolanyo@gmail.com">jolanyo@gmail.com</a> +256-772-421470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Busoga Forestry</td>
<td>MUYAMBI B. Rogers</td>
<td>Program Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rogers.bwengye@greenresources.no">rogers.bwengye@greenresources.no</a> +265-752-921474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Food Talk Uganda</td>
<td>KAIJA James</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amooti.james@yahoo.co.uk">amooti.james@yahoo.co.uk</a> +256-774-901400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Jenga Africa</td>
<td>WADULO Jeff</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jengaafrika@yahoo.com">jengaafrika@yahoo.com</a> +256-772-500726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Ministry of Trade</td>
<td>BASEMERA Peace</td>
<td>External Trade Expert</td>
<td>+250788574322 (<a href="mailto:basemerap2002@yahoo.com">basemerap2002@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Ministry of Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53. Rwanda</td>
<td>BN Producers</td>
<td>NIYIBAHO Belthilde</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+250788357434 (<a href="mailto:bnproducers@yahoo.com">bnproducers@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Rwanda</td>
<td>ACORD</td>
<td>KABANYANA Jeannine</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+250788583166 (<a href="mailto:kaJeanne2005@yahoo.fr">kaJeanne2005@yahoo.fr</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Rwanda</td>
<td>RCSP</td>
<td>FORONGO Janvier</td>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:forjanvier@gmail.com">forjanvier@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Rwanda</td>
<td>ACORD</td>
<td>MUSEMINARI Marcel</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+250788602060 (<a href="mailto:businessdailyrwanda@gmail.com">businessdailyrwanda@gmail.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Rwanda</td>
<td>Rwanda News Agency</td>
<td>GAKWAVA Andre</td>
<td>Chief Editor</td>
<td>+250788770270 (<a href="mailto:andre.gakwaya@yahoo.fr">andre.gakwaya@yahoo.fr</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Rwanda</td>
<td>COPROVIBA</td>
<td>Christine Murebwayire</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+250788536121 (<a href="mailto:coonoptu@yahoo.fr">coonoptu@yahoo.fr</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Rwanda</td>
<td>Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD)</td>
<td>MUNYENTWARI Francois</td>
<td>Country Director former project partner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fmunyentwari@gmail.com">fmunyentwari@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Rwanda</td>
<td>EACSOF</td>
<td>SEBAHIZI Prudence</td>
<td>Director current project partner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sebaprunce@yahoo.fr">sebaprunce@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Regional</td>
<td>Trapca</td>
<td>KIULUKA Peter</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:peter.kiuluku@trapca.org">peter.kiuluku@trapca.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Regional</td>
<td>Trapca</td>
<td>CHEKWOTI Caiphas</td>
<td>Trade Policy Expert</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chekwoti@gmail.com.comchekwoti">chekwoti@gmail.com.comchekwoti</a>@trapca.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Regional</td>
<td>Trapca</td>
<td>Thokazani James Ngwira</td>
<td>Trade Law Expert</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Thokazani.ngwira@trapca.org">Thokazani.ngwira@trapca.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Region</td>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>Mr. Moses Marwa</td>
<td>Principal Agriculture Economist</td>
<td>+255784305860, <a href="mailto:mmarwa@eachq.org">mmarwa@eachq.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Switzerland</td>
<td>Mission of Rwanda</td>
<td>BIZUMUREMYI Edouard</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td><a href="mailto:edwardbizi@yahoo.com">edwardbizi@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Email address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ EAC Geneva Delegation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Switzerland</td>
<td>Mission of Tanzania/ EAC Geneva Delegation</td>
<td>PILI Ms</td>
<td>Minister Plenipotentiary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ppmagesa@yahoo.co.uk">ppmagesa@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Switzerland</td>
<td>Mission of Burundi / EAC Geneva Delegation</td>
<td>NDAYIRAGIJE Pierre</td>
<td>Ambassador</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mission.burundi@bluewin.ch">mission.burundi@bluewin.ch</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Switzerland</td>
<td>Mission of Kenya / EAC Geneva Delegation</td>
<td>MAN YARA Elijah</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ebmanyara@yahoo.com">ebmanyara@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Switzerland</td>
<td>Permanent Mission of Uganda</td>
<td>CHRISTOPHER ONYANGA APARR</td>
<td>Ambassador to Sweden and other International Organizations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:protease.echessah@foreign.ministry.seprotase">protease.echessah@foreign.ministry.seprotase</a>@yahoo.com</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 7: PACT EAC MEDIA COVERAGE

**TV Coverage**

**Date:** 27/03/14 | **Place:** Bujumbura, Burundi | **TV Channel:** Radio TV Renaissance

**Vers un Bulletin Agro-météorologique au Burundi**


**Hyperlink:** [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=izBvz8nw48o&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=izBvz8nw48o&feature=youtu.be)

---

**Date:** 05/12/13 | **Place:** Bali, Indonesia | **TV Channel:** BBC World News

**BBC World News - India's position at the Bali WTO Ministerial**

**Intro:** On BBC World News, Pradeep S Mehta talks about India’s position on food subsidies at the Bali WTO Ministerial Conference...


---

**Date:** 30/08/13 | **Place:** Kigali, Rwanda | **TV Channel:** TV Rwanda

**Pour une collaboration politique sur le Climat**

**Intro:** Cette semaine, CUTS International and the Trade Policy Training Centre in Africa (trapca) ont organisé un atelier de formation portant sur les liens politiques entre le commerce, le changement climatique et la sécurité alimentaire à Kigali...

**Hyperlink:** [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oh4rO8CVyK4](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oh4rO8CVyK4)

---

**Date:** 30/08/13 | **Place:** Kigali, Rwanda | **TV Channel:** TV Rwanda

**For Political Cooperation on Climate Change**

**Intro:** This week, CUTS International and the Trade Policy Training Centre in Africa (trapca) organised a training workshop on the policy linkages between trade, climate change and food security in Kigali...

**Hyperlink:** [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=79IRas9rXIE](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=79IRas9rXIE)
Uganda needs mutually supportive trade and environmental practices

Intro: Trade activists call for a cautious approach to trade policy making, bearing in mind the need to promote sustainable practices protective of the environment...

Hyperlink: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aNHE_BFeQ7s

Une formation sur les liens politiques entre climat, nourriture et commerce.

Intro: Ces deux derniers jours, décisionnaires politiques burundais et représentants de la société civile étaient conviés à un atelier de formation organisé par CUTS International. L'atelier portait sur les liens politiques entre le changement climatique, la sécurité alimentaire et le commerce...

Hyperlink: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b3BylLh7UEU

CUTS et ADIR Lancent une campagne de plaidoyer au Burundi

Intro: Ce 2 juillet, CUTS International et ADIR ont réunis la société civile et des décisionnaires politiques à Bujumbura afin de lancer une champagne de plaidoyer pour l'adoption d'un mécanisme d'information et d'alerte rapide. Celui-ci permettrait au secteur agricole de mieux parer aux aléas des changements climatiques qui touchent le Burundi...

Hyperlink: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RoKejKGycys

Kenya to have poor food production

Intro: Kenya could be staring at another missed opportunity stretching the country's grain baskets thread bare. This follows the uncertainty around the traditional cereals producing areas where farmers are facing crop failures...

Hyperlink: http://www.standardmedia.co.ke/ktn/video/watch/2000067043/-kenya-to-have-poor-food-production

Spotlight on the Climate, Food and Trade Policy Nexus in Rwanda

Intro: TV Rwanda Reports on third meeting of PACT EAC project in Rwanda where a national study on "Climate, Food, Trade: Where is the Policy Nexus?" was launched...

Hyperlink: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-SjvGTDgdzc
La société civile se mobilise pour une plus grand cohérence politique au service de la sécurité alimentaire

Intro: Godefroid Manirankunda (ADIR) talks about the study released in Burundi under the title "Climate, Food, Trade: Where is the Policy Nexus" and outlines future advocacy work on engaging with politicians and other stakeholders...

Hyperlink: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_o3GNKKMAXI

Interview - Trade in fighting against climate-related hunger in Burundi

Intro: Julien Grollier, Assistant Programme Officer, CUTS International Geneva, and Godefroid Manirankunda, Représentant Légal, ADIR, talk about the role of trade policy in addressing climate-related hunger in Burundi at the 2nd NRG Meeting of the PACT EAC Project...

Hyperlink: http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=4x3tJ0ebqy4

Interview - Sécurité Alimentaire, Changement Climatique Et Commerce Au Burundi

Intro: Godefroid Manirankunda, Représentant Légal, ADIR, talks about the PACT EAC Project, the linkages existing between trade, climate change and food security, as well as the importance of multi-stakeholder consultations in coming up with suitable solutions to climate-related hunger in Burundi...

Hyperlink: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9Cz99-Y-RNI&feature=plcp

Press Coverage

Early warning and response system

Intro: Within the main objective of promoting food security in the country, Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade linkages in EAC Project (PACT EAC) urges to set up a new system to inform farmers very early..

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1j6anKq

New trade policy to address climate change challenges in the offing
Intro: The government is reviewing the national trade policy to address new challenges, especially those posed by climate change, John Mwesige, an expert on external trade at the Ministry of Trade and Industry, has said...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNGiBL

Date: 13/03/14 | Place: Bujumbura, Burundi | Newspaper: NetPress

Promouvoir la sécurité alimentaire par une agriculture intelligente et des politiques cohérentes

Intro: Tel est le thème de la cinquième réunion du groupe national de référence qui a été organisé hier par l’Action développement et intégration régionale (Adir). M. Godefroid Manirankunda, représentant de l’Adir, a indiqué que l’objectif de cette réunion est de développer la conscience de toutes les parties prenantes afin qu’ils comprennent que la politique de sécurité alimentaire tient compte de l’adaptation aux changements climatiques et de nouvelles règles commerciales, afin qu’elles soient interpellées et impliquées dans la « remodélisation » des politiques existantes afin qu’elles puissent être adaptées aux circonstances actuelles...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNGiBN

Date: 13/03/14 | Place: Bujumbura, Burundi | Newspaper: Agence Burundaise de Presse

L’ONG régionale ADIR plaide pour la promotion de la sécurité alimentaire par une agriculture intelligente et des politiques cohérente.

Intro: Les ONGs ADIR(Action Développement et Intégration Régionale) et CUTS international ont organisé ce mercredi à Bujumbura la 5ème réunion du groupe national référence sous le thème principal "Promouvoir la sécurité alimentaire par une agriculture intelligente et des politiques cohérentes"...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1j6anKr

Date: 13/03/14 | Place: Bujumbura, Burundi | Newspaper: Le Renouveau

Un systeme d’alerte precoce est necessaire

Intro: Production agricole: Prevenir les catastrophes climatiques..

Hyperlink:

Date: 09/03/14 | Place: Kampala, Uganda | Newspaper: The Guardian

Uganda to host 3rd EAC Secretary General’s forum

Intro: Uganda will host the 3rd East African Community (EAC) Secretary General’s Annual Forum for Private Sector, Civil Society and other interest groups in Entebbe 12-13
East Africa to sign partnership with US

Intro: Uganda and other East African Community member states are to sign a partnership with the United States of America through which climate change adaptation will be tackled. The new partnership is aimed at improving trade and agriculture within the region...

Yawning gap between trade policy and climate change needs to be removed

Intro: It has been revealed that there is an existing gap between the national trade policy and climate change which often makes the importance of the latter to the former ignored to the detriment of the nation...

Entebbe to Host 3rd EAC Secretary General’s Forum for Private Sector and Civil Society in September 2014

Intro: Uganda will host the 3rd East African Community (EAC) Secretary General’s Annual Forum for Private Sector, Civil Society and other interest groups in Entebbe 12-13 September, 2014. This was among the issues deliberated during the three-day preparatory meeting of members of the Regional Dialogue Committee drawn from the Partner States’ Ministries responsible for EAC Affairs, EAC Secretariat, Private Sector, Civil Society Organisations, and other interest groups held in Mwanza, Tanzania 3-5 March, 2014...

Inondations sur le nord de Bujumbura : ce qui devrait être fait pour éviter une réédition ...

Intro: Le gouvernement est interpelé pour la mise sur pied de mesures préventives. Il appelle à la solidarité nationale...

Inondations sur le nord de Bujumbura : ce qui devrait être fait pour éviter une réédition ...
Innovation can solve food security problems

Intro: Food security is a major challenge facing the East African region. Mostly attributed to extreme weather conditions, distribution and availability challenges, the region has continued to suffer from food shortages as a result of crop failures, low purchasing power and low supplies...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNGiBP

Date: 07/02/14 | Place: Kampala, Uganda | Newspaper: The Monitor

We need long-term plans to address food security challenges in East Africa

Intro: Food security is a major challenge facing the East African region. Mostly attributed to extreme weather conditions, distribution and availability challenges, the region has continued to suffer from food shortages as a result of crop failures, low purchasing power and low supplies. Leaders as well as policy makers in East Africa need to be more forward looking in their strategies by developing a long-term plan to address this challenge of systemic pressures on agricultural development and food security...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/MTg1oz

Date: 15/01/14 | Place: Arusha, Tanzania | Newspaper: The Guardian

Geneva firm influences new Tanzanian agricultural policy

Intro: Climate, food and trade initiatives by a Geneva-based organisation, CUTS International have triggered a number of positive improvements in East Africa in 2013, including the new draft agricultural policy and a potential review of the Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) policy...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1j6am93

Date: 21/10/13 | Place: Arusha, Tanzania | Newspaper: EAC Secretariat

2nd EAC Secretary General’s Forum for Private Sector, Civil Society and Other Interest Groups Kicks-off in Nairobi

Intro: Kenya’s Cabinet Secretary for East African Affairs, Commerce and Tourism Hon. Phyllis Kandie has underscored the importance of holding regular dialogue with private sector, civil society and other interest groups in order to get their views and expectations on the various stages of regional integration...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNGjFK

Date: 13/10/13 | Place: Kampala, Uganda | Newspaper: The Observer

Poor agriculture policies hamper growth in EAC

Intro: The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development’s (UNCTAD’s) trade and
environment report 2013, warns that continuous rural poverty, persistent hunger and growing populations, must be treated as a collective crisis...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNGjFO

Date:09/10/13 | Place: Kampala, Uganda | Newspaper: New Vision

Private sector and CSOs to promote EAC integration

Intro: The EAC Deputy Secretary General in charge of Productive and Social Sectors, Jesca Eriyo has commended the efforts made by the private sector, civil society and other interest groups to push the integration agenda...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/HgBOo4

Date:05/10/13 | Place: Kampala, Uganda | Newspaper: Daily Monitor

Government under spotlight over incoherent policy on climate change

Intro: A high level regional meeting in Kampala has been concluded with a call on government to step up its efforts in tackling the evident impact of climate change on trade and agriculture before all gets out of hand...


Date:09/07/13 | Place: Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania | Newspaper: The Guardian

Cotton farmers urged to embrace bio-engineering

Intro: Cotton farmers in the country have been called upon to add Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) to their crops to help increase yields, stressing that the GMOs are safe and pose no threat to humans...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1j6eztw

Date:01/07/13 | Place: Geneva, Switzerland | Newspaper: The Guardian

Complex trade pacts promote land grabs

Intro: Multiplicity of Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) and Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) leave room for some investors to take advantage of African resources, it has been asserted...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNiqIA

Date:17/06/13 | Place: Nairobi, Kenya | Newspaper: Daily Monitor
Time to fight desertification is now

Intro: As East African Community (EAC) countries read their national budgets last week (June 13), efforts were put on raising resources for infrastructural development and service provision. One critical issue, however, remains: Are we doing enough to combat desertification?..

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNlqJC

Date: 22/05/13 | Place: Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania | Newspaper: The Guardian

Tanzania proposes renew of AGOA upon expiry

Intro: Tanzania has put up a request to the US government on the need to extend African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) which is due to expire on 2015 saying the trade programme has benefitted the former country greatly...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNIt8d

Date: 02/05/13 | Place: Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania | Newspaper: The Guardian

Tanzania climate change challenges spotlighted

Intro: There are structural weaknesses in the Tanzanian policy and institutional landscape that may minimise the efficiency to address climate change challenges, a recent report warns...


Date: 19/04/13 | Place: Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania | Newspaper: The Guardian

Operational hitches weaken growth of trade in EAC states

Intro: Though there have been a number of projects going on in the East African Community (EAC) countries in the form of Aid for Trade (AfT) and Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF), operational inefficiency still remain a major challenge facing rapid trade growth among partner states...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNlqJG

Date: 01/04/13 | Place: Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania | Newspaper: The Guardian

Strategies to mitigate climate effects on food security on course – govt

Intro: The government is yet to undertake initiatives to link agriculture, trade and climate changes so as to come up with an effective policy and mitigation measures that will prevent the country from famine...
Un livre sur les liens entre changement climatique, nourriture et commerce, a été lancé

Intro: Un livre qui montre les liens entre changement climatique, nourriture et commerce dans la Communauté est-africaine (EAC) vient d’être lancé dans le but de maintenir un plaidoyer pour la synergie des politiques...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNIt8e

---

EAC discusses food security

Intro: East African governments, business, farmers, civil society, media and academic communities are reviewing policy efforts on how trade can address food security in the region...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1j6ezKa

---

Matooke threatened by banana wilt

Intro: Uganda will soon run out of matooke (bananas) unless serious interventions are put in place to address the banana wilt, a Makerere don has said...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/PdXWPc

---

Three-year agriculture, climate change project launched

Intro: Consumer Unity & Trust Society, working on trade and development issues, will implement a three-year project on "Promoting Agriculture-Climate-Trade linkages" in the East African Community. The project aims at enabling the member states to understand and implement sound policies to harness the potential of trade in reducing poverty and hunger in the face of climate change...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNIlt8j

---

The WTO is needed now more than ever

Intro: WTO approval of new measures in favour of the least developed countries has shown a way forward, both through the haze of global economic uncertainty and against the risks
of increasing protectionism, writes Pradeep S. Mehta..

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1mgwDE8

---

**Date:** 11/03/12 | **Place:** Arusha, Tanzania | **Newspaper:** The Observer

**EAC worried about food security**

**Intro:** Increased dependency on the unpredictable world market, adverse impacts of climate change and inadequate food supply chains have been cited as barriers to the East African Community’s (EACs) potential to produce enough food to meet the region’s demand...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1hNGjFO

---

**Date:** 01/03/12 | **Place:** Arusha, Tanzania | **Newspaper:** Business Daily

**CUTS International launches Agri-Climate Change-Trade Policy for EAC**

**Intro:** CUTS International, a research-based NGO working on trade, agriculture, competition and other development-related issues organized February 23, a two-day meeting to launch its new project entitled “Promoting Agriculture-Climate-Trade Linkages in the EAC” PACT-EAC. The meeting was attended by about 50 representatives of international and regional organization such as FAO and the EAC as well as of governments, CSOs, private sector, think tanks and media from Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda...

Hyperlink: http://bit.ly/1j6eA0s
ANNEX 8: PROJECT OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS ACCORDING TO THE LFA

**Objective 1:** increased knowledge and capacity on climate change, food security and trade (CCFST) linkages by stakeholders so they are able to identify their own policy options, make recommendations and advocate for change.

**Indicator 1.2:** Identification of CCFST linkages and their implications at the country or regional level.

The main outcome is the incorporation of identified CCFST linkages in revised policies and strategies relating to agriculture, environment and trade at the national and regional levels. Examples are presented below:

i. In Uganda, the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives (MTIC) is incorporating the CCFST linkages in the review of the Uganda National Trade Policy because the current policy is blind on the climate change component which greatly influences the performance of the food security and trade components. In addition, some of the linkages identified have been incorporated in Uganda’s Updated Diagnostic Trade Integrated Study prepared for the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF) by the World Bank.

ii. Identified CCFST linkages have been captured in the Environmental Study by the East African Community. This was confirmed during the PACT EAC evaluation interview with Dr. Abubakar M. Moki, formerly Assistant Commissioner in the Ministry East African Community Affairs (MEACA) and currently Commissioner Policy Development and Capacity Building, Cabinet Secretariat, Office of the President, in Uganda in May 2014.

iii. In Kenya, identified CCFST linkages have been incorporated in the revised National Climate Changes Action Plan. This was confirmed by Mr. Paul Kere, Director Policy Formulation Interpretation and Implementation, Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources, during the PACT EAC evaluation interview in Nairobi, in April 2014. A Bill is being worked on to operationalize the revised Action Plan. Both the Policy and Bill are in final stages.

**Indicator 1.3:** Training minimum 300 trainees over course of the project; inviting minimum 300 participants to project meetings per year.

According to the PACT EAC Interim Assessment Report (September 2013), 138 stakeholders attended national training workshops, 784 participated in National Reference Group (NRG) meetings, and 80 participated in regional meetings. The project envisages 5 national and one regional training workshops in the second year (by end September 2013) and 5 national and 2 regional training workshops in the 3rd year (by end September 2014) of the project which should train a total of 300 stakeholders. Hence the target to be trained by end September 2013 comes to about 139 (300/13*6) as against which 138 have been actually trained. With regard to participations in NRG and regional meetings, the expected number of stakeholders over the two years is 600. The total of 864 gives a percentage of 144 which is beyond the projected minimum target.

The percentages of stakeholders from different institutions participating National Training Workshops (NTW), national reference groups (NRG) and Regional Annual Meetings RAM are presented in table 3. Stakeholders from NGOs and government constitute a larger proportion of the participants.

To include a broad spectrum of relevant stakeholders (both male and female) it is
recommended that a stakeholder analysis should be undertaken in future similar projects. This will contribute to achievement of sustainability to project benefits/outcomes.

Table 1: Stakeholders Participating in Workshops and Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Workshops/Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NRG %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia/Research Institute</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Organizations</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/Regional Orgs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACT EAC Interim Impact Assessment Report (September 2013)

From the PACT EAC reports and from the PACT EAC evaluation interviews, the evaluation team established that, the number of trained stakeholders are using the knowledge gained in various ways, particularly with regard to coordinating or collaborating with other stakeholders on CCFST issues. A rating of 63.3% (table 4) of good to excellent shows that participation in trainings and meetings constitutes significantly to coordinating or collaborating with other stakeholders on CCFST issues.

Table 2: Responses to Coordination or Collaboration on CCFST Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Responses Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat (Average)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACT EAC Interim Impact Assessment Report (September 2013)

Indicator 1.4: At least 50% of all participants in the project activities including training workshops indicate that their understanding and capacity on CCFST linkages has improved. Through participation in the project activities, particularly training workshops, and national and regional meetings, stakeholders have increased their knowledge and capacity to deal with CCFST, linkages. Table 5 presents responses of stakeholders to levels of understanding and capacity to deal with CCFST linkages.

Table 3: Responses to Level of Understanding and Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Responses Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat (Average)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
87.7% indicated that their level of understanding and capacity is good to excellent and this was attributed to their participation in Project activities. An officer in the Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA) in Rwanda indicated that the project has improved the capacity of the Ministry to: include CCFST linkages on the national plan of action; introduce climate change considerations in the environmental protection plan; and how to improve gathering and presentation of meteorological information for different stakeholders. During the PACT EAC Project external evaluation interviews, the stakeholders were asked to indicate their level of understanding before the project and now. The percentage responses are presented in table 6.

**Table 4: Responses to Level of Understanding CCFST Linkages Before the Project and Now**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Understanding</th>
<th>Period Before Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: PACT EAC Project Evaluation*

78.3% of the stakeholders indicated that their level of understanding is now high as compared to only 4.3% who indicated it was high before the project. The results of the PACT EAC Stakeholder’s Survey and the results of the PACT EAC Evaluation show that participation in project activities has contributed significantly to increased understanding of CCFST linkages.

The responses to the causes of the level of understanding are presented in Table 7. Participation in training workshops was the leading cause (91.3%) followed by research reports (82.6%). Advocacy/networking and availability of training materials were important causes with 69.6% and 65.2% respectively. During the interviews, it was established that the time allocated to training workshops was not adequate.

**Table 5: Responses on Causes of Increased Level of Understanding on CCFST Linkages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes</th>
<th>Percentage Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in training workshops</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of high quality training materials</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective advocacy and networking</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in project activities</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project action/alerts/press releases</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project briefing papers</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Research reports</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: PACT EAC Project Evaluation*

**Indicator 1.5: Majority of stakeholders indicate the usefulness of project materials.**

During the PACT EAC project evaluation, the stakeholders were asked to rate the
usefulness of the project materials and indicate in what areas the materials have been used. The responses to usefulness are presented in table 8 while the areas of use are presented in table 9.

Table 6: Percentage Responses to Usefulness of Project Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Useful</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Useful</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Useful</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACT EAC Project Evaluation

Table 7: Percentage Responses to Areas of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Use</th>
<th>% Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy formulation</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and information</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding research</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating with other stakeholders</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy/Networking</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Briefs</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACT EAC Project Evaluation

82.6% of the stakeholders indicated that the materials were very useful. With regards to the area of use, 87.0%, 82.6% and 73.9% of the stakeholders indicated that they used the materials for knowledge and information, policy formulation, and collaboration with other stakeholders, respectively.

From the PACT EAC Project Stakeholders’ Survey, the responses regarding the use of various project materials are presented in table 10. The percentages are based on 153 respondents. The research study reports are the most widely used followed by training manuals. While all materials are important, it is recommended that in future similar projects, more efforts should be put on research studies to address specific needs of different stakeholders, as well as revision/upgrading of training manuals.

Table 8: Responses to Use of Project Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Study reports</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training manuals</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC Geneva Forum Papers</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information in the media</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action alerts</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used the materials</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACT EAC Interim Impact Assessment Report (September 2013

Indicator 1.6: At least 5 new initiatives/activities by stakeholders have emerged from their participation in the project.
The project has triggered a number of new initiatives, policies and actions/activities in the EAC countries. The major ones are presented below under each country.

a) Kenya

- The Resources Oriented Development Initiatives (RODI) programme has produced radio programmes in food security following participation of the Programme Coordinator in the project.

2. Several sections on trade, climate change, sustainable consumption and production, as well as industrial development have been incorporated in the 2012 draft environmental policy in Kenya.

3. Implementation of climate change early warning systems and mainstreaming climate change adaptation and mitigation on agriculture and trade processes in Kenya

4. Setting up of insurance system and irrigation infrastructure in Kenya through increased funding of relevant ministries and policy briefs.

a) Uganda

i) Makerere University is in the process of launching Makerere University Centre for Climate Change Research Innovations (MUCCRI) aimed at helping to enhance and sustain climate change related research. A Curriculum Committee at the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences has been established to incorporate climate change components into the College’s main curriculum. The Committee will also review the curriculum in order to mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience, as well as develop a new Masters degree programme in climate sciences. Through support from SEATINI, Paul Isabirye, a member of the Curriculum Committee, and also UNFCCC National Coordinator in Uganda and a member of the Uganda National Reference Group (NRG), has advocated for CCFST linkages to stand out in the curriculum. The College is working closely with SEATINI and it is expected that the MUCCRI will be launched in June 2014.

ii) Gathering views on the local reality on cotton issues to define Uganda’s WTO position.

iii) Coordinating with National Forest Authority on how to develop standard that would be used in forest protection/conservation in Uganda.

iv) Talking to forest owners, both natural and woodlot, in Kibaale and Hoima Districts in Uganda on forest protection/conservation.

v) Lobbying and advocacy for re-drafting of the Uganda National Trade Policy.

vi) SEATINI, Uganda PACT EAC Project partner, has been invited by other Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), such as the National Association of Professional Environmentalists, to train their stakeholders on CCFST linkages.

vii) Mr Jeff Wadulo, the Executive Director of Jenga Africa in Uganda, indicated that the organization is using Project materials to train stakeholders on CCFST linkages.

viii) Mr George Kirabira, the Coordinator of Wobulenzi District Farmers’ Federation (WDFF) in Uganda, indicated that the project materials are being used for training farmers on climate change mitigation and adaptation.
ix) Mr Michael L. Oketcho, Manager Policy and Advocacy, Uganda Manufacturers Association, (UMA) indicated that:

- Uganda Cleaner Production Centre has used the project materials to incorporate impacts of climate change to enhance clean production and trading environment.
- Materials from the project are being used by UMA in training interns on impact of climate change.

a) Rwanda

i) Association for the Defense of Consumers’ Rights in Rwanda (ADECOR), former partner for PACT EAC Project, has used the project materials to assist Consumer International (CI) members in developing and implementing campaign proposals under the Green Action Fund theme for 2013-14: Safer, More Sustainable Food For All.

ii) Mainstreaming of Climate change adaptation and mitigation in agriculture and trade processed in Rwanda

iii) Preparation of new strategy to support advocacy on fair trade in Rwanda.

iv) Approaching institutions directly linked with trade (such as the Ministry of Trade, Rwanda Cooperation Agency, Meteo Rwanda, and Ministry of Agriculture) in Rwanda to deal with CCFST linkages issues.

v) Formulation of a project titled “A Resilient Environment for Sustainable Green Economic Growth” in Rwanda.

a) Burundi

i) Setting up of a National Technical Commission on Agriculture, Climate change and Agriculture in Burundi.

ii) Plaidoyer pour le financement du Plan National d 'Investissement agricole au Burundi.

iii) Discussion sur les actions prioritaires à mener et sur les projets au Burundi.

iv) Adoption of an information and rapid alert system in Burundi.

a) Tanzania

i) Supporting agriculture cooperatives in order to raise their awareness on climate change resilience in Tanzania.

ii) Reducing deforestation, increasing reforestation and afforestation.

iii) Development and implementation of localized adaptation strategies to climate change.

a) All Countries

i) Drawing of synergies between stakeholders at the country level that have benefited the Geneva WTO process in understanding the ground realities, which then inform the WTO Geneva Delegates’ work and negotiation strategies.

ii) Improving inter-ministerial coordination and deepening trust between governmental actors and civil society organizations (CBOs).

iii) Coming up with country positions on various issues of interest relating to CCFST
iv) Organizing collective actions to bring out the relationship between climate change-food security-trade issues.

v) Sharing information among the stakeholders, as well as advocacy and coalition building among stakeholders such as farmers’ groups and members of parliament.

vi) Active participation in research and evaluation of agriculture-nutrition projects and activities from a consumer perspective.

The 31 initiatives are more than the expected target 5. It is expected that more initiatives will emerge as more stakeholders appreciate CCFST linkages and develop strategies and action plans to address impacts of climate change.

**Indicator 1.7: Research Recommendations lead to 5 national advocacy campaigns on CCFST linkages in the five countries for behavior and policy change.**

As indicated in table 2, there have been five advocacy campaigns, one in each of the EAC countries. This was an additional activity not envisaged in the original project. The impacts of the advocacy campaigns are briefly discussed below:

1. In Tanzania, the advocacy campaign by the Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF), the PACT EAC Project Partner, effectively lobbied the government to tackle deforestation, which is a worsening factor on climate change, through stronger regulation of the informal charcoal sector. As the Tanzania Forest Policy is being reviewed, the campaign voiced concerns in the Action Alert that “weak governance has led the charcoal industry to become the second main cause of deforestation in the country”. Several recommendations of the alert were discussed in a meeting between ESRF and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT). The MNRT promised to incorporate recommendations from the alert in the revised policy. This is a clear example of change of attitude and behavior.

2. In Rwanda, the National Trade Policy is currently under review. The Rwanda advocacy campaign has been lobbying for the inclusion of climate change issues in the Trade Policy, as well as representation of Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA) in the National Trade Policy Forum (NTPF) to work on the issue. As a result, a joint lobby committee comprising representatives of the Ministry of Trade and REMA has been setup to work on the issue. The government has publicly announced that it is reviewing the National Trade Policy to address new challenges, especially those posed by climate change, and has acknowledged that the current trade policy does not directly show the linkage between trade and climate change. The announcement was widely covered by the media. The revision of the trade policy is expected to be completed in June 2014.

3. On 8th April 2014, the Ministry of East African Community Affairs (MEACA) and the Office of the Prime Minister held a validation workshop of the Uganda National EAC Policy. During the meeting, SEATINI argued that the section of National Trade Policy fails to bring out the linkages with food security and climate change. The argument was well taken and as a result SEATINI was requested to produce an issue paper addressing how the issues of food security and climate change should appear in the document. The issue paper was submitted on 17th April 2014.

4. In Kenya, the Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources (MEWNR) was working on a draft environmental policy in August 2013. The relationship between trade and environment has been incorporated in one specific section (section 5.2) of the final policy which has a component on “Manufacturing, Retail and Trade Sectors. During the
PACT EAC evaluation interview, Mr Paul Kere, the Director Policy Formulation Interpretation and Implementation in MEWNR, said that the project materials, especially research study reports, have been used as references for the policy on CCFST linkages. Mr Kere is a member of the Kenya National Reference Group and was also a reviewer of the Kenya Research Study report.

4. In Burundi, ADIR’s advocacy campaign managed to bring together the Head of Weather forecasting in the Ministry of Environment and an expert in the Ministry of Agriculture to collaborate on a pilot early warning system for farmers that would timely disseminate appropriate information through appropriate channels. The draft mechanism was presented at a meeting on 12 March 2014 where it received wide media (TV, Radio and print media) coverage. The mechanism is now being finalized and will be presented at the “Government Hearings on Agriculture” at the end of June 2014.

The advocacy campaigns have contributed significantly to effective consultations between government top policy makers and professionals from relevant sectors in addressing CCFST linkages. This has resulted in positive policy and behavior changes among the stakeholders, particularly among top government policy makers.

**Indicator 1.8:** About 500 project stakeholders and about 1,000 other indirect project beneficiaries take project outputs, information and other advocacy materials disseminate to them.

The project issues, activities and recommendations relating to climate change-food security-trade CCFST linkages issues have been mainstreamed in the East African Public debates through the wide media coverage. The project has been widely covered in over 30 media articles and about 12 TV reports in the daily news by the prominent regional and national media outlets including BBC World News; NBS Television, KTN; The New Times; The Guardian; NBS Uganda; New Vision; Agence Burundaise de Presse; TV Rwanda; Daily Monitor; RNA News; The Observer; and Business Daily. The project has been mentioned in several press releases by the EAC secretariat.

During the PACT EAC evaluation interviewed indicated that topical articles by the print media are very useful as they can be photocopied and disseminated to a wide range of stakeholders and beneficiaries. The major challenge is the translation of the articles in local languages for wide dissemination. However, in terms of public impact, electronic media like TV has been instrumental in bring the issues to the public discourse. The KTN news report in Kenya for instance drew much public attention, making it easier to reach to policy makers since it brought into perspective the need to enhance early warning system during the time which the country was faced with a major drought and food shortages especially in arid and semi-arid lands.

As shown in table 11 under indicator 3.2, a total of 1,375 people participated in the meetings and training workshops: 995 in NRG meetings, 160 in Regional Annual Meetings, 138 in national training workshops, 50 in Project Inception Meeting and 32 in regional training workshops. In addition, organizations participating in the project have organized activities for their stakeholders. The evaluation team concludes that through the media, meetings, workshops and activities organized by the organizations/institutions participating in the project, 500 stakeholders and over 1,400 indirect project beneficiaries received project outputs, materials and information (from the mailing list).

**Indicator 1.9:** All country partners successfully implement advocacy campaigns’ activities;
regularly organize and participate in project activities, and provide bi-monthly country notes on WTO-related issues as per the TORs developed by CUTS for possible use by their WTO delegates.

As shown in table 2 and as discussed under indicator 1.7, the country partners have successfully implemented advocacy campaigns, one in each country. The campaigns have resulted in positive change attitudes and behavior, particularly among senior government policy makers with regard to CCFST linkages. By 31st March 2014, the partners had prepared a total of 15 country update notes and a total of 15 communications from the grassroots. In collaboration with CUTS, the partners have organized national reference group meetings and national training workshops. The partners have also been involved in the preparation of action alerts and press releases concerning the project. By 31st March 2014, a total of 28 action alerts and press releases had been prepared. As partners, they have been involved in other project activities undertaken in their respective countries and in the region.

*Indicator 1.10: Number of country partners or other stakeholders provide examples on how similar work will be continued in their organization.*

The following are the examples relating to this indicator:

i) In Uganda, SEATINI, the country project partner, has been invited by other Civil Society Organizations (CBOs) to train their stakeholders on CCFST linkage issues. For example, the National Association of Professional Environmentalists (NAPE) invited SEATINI to train their stakeholders on trade and climate change linkages.

ii) CUTS Nairobi office has used the experience and the momentum created through PACT EAC Project to design a specific project to strengthen civil society collaboration in the region to influence regional integration in the EAC, where trade and climate change were among the key issues to be addressed.

iii) Through technical cooperation between ACCORD (formerly the country partner in Rwanda) and the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) have developed a draft project on food security control system.

*Indicator 1.11: % of workshop trainees indicating their ability to develop/revise policies to be holistic has significantly increased.*

In addressing this indicator, the evaluation team established the following:

i) According to CUTS PACT EAC Project Status Report (April 2014), over 150 stakeholders have been trained and granted competence certification on climate change, food and trade policy issues.

ii) According to the PACT EAC Project Interim Assessment Report (September 2013), as shown in table 5, 89.7% of stakeholders indicated that their understanding and capacity to deal with CCFST linkages is good to excellent (42.3% good and 47.4% excellent).

iii) Table 6 presents the results of the PACT EAC Project evaluation interviews on the understanding of CCFST linkages before the project and now 78.3% of the stakeholders’ interviewed indicated that their understanding is high now as compared to only 4.2% who indicated that their understanding was high before the project.

iv) During the PACT Project evaluation, 82.6% of the stakeholders indicated that their ability to develop/revise policies to be holistic has increased through training in workshops From the above, the evaluation team concludes that the ability of about 80% of the stakeholders to develop/revise policies to be holistic has increased. However, the team
was able to get actual examples of policies developed/revised.

Objective 2: Improved understanding and capacity of EAC Geneva Missions to participate in the WTO discussions and negotiation on issues of interest to them.

Indicator 2.2: Establishment and regular functioning of a Forum in Geneva for the EAC Country Delegates to discuss issues of interest to them at the WTO, share knowledge and insights, and create two-way information and knowledge exchanges between them and grassroots.

The following are the outcomes under this indicator:

1. In Geneva, an exclusive Forum has been established for EAC Delegates. The Forum allows the EAC delegates (current and those that constantly arrive in Geneva) to have a space outside of the WTO to discuss WTO issues, reflect informally on the issues discussed at the Forum meetings, and learn from the realities back home in their capitals. At the multilateral level, the EAC Geneva Forum has become a point of reference for EAC Geneva delegates.

4. At the regional level, the EAC negotiators based in Geneva’ visits to the EAC countries have enabled the delegates to understand CCFST linkages in practical terms and have a clear perception of ground realities, which have informed their positions in Geneva. This has contributed to creation of two-way information and knowledge exchange between the delegates and the grassroots.

Indicator 2.3: 60% of the EAC country Geneva delegates interviewed indicate increased capacity and knowledge to participate in WTO discussions and negotiations.

From the PACT EAC Project Interim Impact Assessment Report (September 2013) and the PACT EAC project evaluation, the WTO delegates interviewed have indicated that the project has increased their capacity and knowledge to participate in WTO discussions and negotiations. This has enabled them to:

2. Deal with the critical challenges of climate change, food security and effective participation in the multilateral trading system.
   - Understand options and implications of specific WTO negotiation issues and discussions.
   - Handle WTO negotiations on trade and environment.
   - Internalize implications and improve interface between multilateral, inter-regional processes and North-South FTAs (e.g EPAs)
   - Identity selected tariff and non-tariff barriers for EAC exports.
   - Adopt informed positions and decisions in certain aspects of WTO negotiations.
   - Provide argumentations to defend or advance positions and to create coalitions.

Indicator 2.4: List of topics identified by EAC Missions in Geneva and related notes written by CUTS for the Forum meetings.

As shown in table 2, by 31st March 2014, 15 country update notes and 15 WTO-related notes had been prepared for the Forum meetings. The following are the topics identified for Geneva Delegates Forum Meetings that generated more awareness:

- EPAs Implications for Developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs).
- Compatibility of the EC-EAC-EPA to WTO
- Making the Tripartite FTA work for EAC interests.
• Trade Facilitation in the TFTA: A closer look at EAC
• Importance of SPS and TBT measures on Trade Policy
• Standards in MTS: Implication for EAC.
• Service negotiations: challenges and way forward for EAC.
• Nexus between biofuels production, food security and trade.
• Implications of biofuels subsidies on food security and trade.
• Exploring the regional dimension on AFT in EAC
• The “Plurilateral Temptation” and the Doha round.
• The 9th WTO Ministerial Conference: What is at stake for EAC
• The WTO services waiver for LDCs
• Impact of WTO or non-WTO plurilaterals
• Implications of EPA negotiations on RTA rules in WTO.
• Impact of the extension or non-extension of AGOA for EAC countries
• The reality of trade facilitation barriers in EAC countries.

During the PACT EAC Project evaluation interviews, some country partners indicated that the WTO Geneva Forum meetings focused more on trade issues than climate change. The partners also indicated that although the partners prepare the country update notes, their feedback is only through the Geneva EAC Forum Digest.

**Objective 3: Improved/enhanced coordination between and across stakeholders at national, regional and multilateral levels.**

**Indicator 3.2: Frequency and Types of interactions between Geneva-capitals, national-regional, national-national, and regional-multilateral stakeholders.**

The main factor contributing to the achievement of this indicator is the interaction of stakeholders through meetings and workshops conducted at the national and regional levels. At the multilateral, the visits of WTO Geneva Delegates to EAC countries have contributed to stakeholder interactions. The various institutions at the national level organize meetings and workshops for their stakeholders.

i) According to the PACT EAC Project Status Report (April 2014) a total of 1,375 people participated in meetings and workshops as presented in table 11:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings/Workshops</th>
<th>Number of Meetings/Workshops</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Reference Group Meetings</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Annual Meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Inception Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Training Workshops</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Training Workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: PACT EAC Status Report (April 2014)*

ii) As shown in table 2, WTO Geneva Delegates made 5 visits to EAC countries to interact with a wide range of stakeholders to learn more about climate change effects, trade and food security.
iii) The institutions participating in the PACT EAC Project organize meetings and workshops for the stakeholders to exchange and disseminate knowledge and information on CCFST linkages and related issues. For example, farmers’ organizations organized workshops to train farmers on climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies.

**Indicator 3.3: Number and examples of coordinated responses/actions/positions/solutions due to stakeholders’ interactions or information being exchanged.**

Efforts to achieve this indicator have focused on policies, actions and initiatives that have emerged through the project interventions. Examples include the following:

b) Lobbying and advocacy for revising national policies, strategies and action plans to incorporate identified CCFST linkages.
   - Organizing collective actions to bring out the relationship between the three CCFST linkage issues.
   - Incorporating climate change components into the curriculum of training institutions as is being done by Makerere University College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences.
   - Supporting agricultural cooperatives in order to raise their awareness on climate change in Tanzania.

**Indicator 3.4: % of stakeholders who are coordinating with other stakeholders on CCFST.**

As shown in table 4, 88.5% of the stakeholders indicated that they have already started to coordinate and collaborate with other Project stakeholders as by August 2013 as a consequence of their participation in project trainings and meetings. National Reference Group (NRG) meetings, Regional Annual Meetings (RAM) and national and training workshops have provided space for debate, confidence building and platforms for coordination.

The following are examples of collaboration:

- SEATINI, the project partner in Uganda, indicated that the Ministry East Africa Community Affairs (MEACA) has constantly shared with SEATINI documents and updates related to trade and climate change.
- CUTS ARC, Nairobi, has developed a proposal on strengthening CSO collaboration in the region to influence regional integration in the EAC where trade and climate changes are the key issues to be addressed.
- ACORD, former project partner in Rwanda, is working in close collaboration with experts from Rwanda Environmental Management Authority and the UNFCCC Focal Point for Rwanda.
- In Uganda, there is enhanced networking between the MEACA and CBOs on trade and climate.

**Indicator 3.5: Facilitation of delegates, country partners, EAC Secretariat to different meetings.**

The following are the outcomes under the indicator:

i) As shown in table 2, WTO Geneva Delegates made 5 visits to the EAC countries. This has contributed to the creation of better linkages between their capital-based/grassroots and Geneva-based work. As indicated under indicator 2.2, the visits contributed to creation of two-way information and knowledge exchange between the delegates and the grassroots.

ii) Through participation in National Reference Group (NRG) meetings and Regional Annual
Meetings the delegates have been able to establish regular contacts with PACT EAC stakeholders. The delegates also make calls to local stakeholders they had met at meetings to seek their views.
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