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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An independent final evaluation has been undertaken on the 2012—2016 Cambodian Export Diversification and Expansion Programme (CEDEP I) which was supported by the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF). Stakeholders have been widely consulted throughout the process including key representatives of the Government and donors, Project Steering Committee members (PSC) and the Main Implementing Entities (MIES). Board members of the Cambodian Rice Federation (CRF) and the Silk Sector Development and Promotion Commission (SDC) were consulted on multiple occasions. Direct and indirect beneficiaries of the programme were an important contributor to the evaluation.

The purpose of the final evaluation was to not only measure overall design and performance of results but to also provide lessons learned that would be useful for key stakeholders in Cambodia, future collaboration with the EIF, further phases of CEDEP and for donors that will provide continued support to the sectors. Specific lessons learned are outlined in Section 10 but are discussed throughout the report.

CEDEP I supports the Ministry of Commerce (MoC) Trade Sector Wide Approach (Trade SWAp) which represents the policy aim of the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) to deepen and broaden Cambodia’s integration into global and regional trading systems through diversification of export products and export markets. The Trade SWAp and its Roadmaps specify ten priority sectors for export promotion out of the 19 that were identified in Cambodia’s 2007 Trade Integration Strategy (CTIS). CEDEP I is funded through the EIF which is a multi-donor framework that supports the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) to use trade as a vehicle for economic growth and poverty reduction by integrating LDCs into the global trading system.

Out of the ten priority sectors for intervention, five are currently being supported. The focus of CEDEP I was to support Pillar 2 of the Trade SWAp by enhancing export capacities for Milled Rice and High Value Silk. CEDEP II focuses on Cassava, Marine Fisheries Products, and Tourism¹.

CEDEP I was implemented by three separate MIEs two of which were development partners (DP’s). The International Finance Corporation (IFC) implemented the Milled Rice component, and the International Trade Centre (ITC) implemented the High Value Silk component. The third MIE is the Department of International Cooperation (DICO) within the MoC that operates as the programme National Implementation Unit (NIU) with support from the EIF. The aim of component three was to strengthen the capacity of the NIU to evaluate and disseminate results and impacts as well as to align results with the Trade SWAp indicators.

DP’s were mainly selected to implement components as they had the technical capacity and previous experience to implement in their component areas and this added significant value to CEDEP I. The selected DP’s also had the necessary fiduciary and management capacities. At the time of CEDEP I, DICO was also fully committed to EIF Tier 1 and the Trade Development Support Programme (TDSP).

¹ CEDEP II commenced implementation in January 2014 with the support of the EIF, UNDP, UNIDO and the Academy of Culinary Arts of Cambodia. It is expected to end in June 2018. There is a Trust Fund Manager (UNOPS) as with CEDEP I.
**MAIN FINDINGS**

Evaluation and rating criteria are in line with those set out by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Criteria (DAC). Using a numeric range of 1 for highly satisfactory to 6 for highly unsatisfactory the programme scores 2 and is rated overall as satisfactory. Details of the ratings and criteria are provided below.

**Relevance**

With clearly identified government priorities which were well articulated in its Trade SWAp and the CTIS there is no doubt as to the relevance of CEDEP I and this is evaluated as highly satisfactory. CEDEP I responded to the priorities of the target groups, beneficiaries and donors with a focus on strengthening the supply capacity of rice millers and high value silk for export to new markets. Intended impacts were relevant to the countries national development plans responding to priority areas of intervention in the Pillar Roadmaps and the Trade SWAp goals.

CEDEP I was particularly relevant to the first two principles of the Paris Declaration on ownership and alignment and was relevant to measurements in the EIF Logical Frameworks. CEDEP II was also relevant to the Revised 12-point Action Plan for Trade Facilitation and Investment, particularly by enhancing coordination between ministries and institutions and strengthening relationships with the private sector.

Milled rice export was particularly relevant to donors and the RGC with the rice value-chain being one of the four major mainstays of Cambodia’s economy. Although high value silk had a lower export potential, silk is highly relevant to Cambodian traditional rural culture, rural livelihoods and as an important off farm activity which generates additional income for farmers. High value silk was also very relevant for women.

**Efficiency**

Overall, CEDEP I efficiency is rated as satisfactory. CEDEP I did not complete against originally planned timelines, however project logical frameworks and work plans were over ambitious especially with regard to the creation of national apex bodies. The termination of the POC required a timeline and budget revision which delayed the commencement of activities. No-Cost extensions (NCE) were necessary for all components but these were judged necessary to improve sustainability for the CRF and the SDC and for DICO to implement activities.

The overall implementation structure using DP’s as MIE’s with a government NIU evaluation function managing the core teams (with some backstopping from the EIF) was the most efficient use of technical and financial resources. Implementing with line ministries directly might have enhanced sustainability, but this is uncertain for private sector apex bodies and efficiency would have been less likely.

Interventions were cost efficient with addition to value being provided by significant previous sector experience of the ITC and IFC and their technical competence. CEDEP I was not operated in isolation from other donor support and both DICO but especially IFC heavily integrated activities into other trade related technical assistance (TRTA).

**Effectiveness and programme results**

As with efficiency overall effectiveness was significantly enhanced by the use of technically competent MIEs and effectiveness is rated as satisfactory. Overall, the programme was well managed and working relationships between the MIE’s developed during the course of implementation. National ownership became more evident towards the latter half of the project and was a result of more leadership from the MOC and the creation of the CRF and the SDC as nationally responsible sector entities. These bodies were created as a result of significant public private dialogue.

The Implementing components have completed their activities and DICO is in the final stages of activity. Activities were generally well implemented to support outputs and generally outputs have achieved the anticipated outcomes. Although exit and sustainability strategies were developed for all three components the key results of institutional sustainability and clear measurements at the impact level of poverty reduction are uncertain. It is also evaluated synergies between the various components were not fully explored.

All MIEs provided significant and relevant capacity building to exporters and the ITC operated a vertically integrated value chain with CEDEP I whereby it also built capacity of suppliers. The ITC built capacity of suppliers’ through the associated Cambodia Rice Sector Support Project (RSSP) funded by the European Union (EU) and heavily integrated this into CEDEP I outcomes. Effective technical assistance (TA) was evident from both international and national advisors and consultants. Stakeholders and beneficiaries widely confirmed the effective results of implementing components especially, trade fairs, certification support, skills development and identification of new export markets.

Results are remarkable regarding rice export with an estimated 268,842 metric tonnes worth USD 146,618,197 being facilitated by the project (in conjunction with the RSSP). Eleven Cambodian rice mills became Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) certified and one Occupational Safety and
Health (OSH) certified. The world’s best rice award was won by Cambodia three years in a row and the DNA fingerprint of Cambodia fragrant rice varieties was established. Another key result was the work done for the Cambodian Angkor Malis branding.

Women’s empowerment was an important contribution by the project and this was evident to the final evaluation particularly in regard to women’s improved control of household income and expenditure. The ITC reported the average annual cross-border exports of Cambodian silk products by the 14 target project beneficiary companies was USD 43,321 per company in 2014 (a 74 per cent increases from 2012). The total value of new contracts was estimated at USD 200,000². ITC also reported a 46 per cent increase in the sales value of silk products sold to tourists between 2012 and 2014. There was a 100 per cent increase in weavers’ average monthly income from USD 387 per month³ to USD 785 per month and the creation of 88 new jobs. 168 weavers were newly contracted by the project beneficiary companies.

The MoC-DICO, served as the Secretariat to the Trade SWAp and capacity was established (in conjunction with EIF Tier 1 and the TDSP) to coordinate Aid for Trade (AfT) as well as monitor results and impacts. In addition, the MoC-DICO disseminated and explained progress made under CEDEP I at the provincial level. The evaluation function reported project components against Impacts outlined in the project document and against KPis from the Trade SWAp. It was evident to the final evaluation that overall management and ownership should rest with MoC staff at the Directorate levels.

Impact

From the results above there was an evident and positive impact on the direct beneficiaries of the implementing components and impact is evaluated as satisfactory. The programme had a positive impact on the identification of new markets and resulted in substantial new contracts for both the milled rice and high value silk which certainly contributed to the creation of jobs and the generation of income. An Improved quality of produce was a reported impact for both milled rice and high value silk.

Government-Private Sector dialogue led to the creation of apex bodies, the support to an enabling institutional environment for export was improved, and an enhanced capacity of the RGC to monitor and lead the implementation of AfT and Trade Related Technical Assistance (TRTA) developed. The programme also aligned particularly well with and contributed to Millennium Development Goals (MDG) 1 and 8, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 1, 2, 11 and 17.

The development of value chains was a positive outcome of the project. The lead company approach adopted by IFC whereby large companies were selected who operate downstream in the supply chain enhanced impact for suppliers. The vertically integrated value chain approach adopted by the ITC specifically took account of suppliers. In the longer term, the programme has the potential to assist the RGC reduce vulnerabilities to external shocks through both strengthening supply side capacities for export and ultimately diversifying the capacities of communities and exporters to generate and sustain income.

To fully transform nascent value chains (especially in the high value silk sector), three years was a short time to deliver and monitor impact. The full potential impact of the programme would be better realized with a fuller understanding of the positive and negative impact of AfT on poverty. To better appreciate impact within potential future phases of the programme there is a need for a more specific focus on quantitative measurements against impact and poverty indicators.

Sustainability

Sustainability is evaluated overall as moderately satisfactory as there remain some moderate shortcomings in the achievement of objectives with challenges to sustainability being consistent across all implementing entities. These relate to the need for more capacity building for the apex bodies and DICO and the need to integrate CEDEP I outcomes into future donor programmes.

The need to implement the policy frameworks introduced for both rice and silk remain paramount. It is assessed that financial sustainability is satisfactory with the creation of the SDC and the CRF and that the RGC can now investigate further opportunities with other DP’s. However, financial sustainability will rely on the ability of the apex bodies to provide and charge for membership services. For the national apex bodies and their national strategies, though systems are in place there was a widely expressed need for further support from both the government and the international community.

CEDEP I was not implemented in isolation from donor programs, DP’s and government priorities and there is continuing donor interest in both rice and silk which the MoC and relevant DP’s are already investigating. It is notable that the capacity built within MoC-DICO under the EIF Tier 1, TDSP, and CEDEP I and CEDEP II appears to be enabling this negotiation, though to some extent donors are still driving the process.

---

¹ Source: ITC end-of project assessment survey, May-July 2015
² Details are provided on pp. 30
Sustainability seems assured for direct beneficiaries in the milled rice and high value silk sectors; they are already operationalizing their training and exploiting new market opportunities.

While largely outside the scope of the project there remain constraints to sustainable export promotion that can potentially offset gains made by the programme. Infrastructure and production costs remain a constraint. Access to finance for businesses engaged in the agricultural sector remains difficult.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Recommendations adopt a forward looking approach based on the experience of implementation of CEDEP I. It is anticipated recommendations will be of use to the MoC-DICO when it implements future priorities identified in the CTIS Roadmaps and more globally for the EIF. The component recommendations should also be of use to DP’s who intend to support activities in related activities. Responsible entities to implement programme level recommendations include the RGC, especially the MoC-DICO and private sector departments, and DP’s.

**Recommendations at the Programme Level**

**Relevance and programme design**

1. If identified as a trade related export project, donors should follow the Trade SWAp framework to encourage national ownership, complementarity and alignment with government priorities.

2. Formulation of comprehensive and detailed sustainability strategies at the individual sector level during planning would enhance the relevance of sectors interventions and their potential for sustainability.

3. Activities toward sustainability and exit strategies, such as the creation of apex bodies, need to be prioritized at the outset of activity.

4. Programme Logical Frameworks and project documents must have SMART² measurements and articulate linkages to government strategies for poverty reduction.

5. Look for complementarities, synergies and lessons learned from both current and past relevant donor support programmes.

6. Project documents should fully articulate gender and youth targets.

7. Relevance of component outcomes would be enhanced by ensuring the Outcomes and Indicators in the Programme Logical Frameworks fully match the Outcomes articulated for the relevant sectors in the CTIS for 2014-2018 as well as RGC priorities outlined in poverty reduction strategies such as the Rectangular strategy Phase III (RSIII) and MoC Medium Term Plans.

8. Supply side constraints must be clearly identified in project documents and how these will be overcome should be articulated.

9. Re-emphasize the goal, purpose and implementation modality of the programme with principal stakeholders.

10. Longer time frames should be considered when the aim of the project is a pro-poor transformation of an export sector requiring the development of institutional frameworks and policies. This would also allow improved monitoring at the impact level.

**Efficiency**

1. Where possible replicate the lead firm approach of the IFC.

2. Where possible replicate the vertically integrated value chain approach of the ITC.

3. When there is future implementation, consider incentive mechanisms for maintaining and deepening inter-ministerial coordination through the Core Teams.

**Effectiveness**

1. While promoting export diversification, it is recommended to partner closely with ministries, organisations and DP’s supporting the development of supply side capacities.

2. Enhance the synergy and coordination with other line ministries to promote exports in joint marketing efforts.

3. Develop a clear capacity building and exit plan for consultants within MoC-DICO.

4. Ensure complementarities and synergies are developed between various project components.

5. MIE’s should at all times promote the full involvement of line ministries.

6. Financial including procurements and disbursement records should be provided to MoC-DICO by MIE’s for information management purposes.

**Impact**

1. MoC and DP’s need to better articulate the impacts of project interventions.

2. Investigate and report the total volume of AfT disbursements to Cambodia.

3. Considering the independently evaluated success of CEDEP I, investigate replication and up scaling of project results.
Sustainability

1. Ensure financial sustainability for the evaluation function of MoC-DICO to retain its human resource, operational and advisory capacities for Trade SWAp.
2. MoC should continue to advocate for favourable trade tariffs, to improve infrastructure, access to finance and cheaper electricity costs. This is necessary for export to become competitive and sustainable.
3. The MoC-RGC should work with DP’s to continue to build the Capacity of the CRF and SDC.
4. The RGC-MoC should continue to focus support on the development and promotion of “Made in Cambodia” product brands like Angkor Malis.
5. Provide donors with more extensive lessons learned from implementation.

Recommendations at the component level

Milled Rice: Main Responsible Entities are the Cambodian Rice Federation/IFC and DP’s

1. Continue to promote Cambodian brand image and product certification for both domestic and international markets.
2. Finalize the project completion and final report for CEDEP I.
3. Consider whether there is a role for the MOC-DICO under remaining EIF Tier 2 funds to play a role in the upcoming evaluation on the employment impact of the Cambodian Rice Sector Support Project (RSSP).
4. It is recommended to continue support to both product and market diversification to increase competitiveness in world markets.
5. It was recommended by millers that more support be provided to processing to better develop and diversify rice products.
6. Investigate co-financing mechanisms so that rural banks can provide credit. Many banks are not willing to invest.
7. The CRF could consider offering training in food safety services for millers. The CRF could also support its members to reach the OSH levels necessary for third party certification.

High Value Silk: Main Responsible Entities are the Silk Development and Promotion Committee/MoC DP’s and Provincial Departments

1. The MOC and SDC should investigate potential sources of future funding for the silk component (such as IFAD).
2. It is recommended to focus more on fair trade for silk export.
3. It is recommended to provide ongoing support for new product designs to continue competitiveness and ensure sustained demand from foreign markets.
4. The administrative arrangements for the proposed annual national silk day should be developed.
5. The SDC and MoC should continue to develop plans including institutional funding and sustainability options for a national silk centre.

Evaluation Function and Organisation of Core Teams: Main Responsible Entities are the MoC-DICO the RGC and DP’s

1. Disseminate the key findings of the final evaluation with principal stakeholders in a timely manner, once approved by the EIF ES and the MIE’s and SSC-TD-TRL.
2. Strengthen the measurement and reporting against the highest level impact indicators of the components (such as poverty reduction).

Lessons learned

• Significant project value is added when export promotion projects partner with organisations/donors supporting the development of supply side capacities.
• Government support is necessary for sustainability beyond TRTA.
• Sustainability is more likely for projects that operate within a broad programme framework which includes projects being supported by other donors.
• Longer timeframes may be necessary to implement and monitor projects that are trying to transform export sectors.
• Sustainability and ownership are key challenges requiring a significant focus on exit strategies for the institutional level. National ownership and sustainability is significantly enhanced through the creation of national sector bodies.
• Development of value chains to include export can be a significant driver to enhancing supply through increased demand.
• To be fully efficient budgets should be adequate for downstream interventions to help overcome supply side constraints.
• The effectiveness and impact of national TRTA is dependent on the private sector business environment within Cambodia but regional competition can be an equally decisive factor.
• When there are different projects that contribute to a programme it will take time before the project components work together effectively and efficiently.
As noted by the World Trade Organization (WTO) Secretariat Report, prepared for Cambodia’s 2011 Trade Policy Review (TPR), “international trade has been crucial to achieve rapid and sustained socioeconomic development as it has been the driving force behind much of Cambodia’s recent economic growth and poverty reduction, linking its economy more firmly to regional and global markets”.

The RGC endorsed the Cambodian CTIS Update in December 2007. The CTIS update outlined 19 sectors that had potential to benefit Cambodia’s export growth and highlighted nine as priorities. These priority sectors included footwear light manufacturing and assembly, processed food, fisheries products, milled rice, cassava, rubber, tourism and silk products.

To address these priority sectors through a coordinated programme approach for all Trade Related Technical Assistance (TRTA) and Aid for Trade (Aft) the RGC established the Trade Sector-Wide Approach (Trade SWAp). This falls under the leadership of the MoC and represents the policy aim of the RGC to deepen and broaden Cambodia’s integration into global and regional trading systems and reduce economic shocks through diversification of export products and export markets.

The Trade SWAp Roadmap for 2014—2018 includes a series of Development Impacts/Goals across three pillars which cover key indicative areas for reform and development of Cambodia’s trade sector.

**Pillar 1:** Increasing the competitiveness of Cambodian exporters in world markets through a strengthened export business environment

**Pillar 2:** Expanding and diversifying Cambodia’s export base through strengthening supply in current and new sectors, entering new markets, and moving up value chains

**Pillar 3:** Strengthening the capacity of RGC and Cambodian stakeholders to manage the trade agenda and trade challenges (trade reform, trade policy, aid for trade, bridging skill gaps for trade, etc.)

The main purpose of the first phase of the Cambodian Export Diversification and Expansion Programme (CEDEP I) was to support pillars 2 and 3 of the Trade SWAp by strengthening and diversifying export supply capacity in two of the priority sectors identified in the CTIS.

The focus of CEDEP I was on enhancing export capacities for Milled Rice and High Value Silk. A third component of CEDEP I was to enhance the capacity of the DICO in the MoC to monitor and evaluate progress against the Trade SWAp. The main anticipated results of CEDEP I are an enhanced enabling environment for rice and silk exports including the creation of national associations or boards, an identification of new market opportunities and an improvement of the quality and quantity of goods that can meet the standards required of those international markets. The role of the NIU would also be strengthened to better evaluate impacts and results which included gender and poverty as a crosscutting issue.

The implementation of the three components of CEDEP I is undertaken by Main Implementing Entities (MIE). The selection of MIE’s to implement the two substantive components included in CEDEP I responded to the RGC view that the DICO within the MoC was already fully committed with the execution of EIF Tier 1 and the TDSP and lacked resources to execute yet another major project. In addition, the line Ministries that could be considered as partners for CEDEP I implementation did not have the minimum-required fiduciary and management capacity to act as implementing entities for EIF (Tier 2) technical assistance projects.

The MIEs in CEDEP I include the IFC which is implementing the Milled Rice Component and the ITC which is implementing the High Value Silk Component. The Evaluation function and composition of the core teams is implemented by the MOC-DICO.

CEDEP I is funded through the EIF which is a multi-donor framework providing official development assistance (ODA) to LDCs and using trade as a vehicle for economic growth and poverty reduction by integrating LDCs into the global trading system. The EIF Programme is a joint initiative of the World Bank (WB), International Monetary Fund (IMF), the WTO, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the International Trade Centre (ITC) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Government contribution</th>
<th>Private Sector contribution</th>
<th>In-Kind Contribution by MIE</th>
<th>Total Program Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milled Rice</td>
<td>$1,112,847</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
<td>$159,725</td>
<td>$1,680,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Value Silk</td>
<td>$1,004,347</td>
<td>$167,400</td>
<td>$178,150</td>
<td>$1,389,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Function + Core Teams</td>
<td>$290,520</td>
<td>$22,440</td>
<td>$337,875</td>
<td>$3,383,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,407,714</td>
<td>$189,840</td>
<td>$337,875</td>
<td>$3,383,429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The TDSP supports pillars 1 and 3 of the SWAp, not pillar 2
7. pp5. CEDEP I Project Document
With the ending of the CEDEP I an independent external evaluation has been commissioned by the MoC to determine the efficiency of the project in line with OECD/DAC criteria. It was anticipated the evaluation would be useful for key stakeholders in Cambodia, future collaboration with the EIF, further phases of CEDEP implementation and donors that were to provide continued support to the sectors.

As clearly outlined by the Terms of Reference (ToR) the purpose of the final evaluation was to provide the following:

1. To conduct an independent evaluation of the project’s performance against the overall project objectives, outcomes and impact as stated in the project logical framework for EIF and CEDEP,
2. To undertake an assessment of the original project design, and the overall implementation,
3. To define the impacts and results of the projects, especially related to employment generation, export improvement, and poverty reduction,
4. To assess the EIF’s role in supporting the CEDEP I project implementation,
5. To provide lessons learned and experiences in project implementation that can be applied in the Cambodia future project or other EIF countries, and
6. To provide clear recommendations on how the design could have been improved to achieve greater impact and sustainability of project activities.⁸

The final evaluation was to cover the full period of the project. It was expected to focus on the manner of project identification and formulation, how relevant the project was to the strengthening and diversification of export supply capacity, the likely cost-effectiveness of the project design, project ownership, coordination and management, how efficiently the project was implemented, the projects effectiveness and its expected impact and sustainability. The evaluation would conduct a field level assessment through stakeholder interviews, surveys and field visits and all MIEs would be fully consulted on the list of participants to be evaluated.

The evaluation was to make a determination against the specific measurable outcomes from the logical framework key performance indicators (KPIs) and determine the extent to which they were completed and have made a sustainable impact. A consideration of individual outcomes would also provide an opportunity to consider relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, potential impact and sustainability. The evaluation was also to take full account of the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) Report for CEDEP I and include an analysis on the implementation of recommendations that were provided by the EIF-ES (EIF-Executive Secretariat) and the Trust Fund Manager (TFM) and other relevant recommendations from MIE reports. (See the summary findings and recommendations from the 2014 MTE below).

Main findings and recommendations of the 2014 MTE of CEDEP I

Main Findings of the MTE

- The goals and objectives of CEDEP I were relevant to government, donor and beneficiary priorities for the expansion and diversification of export.
- The project was only partially efficient with delays in the establishment of national apex bodies and late commencement of some outputs, especially the M&E function.
- “Great results” were achieved under effectiveness with an expansion of quality rice exports and high value silk, but the development of institutional frameworks including the development of core teams was less efficient.
- Potential impact was significant and in line with MDGs and Trade SWAp Goals. However, there was insufficient measurement of poverty reduction and job creation.
- Sustainability was the major challenge at the time of the MTE with the need for the establishment of national apex/ regulatory bodies such as the Silk Board, and significant work needed to strengthen the Cambodian Rice Federation and the Core Team mechanism.

Main Recommendations

- One-year NCE were recommended for all components to particularly focus on establishing and strengthening the institutional frameworks and facilitate strategic guidance at the central level.
- Main recommendations for relevance included the suggestion to focus on niche markets rather than large scale production that Cambodia might not achieve competitively.
- To enhance efficiency it was recommended the sub decree for the establishment of the National Silk Board be approved and a national body be established. It was also recommended to reinforce coordination between MIEs and Core Teams.
- To enhance effectiveness it was recommended there be specific follow up technical (market based) guidelines to help rice exporters (and silk exporters) finalise potential deals. It was also recommended to reinforce dialogue between the RGC and the private sector and promote Cambodian brand images and products.
- To measure potential impact it was recommended to identify human development indicators to measure the impact on poverty and job creation; and to expand the scope of activities and number of beneficiaries in the high value silk component.
- Recommendations on sustainability included investments in long term infrastructure, the establishment and strengthening of national apex bodies and the need to investigate follow up funding possibilities for all components.

⁸ See Annex 1: Final Evaluation Terms of Reference.
Inception Phase

The evaluation team undertook a one week planning phase at the outset of the final evaluation. This entailed collating documentation from the M&E Advisor of MoC-DICO and an analysis of Final Evaluation ToR, project documents, progress reports and previous recommendations from MIEs, the MTE and the EIF-ES.

A key output of the planning phase was a detailed inception report. The inception report included an overall evaluation framework which considered the key criteria and areas to be examined during the evaluation, the indicators that were to be used for determining results, what sources of information were to be used and the data collection methods. Key criteria were identified as the DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact as well as cost effectiveness, complementariness and synergies between components and lessons learned (See Annex 2 Evaluation Framework).

During the inception phase a list of stakeholders to participate in the evaluation was determined independently by the evaluation team and verified with MoC-DICO. (See Annex 3 for the final list of individuals contacted). A time-bound overall work plan was also drawn up during the inception phase (see Annex 4). The anticipated development impacts and outcomes of the project were also analysed as were their consistency to key trade swap goals, (see Annex 5).

Evaluation questions were drawn up by the evaluation team that were extracted from the ToR and were submitted to the MoC-DICO for verification. Guidelines for qualitative questions were drawn up by the evaluation team for Key Informant Interviews (KII) with key stakeholders (See Annex 7) and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with beneficiaries (See Annex 8). In some cases the FGD guidelines were also to be used for indirect beneficiaries as with weavers.

Evaluation Criteria

It was determined by the evaluation team the following criteria were to be used for rating the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</td>
<td>The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory (S)</td>
<td>The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</td>
<td>The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</td>
<td>The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory (U):</td>
<td>The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</td>
<td>The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection Phase

Stakeholders were widely consulted throughout the process and included key representatives of the Government, PSC members, Board and association members, the core teams, MIEs and both direct beneficiaries (exporters) and indirect beneficiaries (suppliers). Donors were consulted and an ongoing process of feedback was sought from component MIEs and the EIF.

The evaluation team undertook field visits to Battambang to meet with principle beneficiaries of the milled rice component and Prey Veng to visit beneficiaries of the high value silk component. The majority of meetings were held with MoC-DICO, the IFC and the ITC in Phnom Penh. MIE’s were not included in the majority of discussions with stakeholders to.
encourage a more open exchange of information.

In some cases the evaluation team undertook multiple visits to key stakeholders such as the IFC, the CRF, the SDC and Supreme National Economic Council (SNEC) to reconfirm the validity of findings. The Final Evaluation was being undertaken at the same time as an independent evaluation of 2008—2014 EU-IFC Programme for the development of SMEs in the Agro Industry Sector in Cambodia. This programme had a specific component on improving export competitiveness of milled rice⁹ which was working in conjunction with the Milled rice component of CEDEP I. The evaluation team attended the final seminar of the EU evaluation on the 31 August and met separately with the EU team to exchange preliminary findings. The evaluation team also participated in a half day team building exercise with CEDEP I core team members in Siem Reap on the 8 September.

Due to the sheer volume of primary and secondary data related to the project implementation of milled rice, high value silk and export related documents (including Trade SWAp) the desk review of source material was an ongoing exercise throughout the evaluation (see Annex 12 for the list of documents and materials reviewed).

Presentation of Draft Findings and Results

Towards the end of the field based data collection a preliminary presentation of main findings was held in Siem Reap on the 8 September 2016 (See Annex 12). The evaluation team took the opportunity to make a second presentation to the IFC on the 13 September.

Limitations of the evaluation

It is not possible for this final evaluation to assess the project’s longer-term sustainability or impact with any degree of confidence due to the limited time since the project ended. Additionally, there is a limited reporting and a lack of measurable indicators for poverty reduction.

A further limitation of the evaluation was the inability to always directly attribute results to CEDEP I alone. With multiple donor assistance and projects being implemented both previously and concurrently to CEDEP I, the final evaluation can only consider the contribution of EIF with any confidence. This was true to some extent across all components, especially milled rice.

Structure of the Evaluation Report

The structure of the final evaluation report closely follows guidance issued by the EIF¹⁰. Sections one to three include a background to the project, and the purpose and methodology of the final evaluation. Sections four to seven include a detailed evaluation of the CEDEP I components against OECD/DAC criteria. Sections eight and nine draw conclusions and recommendations for potential future implementation and section ten summarizes lessons learned from implementation.

---

⁹ The Cambodia Rice Sector Support Project (RSSP) with a total budget of 4.4m including the CEDEP I contribution
¹⁰ End-Phase Project Evaluation Guidance Note For EIF Tier 1 and Tier 2 funded projects July 2015
CEDEP I is the first programme implemented in Cambodia under the EIF Tier 2 and was designed to respond to the objectives of Pillar 2 of the Trade SWAp to develop, strengthen and diversify the export capacity of Pillar 2 sectors that were identified by the Government as requiring priority action in the 2007 CTIS update. The evaluation and core team component also supported Trade SWAp Pillar 3 to strengthen the capacity of the RGC to manage the trade agenda.

The programme proposal is evaluated as a comprehensive document and it was reported by the MoC that all the MIEs fully contributed to the formulation and design of CEDEP I. The proposal was endorsed by the EIF Tier 2 Appraisal committee on the 4 May 2012 following comments from the EIF- ES and the TFM.

The proposal clearly outlines the strategic concept for implementation of components and outlines previous support to the three pillars of Trade SWAp under the Government’s National Trade and Private Sector Development Agenda. Specific TRTA provided previously to the proposed CEDEP I sectors is also outlined as is the RGC’s July 2010 Rice Policy.

Impacts and outcomes are linked to the five goals pursued under Cambodia’s Trade SWAp and KPIs from the Trade SWAP Roadmap were incorporated into outcome and output measurements of the component log frames. Importantly, there is also a section on risks and their associated mitigation strategies.

A reported issue was the lack of detailed baselines in the original project document log frames and a lack of clear pro-poor impact indicators at the design stage. Three years was also a short time to implement activities and proved to be too short to deliver the necessary institutional framework requirements and to sustainably transform the sectors. A longer implementation timeframe during project planning would have been beneficial especially considering the supply side constraints and the benefit from more detailed impact monitoring and evaluation.

Governance and project accountability processes are clearly described and these were generally implemented properly during the life of the project. These included financial and progress reporting obligations to the EIF TFM and the EIF ES. In some cases it was reported there were delays in reporting. This was explained as a result of multiple reporting formats and the fact that ITC and IFC tended to report to their regional/National headquarters as a priority.

The EIF-ES provided strong support to the programme, including close supervision and oversight of progress. Joint ES-TFM missions were also undertaken regularly and played an important role to coalesce the efforts of the three MIE’s into a programme based approach. The ES-TFM provided specific recommendations to MIE’s, including the NCE, oversaw the CEDEP I MTE and provided their own assessment of performance in the Project Completion Report (PCR) for high value silk.

Figure 1: Summary of Reporting Framework
Steering committees endorsed component terms of reference as well as overall project work plans and outputs of the implementing components. PSC were also informed of progress and issues and provided recommendations for implementation. PSC were also informed of variances or adjustments to timeframes.

The PSC for milled rice CEDEP I was governed by the EU Agro SME Programme Steering Committee with the Ministry of Industry and Handicraft until 31 December 2014. Following the end of that project it was agreed with UNOPS and the EIF Secretariat a new PSC was to be established by MoC-DICO. Establishment of the PSC reportedly took time and there was only one meeting (the final PSC) held in February 2016. The Steering Committee of the Silk Component (SCSC) met four times with the final meeting on 17 March 2016, under the chairmanship of the MoC.

**Main Implementing Entities**

CEDEP I was implemented by three separate MIE’s. DICO within the MoC operates as the programme NIU with support from the EIF; the IFC which implements the Rice component, and the ITC which implements the high value silk component. The decision was made by the EIF TFM and DICO that separate Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for each component would be appropriate and that each MIE would be responsible for substantive and financial reporting to the EIF TFM.

There were multiple reasons for the selection of DP’s as MIEs. The first was the issue that MoC-DICO was at the time fully committed to EIF Tier 1 and the TDSP Project. Secondly the selected MIEs were determined as having the necessary fiduciary and management capacity to implement the components. Thirdly, it was indicated this would provide the opportunity to obtain the best possible support capacity for the RGC from its DP’s. Finally it was envisaged the separation of the NIU from the implementing sectors would encourage capacity for the NIU to evaluate results and impacts of projects implemented at arm’s length.

All the MIEs had previous experience in the areas in which they were selected to implement. DICO was established as a permanent department of the MoC under the Ministry’s reorganization implemented in early 2008 and significant capacity building had already been provided to DICO through the EIF Tier 1 and the TDSP. The NIU is responsible for coordinating in-country EIF activities and for EIF implementation at the national level. The NIU is supervised by the MoC EIF Focal Point and has 3 outputs: i) Support to the NIU (DICO), ii) Support to line ministries and pillars, and iii) raising awareness, promotion and trade mainstreaming.

In addition, a team of mid-level government officials were to be selected as core teams to ensure close coordination of outputs and activities between the project components and associated stakeholders and beneficiaries. DICO provided terms of reference, capacity building and overall coordination for these multi-ministry bodies. In some cases it was reported, however, that only relatively junior government members attended meetings and their representation was not always consistent.

The IFC, the private-sector arm of the WB, has been involved in the agro-processing industry since 2008 in Cambodia and commenced implementing the Cambodia RSSP in 2012. IFC was also involved in certification of food safety standards and HACCP and Sanitary and Phyto-Sanitary measures (SPS) in coordination with the MoC TDSP. IFC-Cambodia was a key development partner of the Government in the implementation of its 2010 Rice Policy.

The ITC is one of the core agencies of the EIF and had been working closely with the MoC on the silk sector since 2004 funded by NZAID (New Zealand) SECO (Switzerland) and UNDP. The ITC had previously implemented a number of projects focussing on several segments of the value chain including sericulture and yarn supply, weaving, and product market development and sales.

Each MIE was responsible for progress and financial reporting of its own component directly to UNOPS which operates as the EIF TFM. The EIF Executive Secretariat (ES) and MoC/DICO is kept informed of progress via copies of the reports prepared for UNOPS.

MoC DICO consolidated all progress reports to report to the Trade SWAp Implementation Committee (IC) and the Sub-Steering Committee on Trade Development and Trade-Related Investment. (SSC-TD-TRI). The IC met monthly and the SSC-TD-TRI met quarterly. It was indicated by the implementing MIE’s that the monthly IC meeting was a particularly useful forum as were the high quality publications prepared and disseminated by DICO.

The implementation schedule with preliminary work plans was also outlined in the project design phase. Table 3 below summarizes the length of implementation for each component.
Table 3: Programme Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Programme/MIE</th>
<th>MoU Signed with EIF TFM</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milled Rice</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation (IFC)</td>
<td>December 14th 2012</td>
<td>Dec 31st 2015 (NCE to June 30th 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Function and core teams</td>
<td>MoC- Department of International Cooperation (DICO)</td>
<td>October 25th 2012</td>
<td>26th October 2015 (NCE to October 26th 2016).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RGC approved CEDEP I on 21 May 2012 and the EIF Board approved the programme on August 2012. The MoU between the MoC-DICO and the EIF TFM was signed on 25 October 2012 and project activities were scheduled to end on the 26 October 2015. A one-year NCE was provided on the justification that the termination of the POC required a timeline and budget revision, there was a delay in creating apex bodies and that the simultaneous implementation of other TRTA without key staff in place had all delayed activities.

The MoU between the EIF TFM and the IFC was signed on December 14 2012 and the first payment was received in January 2013 when activities commenced. The original intended end date for the milled rice component was December 2015. A six-month NCE was granted until December 31 2015 (with a Project Financial End-date of June 30 2016) in order to address sustainability challenges and strengthen the capacity of the new CRF.

For the high value silk component the implementation letter was signed on September 25 2016 and activities commenced when the first payment was received on the 2nd October 2012. The project was anticipated to end in September 2015. A six-month NCE was granted to the ITC due to the late establishment of the SDC whose establishment was a pre-requisite to the update of the silk sector strategy.

It is noted by the final evaluation that all cost extensions were recommended by the MTE and were a result of justified concerns regarding sustainability.

Visiting activities to BRICo.,Co., Ltd, led by Mr. Chhieng Pich, DICO/EIF&TDSP Director. Photo: 2015, DICO/MoC/El Chuon
5.1 Relevance

The overall relevance of CEDEP I regarding the priorities of the target groups, beneficiaries and donor is evaluated as highly satisfactory.

Relevance to Government frameworks and priorities

At the highest level the objectives to positively affect job creation and poverty reduction, reduce the likelihood of external shocks through enhanced export diversification, improve government private sector dialogue and enhance the government role in managing and monitoring AfT are stated government priorities.

With a focus on strengthening the supply capacity of rice millers and silk for export to new markets and enhancing evaluation capacities of the government it is evaluated the activities and outputs of the CEDEP I are consistent with the intended impacts and effects of the project. They were relevant to Cambodia's trade development policies as prescribed in the 2014—2018 National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) and the Trade SWAp as well as the CTIS 2007.

Intended impacts were relevant to the countries national development plans and the countries Trade SWAp, responding to priority areas of intervention in the Pillar Roadmaps and the Trade SWAp goals (see Annex 5 Summary and Goal of Project Development Impacts, Outcomes and Objectives of Pillar 2).

CEDEP I supports the RGC Rectangular strategy Phase III (RS III), particularly in the Private Sector Development and Employment component, and closely aligns with policy priorities articulated in the RS III regarding the development of industry and small and medium enterprises (SME's), strengthening the private sector and diversification and commercialization of the agricultural sector. Of specific relevance was the government focus to enhancing value added of milled rice production and export, especially fragrant and organic rice and other high value agricultural products including silk\(^1\).

CEDEP I is also relevant to the Revised 12-point Action Plan for Trade Facilitation and Investment, particularly by enhancing coordination between ministries and institutions and strengthening relationships with the private sector.

It is also evaluated that the selection of MIE’s during the project design stage was highly relevant to efficient implementation. All MIE’s had relevant technical capacity in their components, they had significant previous experience implementing in their sector, and they had created the extensive networks (formally and informally) which was necessary for the creation of apex bodies.

CEDEP I was particularly relevant to the first two principles of the Paris Declaration\(^1^2\) on ownership and alignment. Through the MoC-DICO and Trade SWAp documents a good attempt was made to provide national leadership within Cambodia’s own national development strategies.

Relevance and ownership of the implementing components

As one of the major agricultural activities of Cambodia, milled rice was highly relevant for export prioritization and a significant capacity and will of the private sector was evident to the evaluation. Although high value silk had a lower export potential (especially in terms of volume) silk is highly relevant to Cambodian traditional rural culture, rural livelihoods and as an important off farm activity which generates additional income for some farmers. The silk sector also had a highly relevant gender focus with women being involved in all aspects of the silk value chain. This relevance was independently confirmed by a major international donor.

Direct beneficiaries consistently stressed the relevance of project support (See text box below). Their primary reported need was the identification of new markets for export and achieving the quality and certification standards of, for example, European markets. A consistent desire to enhance export volumes was also evident. It was reported by companies that both silk and rice products had gained export value though serious regional competition remained evident.

It is evaluated that working with established companies in both the milled rice and silk components enhanced ownership, particularly the lead firm approach adopted by the IFC. The fact that private companies were paying half the cost to attend trade fairs and missions is a solid indicator of the relevance of activities implemented.

At the sector level, ownership was certainly enhanced in the final stages of the project with the creation of the CRF and the SDC. These bodies should ultimately have the independent capacity to advocate for their sector and provide specific membership services through fee paying structures. It is evident; however, that these apex bodies need further support before their sustainability is ensured (especially the SDC).

---

\(^1\) The RGC's Rectangular Strategy Phase III (RSP3), pp7

\(^1^2\) Declaration by the Royal Government of Cambodia and Development Partners on Enhancing Aid Effectiveness
Relevance to donors

CEDEP I was highly relevant to donor frameworks and UN targets of MDG’s and SDG’s with agriculture being considered by the WB as a strong engine of growth supporting poverty reduction. In the final stages of the project (and any for any future implementation) outcomes and objectives also closely align to SDGs.13

Milled rice export is particularly relevant to donors with the rice value-chain being one of the four major mainstays of Cambodia’s economy (along with garments, tourism and construction). Particularly relevant projects to the CEDEP I component on milled rice were the 2012—2016 EU funded RSSP implemented by the IFC and the 2012—2014, Agence Francaise Development (AFD) Support to the rice sector in Cambodia project.

Diversification and expansion of trade is aligned with the priorities of the UNDAF for 2011 to 2015. UNDAF Outcome I for Economic Growth and Sustainable Development focuses on a more diversified economy for Cambodia with increased pro-poor investment through trade and private sector development.

5.2 Efficiency

Despite constraints related to timeliness and some concerns regarding ownership, efficiency is rated overall as satisfactory. No-cost extensions were justified for all components and followed recommendations from the MTE as well as the EIF.

There were several alternatives for an implementation structure that were not established. The MoC-DICO could have implemented CEDEP I directly. Relevant Line Ministries could have directly implemented the components, or they could have implemented the components with additional TA physically collocated in the Ministries.

Regarding the capacity of MoC to implement directly (as discussed previously in Section 4) the MoC-DICO was fully committed to the TDSP and the EIF Tier I at the time of CEDEP I. It was also decided that separating the MoC-DICO from direct implementation would enhance the efficiency of its monitoring and evaluation function.

Regarding project management arrangements and a more significant role for line ministries, CEDEP I had been formulated on the assumption of a salary top up to organize core teams for each implementing component. However in July 2012 the RGC ended the POC following decisions of most DP’s to no longer provide funding for top ups. This negatively affected the start date of CEDEP I, had implications for the commitment of line ministry core team members and was a justification for the NCE for MoC-DICO.

Ultimately each line Ministry could have considered creating or allocating an AfT secretariat to prepare for implementation with their appropriate technical departments under the overall guidance of the MoC. However, this was not the case for CEDEP I or II.

While implementing directly with line ministries would possibly have enhanced ownership and sustainability, it was broadly evident to the final evaluation that both IFC and ITC were technically effective with the ability to draw on highly relevant technical capacity and advisory functions. The value added by IFC, for example, by completely integrating the activities and outputs of the CEDEP I with both the RSSP and the Development of SMEs in the Agro Industry Sector in Cambodia was highly significant. This resulted in an extended and comprehensive value chain from the point of production through to international export.

CEDEP I was not a standalone programme and it was heavily integrated into other TRTA. Synergies with the TDSP, EIF Tier 1 Trade SWAp support have been discussed previously. Both ITC and IFC are also operating within internationally developed frameworks for TRTA and are operating multiple projects in other countries.

There were reports to the evaluation that the implementing MIE’s operated too independently from the government at the commencement of activities. However, it was reported this was ameliorated towards the latter half of the project and following findings of the MTE. Both ITC, but particularly IFC improved their working relationship with MoC and other relevant line ministries significantly towards the end of the project. Regarding collocation within specific line ministries The ITC did locate its offices in the MoC building. It was not reported, however, that this had a significant impact on efficiency either way. The Consultants for DICO are physically located within MoC-DICO where they continue to not only provide TA but manage much of the EIF and CEDEP I.

It is evaluated overall that CEDEP I implementation using DP’s as MIE’s with a government NIU evaluation function managing the core teams was the most efficient use of technical and financial resources given the constraints. However, this structure did have some early have implications for fully mobilising the potential of line ministries and ultimately posed challenges for sustainability (discussed later).

With no-cost extensions for all components it is evident the project did not complete according to anticipated original

13 SDGs were launched on 1 January 2016
work plans and if evaluated against timeliness alone efficiency would be rated as unsatisfactory. The project completion report (PCR) of the EIF indicates that resource use efficiency was satisfactory but timeliness was unsatisfactory\(^\text{14}\). As clearly articulated in the MTE evaluation of CEDEP I, delays in the establishment of the SDC, the fact that CRF still needed additional capacity building and the delays in operationalizing the core teams all negatively affected the efficiency of components, especially Outcome 1 for IFC and Outcome 3 for ITC. However, it is broadly assessed by the final evaluation that the final outcomes of the component activities were more important than adherence to a tight deadline. The creation of apex bodies required political will and commitment and this was outside the direct control of the IFC and the ITC.

Regarding the limited procurement for CEDEP I it is assessed principles of competitiveness and transparency were followed with both the ITC and the IFC following standard UN procedures. DICO followed the RGC Procurement Manual and according to rules and instruments agreed upon with UNOPS under EIF Tier 1. The use of budgets was transparent with UNOPS operating as the TFM and there are detailed rules for and procedures for procurement. While each implementing MIE follows the audit requirements of its own organization, audits are consistent with the terms agreed by UNOPS. DICO is also subject to an independent audit.

Financial reporting was described as adequate from the TFM perspective; project funds were reportedly made available in a timely manner and budget revisions were transparent and justified. It was reported by the TFM and MIEs that expenditure at the project end was slow. This was principally a result of the abolition of POC scheme which was budgeted for at the project design stage. The project had to be reoriented and budget adjusted accordingly. At the time of the final evaluation the final disbursement by components had not been reported to the TFM, though the IFC indicated disbursement was at 100 per cent and the ITC confirmed that all obligations and engaged expenditures had been cleared. The latest reported disbursement from the TFM is outlined in Annex 9.

Despite the relatively modest budget of around USD 4—500,000 per year for implementing components and an overall budget of USD 300,000 for DICO, a significant amount of international TA was evident. The ITC specifically mobilized an international programme Manager from Geneva. The IFC jointly allocated existing national and international programme management from its EU agro programme. A senior technical consultant (STC) and consultancy firms including Agland and Ad communication were also mobilized.

Both implementing components also mobilized international TA to prepare high quality publications including for example market studies, export manuals, value chain analyses and a sector policy (for silk). DICO also drew on the advice of two international advisors (one from the TDSP and one for the MoC) although they were not directly budgeted for from CEDEP I.

An adaptive management was also evident with MIE’s reporting they responded to recommendations from the ES and the TFM as well as the recommendations in the MTE. One adjustment to the implementation arrangements was made for both milled rice and high value silk and carried out by the MoC. This was the establishment of both the CRF and the SDC by Prakas instead of Royal Decree. To sign a royal decree would have needed the signature of the Prime Minister after approval from the Council of Ministers which was estimated would have taken too long.

5.3 Effectiveness and Project Results

The effectiveness of the project interventions is rated as satisfactory by the final evaluation. Effectiveness was significantly enhanced by previous experience of relevant technical implementing agencies across all components. It was the selection of the ITC, IFC and DICO by the EIF that has enabled this success.

The Implementing components have largely completed their activities and DICO is in the final stages of activity. Project log frames were relatively well constructed and where baselines or progress measurements were weak EIF-DICO strengthened and closely monitored results frameworks. As with log frames initial work plans were reported to be relatively weak, but these were adjusted during implementation.

Activities were generally well implemented to support outputs and generally outputs have achieved the anticipated outcomes. What appear less certain are the key results of institutional sustainability, and clear measurements at the impact level of poverty reduction.

MIE’s produced comprehensive progress reports and a significant number of guidelines including potential market analyses, export manuals, value chain analyses, and success stories. It was reported for both milled rice and silk that there was also more effective coordination between the private and government sector and two key outputs had been the creation of the CRF and the SDC. In some cases it was reported, however that MIE’s had a tendency to prioritize reporting to the TFM and their own head offices, rather than the MoC or the SSC.TD.TRI.

The focus of the value chain at the export level is assessed as

---

\(^\text{14}\) At the time of the final evaluation no PCR was available for the IFC. However it is likely the ratings will match those of the ITC.
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an effective methodology for CEDEP I to contribute towards both overcoming supply side constraints and potentially driving new demand. A particularly effective methodology employed by the ITC was its approach of vertically integrating the value chain as this made it possible to at least provisionally assess the impacts on poverty reduction.

Helping to identify new demand should effectively promote higher volumes and better quality supply. This was consistent with Pillar 2 Outcome 3 under the Trade SWAp’s Strategic Framework. While significant previous support had been provided to rice and silk, the majority of inputs had been focused on supply capacity for domestic demand. Conversations with IFC indicated that the export focus of CEDEP I provided significant value added to their overall rice support programmes.

Exit and sustainability strategies were also developed for all three components. DICO developed these from the very outset of project preparation and both ITC and IFC developed strategies that were reported in their final reports. Sustainability strategies rested clearly on the successful creation of national sector bodies, the SDC and CRF. The CRF was established by Prakas in May 2014 and the SDC was established by Prakas in March 2015. To be fully effective it is evident more time will be needed for development at the institutional level.

Stakeholders and beneficiaries widely confirmed the effective results of implementing components especially, trade fairs, certification support, skills development and identification of new export markets. For the silk component, key results were increased exports sales to old and new markets, improved quality and product design and the development of a sector wide silk strategy. The ITC also prepared comprehensive baseline data, which it measured against during implementation. For the rice component, key results were increased export of higher qualities of milled rice to old and new markets, TA for the CRF and HACCP certification for millers, and DNA fingerprinting of Cambodian fragrant rice varieties.

There were some concerns expressed to the final evaluation. It was a general consensus from multiple government offices and stakeholders that the implementing components did not commence activities in a fully collaborative manner with too little communication between the MIEs and core teams. It was indicated to the final evaluation that progress reports were not always received by MoC-DICO in a timely fashion and this was a result of the DP’s having to report in multiple formats over multiple reporting lines. It is assessed that CEDEP I commenced with some disconnect between the Implementing entities and the MoC-DICO and disconnect between line ministries/core teams and the MIEs. There was, however, a general consensus that this communication and potential synergy improved significantly towards the second half of component implementation.

Stakeholders generally expressed the effectiveness of DICO activities, especially raising awareness of the programme through high quality publications, but some expressed concern on the effectiveness of the core team mechanism and whether DICO could have done more to measure impact of the component activities, especially poverty reduction.

5.3.1: Component 1: Milled Rice

The milled rice component was aimed at enhancing the enabling environment for the private sector through the creation of an Association of Rice Exporters, the identification of new major import market opportunities and the successful completion of export contracts in three new markets meeting the required quality standards.

The results achieved under this component have been very positive with the creation of the CRF, and the diversification of improved quality products into new markets. A summary of fully completed indicative activities from the log frame is included in Table 4 below.
## Objectives, Outcomes and Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 1: As rice is the largest employment sector of the Cambodian economy, development of milled rice exports will have a positive impact on poverty reduction, especially through income growth in many regions of the country. Development of the sector supports Cambodia’s efforts to meet its MDGs</th>
<th>Status (September 2016)¹⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed: 538,396 tons worth USD 376,877,200¹⁶ Poverty reduction is not measured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact #2: The competitiveness of Cambodian rice exports is increased, resulting in better earnings of rice millers and farmers in the milled rice supply chain, led by its higher value fragrant rice segment.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1: The Enabling Environment for the Cambodian Private Sector to meet the Government’s targets for Milled Rice exports is enhanced and sustained through the creation of an Association of Rice Exporters and enhanced G-PS dialogue on Rice exports in G-PSF or other venues</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: Technical working groups are organized among rice millers and exporters as a precursor to the association</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2: Updated mapping of milled rice value chain (based on mapping in Rice Policy) (to be done jointly with MoC Value Chain Unit and other stakeholders)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3: Functioning association is created and registered</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 4: Mechanism(s) for regular consultation between Government and Rice exporters on milled rice exports is (are) established through G-PSF or other venue and utilized.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2: Cambodian Rice Millers are successful in identifying several new major import market opportunities (in addition to EU and Russia)</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: Market Potential Analyses/Trade information developed for five new markets (to be done jointly with MoC Value Chain Unit)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2: Manual on export procedures/ trade facilitation issues for milled rice produced</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3: Manual on SPS standards and certification requirements for milled rice produced</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 4: Develop and publish Cambodian Rice Portfolio Catalogue</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 5: Three new potential markets have been visited by groups of export-ready and exporting rice millers</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 6: Export-ready and exporting rice millers have participated in 4 key rice trade fairs and buyer-seller meetings (actual timing depends on event calendar)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 3: Cambodian Rice Millers are successful in clinching and completing export contracts by meeting quantities, quality, and price requested by importers, especially with respect to fragrant rice which is developed as the leading Cambodian rice brand.</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: Establish a Cambodian fragrant rice brand for an export quality type of milled fragrant rice competing with Thai fragrant rice and responding to expectations of import markets.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2: Promote Cambodian fragrant rice brand.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3: 8 Rice millers are supported to become HACCP certified</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹⁵ Despite the fact that components of CEDEP finished previously the date of the final evaluation is used to reflect the most up to date findings.

¹⁶ These are total export figures for year end 2015 and are not wholly attributed to CEDEP I. Impact 2 is the value and volume of rice export directly facilitated by the CEDEP I.
In relation to the overall impact indicators, results appear remarkable when measured against increased export volumes and value. The target of a 100 per cent increase against a baseline of 140,000 MT has been met and doubled and as of December 2015, the national rice export baseline value of US$ 84,280,000 had increased to US$ 376,877,200. In conjunction with other projects (such as the RSSP) the IFC achieved major impacts by supporting the transformation of rice export from low value paddy to high value milled rice.

The enabling environment for the Cambodian private sector has been improved by CEDEP I and in the context of the programme results it is evaluated as complete. However, more needs to be done. It was reported, for example, that Cambodian prices for rice remain non-competitive and the sector is still not fully commercialized.

Three technical working groups were established among rice millers and exporters and 24 meetings were held. A mapping study on fragrant rice production and its supply chains was completed with feedback and comments from key exporters and government agencies incorporated. The report has been finalized and the survey results will be shared in the EIF/CEDEP I Completion Report.

Although not wholly attributable to CEDEP I the CRF was created in May 2014 and the IFC provided TA to the CRF in the areas of business development strategies, support to the delivery of products and services to members and technical support on branding development.

Regarding the requirement for Formal G-PS consultation under Output 4 there was an evident synergy between various agencies. The IFC worked in close collaboration with Agence Française de Développement/Supreme National Economic Council (AFD/SNEC) to enhance capacity of CRF management to communicate with relevant stakeholders. Meetings between the government, rice exporters and the CRF included, for example, the first annual general meeting (AGM) and meetings with multiple ministries regarding taxation, rice export procedures, customs and electricity pricing.

The second outcome aimed to result in the identification of new markets import opportunities. IFC completed six international market studies on market opportunities for fragrant rice for six regions including China/Hong Kong, Cote D’Ivoire, France, Germany, USA and Singapore. The market studies were used to inform Cambodian brand development and marketing strategy and the results were disseminated over two workshops. These particularly responded to recommendations from the MTE to provide technical guidance to help rice exporters finalise deals. Findings of these studies were also synthesized and distributed to the private sector, the RGC, policy makers and donors to inform the potential for market diversification.

A large number of best practice publications were prepared under outputs 2, 3 and 4. These included a manual on export procedures/trade facilitation issues for milled rice, a food safety manual and manuals on ISO 22000, GMP, HACCP and Occupational, Health and Safety (OHS). All manuals were subject to stakeholder feedback during preparation before final dissemination. The product portfolio of Cambodian milled rice was updated and published in the ‘Exporters Compendium’ for 2014 and 2015. Mr. Kunthy Kann the CEO of BRICO Co., Ltd reported his view of HACCP and GMP certification:

“We are proud of to be the first GMP and HACCP certified rice mill in Cambodia. These certifications can be used as marketing tools to separate BRICO from the rest of Cambodia’s miller and exporters and we would like to encourage the international buyers to deal only with Cambodian rice millers that are internationally certified to ensure the quality of the rice they are importing”.

Under output 5 and 6, three new markets were visited by export ready rice millers including the US the EU and China. Exporting rice millers participated in international exhibitions in Guangzhou, the Netherlands and Switzerland, which allowed global networking. International exhibitions were also used as an opportunity to promote the quality of Cambodian rice including the fact it had won best quality rice three years in a row. Twenty eight exporters also attended The Rice Trader (TRT) World Rice Conference (WRC) exhibition in 2015 in Kuala Lumpur.

For individual exporters met during the final evaluation it was outputs 5 and 6 that were assessed as the most effective, resulting in specific export contracts and the development of new markets. It was notable that all exporters that participated in international meetings were prepared and capable to meet half the cost of participation. Heang Kimkrea of Eang Heng Import Export Co. Ltd reported how “the IFC has not just enabled us to reduce our production costs and maintain our old buyers, but to identify new buyers in Europe”.

The final outcome of the milled rice component was a successful conclusion of export contracts that met the international quality standards for three targeted markets in terms of food safety management and rice branding. Two outputs were implemented to achieve this outcome. These included the establishment of a Cambodian rice brand for export quality fragrant rice and the promotion of that brand. The revised Cambodian Milled Rice standards were also approved by the Senior Minister of MIH.
A consultancy company was commissioned through a competitive bidding process that commenced by identifying key values for the brand. These included ownership (the CRF), and brand values (including both subjective and objective values of how consumers might perceive the brand). IFC advised on a universal name suitable for international markets and the brand name was collaboratively selected as Angkor Malis.

Consumer and trade research was undertaken in Los Angeles, France and Shanghai, together with focus group research in Cambodia to get an insight for key end markets which helped determine the international perception and visual representation of the brand including the logo.

Throughout the brand development process capacity building was provided to the CRF team to ensure the long term sustainability of the brand once the IFC project finished. The official launching of the Brand is expected to happen by the end 2016.

A range of promotional material was used to promote the Cambodia fragrant rice brand. This was largely facilitated by the fact Cambodia has won the World’s Best Rice Award on three occasions. Promotional materials included four-page folders, leaflets, a compendium, rice specification booklets, and paper bags.

Eleven Cambodian rice mills became HACCP certified and one became OHS certified under Output 3. It is here that the synergy and value added between the EIF CEDEP I and the EU RSSP was specifically measurable. It was estimated by the IFC that certification for four millers fell solely within the CEDEP I timelines but with the work already done under the EU programme the target for eight millers was easily exceeded. As part of IFC project monitoring and evaluation, a survey found that 92 per cent of rice mills reported improved access to international markets and 83 per cent reported improved performance and productivity as a result of HACCP implementation and certification. Finally the DNA fingerprint of one Cambodian rice variety (Somaly) was established as a benchmark against which rice (DNA) purity can be analysed.

5.3.2: Component 2: High Value Silk

The High Value silk component was aimed at increasing the export competitiveness of the silk sector through a diversification of markets and product design supported by the development of a silk ‘board’ and national sector strategy. The project was implemented by the ITC in partnership with the MoC and the Cambodia Women Entrepreneurs Association (CWEA).

The silk component has had positive results with the creation of the SDC, the identification of new markets to which quality products are being exported and a measured increase in jobs and income. Much of this was possible due to the NCE extension that was recommended by the MTE and accepted by the EIF-ES and TFM.

Throughout project planning and implementation it is particularly noted by the final evaluation how the ITC effectively disaggregated all reporting information by gender. A summary of fully completed indicative activities from the log frame is included in Table 5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives, Outcomes and Outputs</th>
<th>Status (September 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 1</strong>: Increased competitiveness of the Cambodian silk sector with a positive impact on poverty reduction through employment creation and income growth, especially among women, thereby contributing to meet Cambodia’s MDGs</td>
<td>Completed: 88 new jobs created 100% increase in income (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 2</strong>: Focus on high value silk exports will contribute to developing Cambodia’s image of an economy that can compete not only on price but also on quality</td>
<td>Cannot be measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1</strong>: Increased sales of handmade high value silk products by 8 to 12 Cambodian silk exporters, and their respective production networks of female weavers in rural villages, to up to 5 selected importing markets and to international visitors</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.1</strong>: Export potential and key export markets for high value silk products identified</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 This was a further specification of the original outcome “Increased export sales of handmade high value silk products by Cambodian silk exporters”
Output 1.2: Marketing capacities of selected exporters strengthened and export marketing strategies elaborated
Completed

Output 1.3: Exporters actively investigate foreign markets
Completed

Outcome 2: Improved quality and product design of handmade Cambodian silk products to meet market demand requirements for targeted export markets and from international visitors
Completed

Output 2.1: Skills of male and female exporters in product innovation and design development strengthened
Completed

Output 2.2: Improved vertical integration of silk value chain and enhanced technical skills of weaving communities to enable production of high quality silk products in larger quantities
Completed

Output 2.3: Quality and traceability of silk yarn imports ensure
Completed

Outcome 3: Enhanced capacity of public and private stakeholders to jointly articulate and manage strategic priorities and initiatives to increase competitiveness and exports of the silk sector enhancing thereby its development impact
Completed

Output 3.1: Silk Board and Silk Secretariat have been created. Working groups of stakeholders have been formed around key silk sector development issues
Completed

Output 3.2: Silk Sector Strategy and Plan of Action incorporating gender related considerations developed with stakeholders
Completed

Output 3.3: Effective implementation management and monitoring framework established
Completed

To achieve Outcome I of increasing sales and exports, ITC commenced by developing assessment methodologies to measure both performance and productive capacities of the sector level and developed a Streamlined Harmonized system (HS) to comply with export procedures such as Certificates of Origin (C/O). Five market studies were compiled for the European Union, Japan, Korea, the United States, Australia and New Zealand identifying potential buyers and market requirements in these proposed key export markets. All studies were disseminated through specific workshops and throughout implementation.

Fourteen silk companies (9 women owned) were selected for direct support from ITC. This exceeded the original target of 8-12 companies. ITC supported the companies to elaborate export plans, market access criteria and buyer requirements. Marketing materials were also developed including corporate branding image and product catalogues. While the ITC focussed the majority of their support for the 14 selected companies’, training was also provided and workshops were held to disseminate lessons learned to project companies not directly supported by the project. It is evaluated this was a positive attempt to upscale activities.

To investigate the potential of foreign markets, four training workshops were conducted for 26 companies on marketing development missions and trade fair preparation. The project supported the exhibition of Cambodian High Value Silk and participation of companies (on a cost-sharing basis) in 11 trade fairs in Germany, the US, France, Japan, Vietnam and Cambodia.

Seng Takakneary, owner of SentoSaSilk indicated that “we particularly benefitted from attendance at trade fairs, where I met important buyers and fashion designers who were very impressed by our products.” SentoSaSilk identified USD 66,000 worth of new deals — the equivalent of three months’ business — during a two-day Artisans Resources trade fair in New York.21

The ITC reported that contacts were established with more than 300 prospective buyers in Europe, the United States, Japan, Australia and New Zealand resulting in more than USD 200,000 of new orders concluded or under negotiation. ITC also facilitated the establishment of five new sales outlets in Phnom Penh for sales to the tourist market.

To support the second Outcome for product innovation and design development the project assessed supply side capacities of the companies and conducted multiple training courses on contemporary trends to 20 silk companies. Four study tours for designers were organized for 13 companies jointly with marketing missions in the US; France and Germany. In total, 127 new silk products were designed by 13 companies with the support of project TA. Companies also developed

21 Takeo Province Silk Weavers Benefit from Silk Trade Sector Assistance: A Success Story (Prepared by the MoC-ITC)
individual brand books.

To improve the vertical integration of the silk value chain the project also focussed on the primary suppliers: weavers. Weaver surveys were conducted to identify competitive advantages of particular communities including weaving and dyeing techniques. ITC also conducted a study on silk yarn sourcing identifying suitable import markets based on cost and quality. A Study tour was organized to Vietnam to survey silk yarn sourcing and findings were disseminated to 30 Cambodian silk companies to facilitate bulk purchase.

Additional technical training was provided to weavers where necessary and linkages were established between the weaving communities and the 14 companies. Two study tours to weavers’ villages in five Cambodian provinces were organized for 11 companies who met with 23 weavers groups and visited three weaving centres.

As well as technical support and capacity building for companies and suppliers a key outcome of the component was the development of the public and private sector to manage priorities and strategies for the sector as a whole. Two main outputs supported this outcome: the development of a silk secretariat and the development of a silk sector strategy. The ITC facilitated multiple meetings with relevant ministry stakeholders to support the set-up of the silk commission including meetings with the Silk Board Working Group Meeting in January 2013 and three Silk Component Steering Committee (SCSC) meetings. Several working meetings were also held with the MoC between March and December 2014.

Although the MTE had recommended the development of a sub-decree, the SDC was formally established by Prakas on 20 March 2015. The SDC and its Executive Secretariat are now expected to play a central coordinating and monitoring role in the implementation of the Silk Strategy. The strategy includes a detailed Plan of Action for supporting the silk sector development on the short, medium and long term.

The 2016 updated silk strategy was formally edited and peer reviewed on the 15th February 2016 and launched by the MoC on 18 March 2016. To update the 2009 strategy, ITC disseminated results of the market assessment from Outcome I to stakeholders for consultation, organized inclusive participatory workshops and specifically included a gender dimension.

The Strategy is summarized as follows:

“the silk strategy through a public–private partnership (PPP) model, investment and access to finance, aims to achieve greater vertical integration, specialization and mechanization in the value chain, with an overall view to scaling up yarn, textile and garment production; enhancing quality; and positioning Cambodia as a recognized supplier of high value and quality silk at the regional and international levels.”

5.3.3: Component 3: Evaluation Function and Organization of Core Teams

The MoC was the recipient of the EIF project in Cambodia and operated under a clear structure of fiduciary responsibility. CEDEP I was approved by the EIF Tier 2 appraisal committee (TAC2) meeting of 3 May 2010 and recommended for submission to the EIF pending formal approval by the SSC. TD-TRI.

The aim of CEDEP I component three was to strengthen the capacity of the NIU to evaluate and disseminate results and impacts of components as well as to align results with government frameworks, particularly the Trade SWAp. Primarily the M&E function in EIF-CEDEP I contributed to mainstream the activities and outputs of DP’s into the Trade SWAp, thereby ensuring TRTA was relevant and directly linked to government priorities. This is important for Government ownership. A summary of fully completed indicative activities from the log frame is included in Table 6 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives, Outcomes and Outputs</th>
<th>Status (September 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 1</strong>: Enhancing the Government’s ability to lead and drive its Aid for Trade as a means to strengthen the effectiveness of the mainstreaming of Trade in its development policies and development of its institutions</td>
<td>Completed for CEDEP I, but Ongoing with CEDEP II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 2</strong>: NIU sets up salary supplement schemes to include 10 Government officials from various line ministries in two “core teams” (one for each project component).</td>
<td>No longer applicable, removed from Log frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1</strong>: Strengthen the NIU’s capacity to monitor and evaluate progress made under Trade SWAp, including evaluating impacts and results of technical assistance</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: A mid-term independent evaluation of the Tier 2 project is organized and carried out</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2: A final independent evaluation of the Tier 2 project is organized and carried out</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2</strong>: Strengthening the NIU’s capacity to disseminate progress and results of technical assistance under Trade SWAp</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: Findings of project results and impacts are explained and disseminated once a year through five regional workshops</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2: Findings from evaluations (mid-term and final) are published and disseminated within Cambodia and to the international community</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Evaluation component required longer commencing than anticipated due to a change in the operational structure of CEDEP I. Based on the experience from other programmes; Core Teams were to be established through POCs, which formed part of the sustainability and knowledge transfer strategies for DICO. However, the POC was abolished after the CEDEP I EIF Board had already approved CEDEP I. Consequently, UNOPS and the MoC signed an amended MoU on August 14th, 2014 with revised work and budget plans. No disbursement was made under this component until the date of the MoU amendment. A specific M&E Advisor was employed by DICO shortly thereafter in September 2014 and (due almost entirely to the additional time granted by the no cost extension) the component is now completing its final activities prior to the end of October 2016.

It is determined by the final evaluation that the component has shown it can effectively identify consultants for M&E including mid-term and final evaluations, has the capacity to link delivery of Outputs to Outcomes and Impacts, has developed high quality communication products for dissemination to domestic and international audiences and contributed to in-country arrangements of the EIF increasing Cambodia’s ownership of TRTA. Effectiveness of the evaluation function was enhanced by the level of commitment shown by senior management and advisors in the MoC and the ongoing efforts to specifically measure individual component outcomes and outputs to its own Roadmaps.

Following the decision of the EIF, core teams were maintained by the NIU and ToR were designed and developed and DICO undertook a significant number of activities to continue to train and mobilize this function. The lack of POC was reported as a constraint during implementation with the inconsistency of core team membership being a reported issue. In some cases the role of the core teams was not clear to the MIEs and it is evaluated the roles and responsibilities of core teams needs ongoing and continuous clarification and reinforcement to be more effective. In addition, it was not generally evident that there had been a strong synergy between the MIE’s and the core teams, or the MIE’s themselves.

Regarding Outcomes 1 and 2, the MoC DICO, served as the Secretariat to the Trade SWAp and is responsible for coordinating AFT as well as monitoring results and impacts. The evaluation function had the specific responsibility to report regularly on the progress of CEDEP I to the Trade SWAp Governing Structure including the IC and the SSC-TD-TRI which serves at the EIF National Steering Committee.

DICO NIU compiled and consolidated reports from each component and presented these to the Implementation Committee (IC) monthly and the SSC-TD-TRI every quarter. Monthly reports were also provided to the NIU Director and EIF Focal Point during the NIU staff meeting.

Quarterly financial reporting was reported to UNOPS in its
capacity as EIF TFM. Six monthly and annual narrative reports were compiled by the MIE’s and provided to DICO and DP’s. These were then evaluated and sent onto the EIF. Bi-annual substantive and financial reporting was forwarded to UNOPS in its capacity as EIF-TFM.

In addition, the MoC-DICO disseminated and explained progress made under CEDEP I at the provincial level and held four dissemination regional workshops on Trade SWAp and EIF CEDEP I findings. High quality publications were prepared to support these workshops including the MTE for CEDEP I and explanatory brochures for Trade SWAp regarding both the milled rice and high value silk components. The high quality of these documents was specifically indicated by the IFC.

The evaluation function reported project components against Impacts outlined in the project document and against KPI’s from the relevant trade swaps. However, to be fully effective, measurable impact indicators would need to be better defined during project preparation. It is self-evaluated that MoC-DICO needs to continually strengthen programme analysis at the Trade SWAp programme impact and outcome level. Ongoing constraints were also evident regarding the lack of timeliness of report submission to MoC-DICO and the difficulty in getting the MIE’s to provide full analysis against potential impacts of their components.

It was evident to the final evaluation that overall management and ownership rests clearly with MoC staff at the Directorate levels. It is evaluated, however, that considerable activity was implemented directly by National and international consultants who also built on capacity provided by the TDSP and EIF and who were physically located in the DICO offices. These consultants, whether from the EIF, TDSP or CEDEP I or II, undertook the great majority of overall implementation and monitoring of the CEDEP I. It was reported that more capacity building needed to be provided to government counterpart staff.

**MoC-DICO: Measurement against the Trade SWAp and the EIF Framework**

As of 31 December 2015 the component M&E log frames were linked with the Trade SWAp result framework to indicate the progresses made against key performance indicators enabling reporting on EIF progress to take place in accordance with the SWAp governance framework. Importantly the MIE reports also included an updated status of the joint ES/TFM recommendations.

MOC-DICO comprehensively matched CEDEP I indicators with the national level indicators in the Trade SWAp, during both project preparation and implementation. The Programme results framework (updated on the 31 December 2015) for the EIF Tier 2 CEDEP I was developed. This considers:

- each components separate contribution to the strategic objectives and building blocks (or intermediate outputs) of the Trade SWAp;
- linkages between the objectives, outcomes and outputs of each component logical framework to specific KPIs from the Roadmaps;
- linkages between the impacts of each component logical framework to specific KPIs from the Roadmaps;
- The status of progress of activities

When measured against the M&E logical framework for the EIF, the findings are positive. Under Tier 2 initial funding has been provided by the government, multiple international agencies and the private sector to three sector specific activities for identified priorities in the CTIS. Small priority projects have commenced that are coherent and integrated into the overall TRTA framework for Cambodia. Under CEDEP I, the first and second credible project proposals have been developed in support of priorities outlined in the LDC’s DTIS/Action Plan (the Cambodian CTIS).

At the programme and component level CEDEP I is contributing towards the following four specific outcomes of the EIF global programme;

- that EIF countries mainstream trade into their national development strategies and plans;
- that delivery of trade-related resources by donors and implementing agencies to implement country priorities following the adoption of the DTIS Action Matrix is coordinated;
- that EIF countries secure resources in support of initiatives that address DTIS Action Matrix priorities, and;
- that sufficient institutional and management capacity is built in EIF countries to formulate and implement trade-related strategies and implementation plans.

With the completion and dissemination of the Final Evaluation Report and its endorsement by the SSC.TD-TRI and the EIF, all activities outputs for the evaluation function will be completed by the 26 October 2016.
Value chain development in CEDEP I continued to yield a transformational impact in the high value silk and (especially) the rice sector supply chain. This transformation has been at the individual as well as the sector level translating into improved production and significantly enhanced export. As outlined just prior to the commencement of CEDEP I “the shift from export of low value paddy rice to high value milled rice is turning into a success story of expansion and diversification of Cambodia’s export basket” 26. CEDEP I built on the previous work of the RGC, donors to continue this process.

At the highest level of impact, however, poverty reduction is hard to specifically evaluate without a clear measurable and without specific impact assessments, ex ante and ex post, to better understand the effects of AfT programmes and social benefits to poor and marginalised population groups27.

The Final Evaluation of the EIF Tier I also recommended that “special attention should be given for ensuring that Pro-poor mechanisms are in place in the design of AfT and trade sector policy, plans and their implementations”28.

It is noted, however, that full quantitative impact analyses were not defined in the project log frame and would have been time consuming in a project of relatively short duration. However while CEDEP I components would ultimately benefit from more quantitative analysis of impacts, MoC-DICO did prepare a number of high quality success story brochures for Milled Rice and High Value Silk. These provided a useful qualitative summary of impacts.

In the short to medium term it is independently evaluated that CEDEP I has certainly contributed to the creation of jobs and the generation of income, enhanced the enabling environment for export and had positive results regarding the development of national associations, export expansion and diversification (especially in milled rice export). It is evaluated that short to medium term impact for CEDEP I is Satisfactory.

The potential impact of CEDEP I was relevant across all five Trade SWAp goals. CEDEP I also contributed towards MDG 1 (the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger) and MDG 8 (forging a global partnership for development). For MDG8, enhancing the Government’s ability to lead and drive Cambodia’s AfT agenda and mainstream trade in its development policies is a significant potential impact that can contribute to longer term national development goals (Programme Impact 4).

The potential impacts for CEDEP I also align well with a number of SDG’s. CEDEP I should ultimately contribute to SDG1 and SDG2 whereby economic growth is pro-poor, inclusive and agriculture is sustainable. The programme should also contribute to ensure sustainable production patterns (part of SDG 11). CEDEP I should also contribute to SDG 17 with the development partnerships between governments, the private sector and civil society.

The development of value chains was a positive outcome of the project. The lead company approach adopted by IFC whereby large companies were selected who operate downstream in the supply chain enhanced impact for suppliers. The vertically integrated value chain approach adopted by the ITC specifically took account of suppliers. In the longer term, the programme has the potential to assist the RGC reduce vulnerabilities to external shocks through both strengthening supply side capacities for export and ultimately diversifying the capacities of communities and exporters to generate and sustain income.

There were reported positive impacts for both IFC and ITC particularly related to the result of trainings, market missions study tours and trade fairs. These had been very important to the development of new markets and had resulted in substantial new contracts for both milled rice and high value silk. These findings came from progress reports, success stories, and independent findings of the final evaluation.

Reports to the Final Evaluation did indicate a number of significant beneficiary specific impacts and these were also reported by the IFC in success stories. Hong Yun of the Indochina Rice Mill indicated to the Final Evaluation for example how “IFC have opened Cambodian rice marketing to the world.” Impacts are further outlined below from case studies derived from findings of the Final Evaluation.

---

26 pp 7 AfT Case Study OECD –WTO The Expansion and Diversification of Cambodia’s Exports of Milled Rice
27 There was an identified need to specifically measure wider impact of the IFC component. However, it is important to note IFC are fully aware of this and have planned an ex post evaluation on the specific employment and social impact of the RSSP. This will be undertaken in conjunction with the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and will fully incorporate the EIF CEDEP I programme contribution.
28 pp 9 Tier I Final Evaluation
Both City Rice Import and White Gold companies stressed the most effective support from the IFC had been the support to identify new markets and attendance at Trade Fairs and Market Missions to Europe and Asia (especially China and Thailand). This support had contributed to export expansion and diversification into new markets, especially for products like fragrant rice. City Rice Import Export reported as an example “in 2013 we exported 4,000 MT but we may export 30,000 MT in 2016.” The companies now had combined exports to Malaysia, Singapore, Europe, Russia, China, New Zealand and they both reported these had been mainly developed since 2012. Both companies particularly stressed that more market missions were needed with City Rice Import and Export company reporting “market missions to Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands were particularly effective.”

White Gold reported an increase from 7,000 MT in 2011 to 20,000 MT by 2015. Both companies reported that marketing promotion, business mapping, GMP and HACCP were valuable support from the IFC as they had “enabled them to meet standards required for European markets”; City Rice Import Export also outlined how the MoC-IFC had “specifically enhanced our understanding of the importance of HACCP”. Companies also reported their support for the Angkor Malis brand especially if it could help in the identification of new markets. One company specifically reported how the automation of certificates of origin by the MoC (with support from the associated TDSP), had reduced ‘informal’ transport costs. However, both companies also reported that they were facing increasingly significant regional challenges from Vietnam, Thailand and China which was affecting their export competitiveness. They also reported constraints regarding high production and electricity costs, and that banks remained resistant to providing loans for agriculture.

In total Cambodia exported 538,396 metric tonnes of rice in 2015, significantly exceeding the target of 100 per cent from 2011 baseline of approximately 140,000 metric tonnes. IFC estimated it had facilitated a total rice export of USD 146,618,197 as of December 31, 2015, though it does not claim this is solely a result of the EU or the EIF programmes. ITC undertook an end-of-project assessment survey which collected data on project achievements from both companies and weavers. This found the average annual cross-border exports of Cambodian silk products by the 14 target project beneficiary companies was USD 43,321 per company in 2014 a 74 per cent increase from 2012. The total value of new contracts was estimated at USD 200,000 (though some were still under negotiation 29). ITC also reported a 46 per cent increase in the sales value of silk products sold to tourists between 2012 and 2014. There was a 100 per cent increase in weavers’ average monthly income from USD 387 per month to USD 785 per month and the creation of 88 new jobs. 168 weavers were newly contracted by the project beneficiary companies. It is a positive finding of the final evaluation that ITC disaggregated its finding by gender. A case study of the reported effectiveness and impact of the ITC component is outlined in the case study below.

29 For the period of February to August 2015, there were 16 orders after Ambiente 2015 plus 8 orders in Australia and New Zealand for 7 companies and 4 orders for 4 companies after the New York fair 2015. (ITC Progress report March 2016).
It was reported by Ms. Hok Thannan of Kravan House that company exports had increased by about 20—30 per cent overall as a result of the CEDEP I support to the silk sector. The quality of their products had also increased as a result of improved design and dyeing. Kravan House had also been able to employ additional workers. In 2012 the company had had about 20 weavers and 20 home based women working on sewing and dyeing. By 2016 they had doubled those numbers, enhanced their contacts with additional weaving communities and had also established a home based training centre. Ms. Thok Hanan reported how “the orders we got by participating in Ambiente trade fair in Frankfurt encouraged us to make the investment which is a big step for us” Seventy five per cent of workers were women and 60 per cent of their workers were disabled. Many of the women were female headed households and the project had reportedly empowered women, enabling them to support child education. Weavers from Preaek Chrey Village in Prey Veng province indicated that “our income has increased as we rarely stopped production since 2012 and silk is our second main income.”

ITC and the MoC-DICO were reported to have had very good communication with the company encouraging Kravan House to frequently meet with other companies in the sector to identify constraints and lessons learned at the ‘sector’ level. ITC had enabled Kravan house to attend trade fairs in Frankfurt on three occasions on an equal cost sharing basis and this had resulted in an additional four to five buyers. Importantly it was reported by the company they felt “a lot more knowledgeable and confident about exporting as result of the project.”

Training provided by the ITC was reported by Ms. Thanan as very effective especially in the areas of “design, enhancing communication abilities and an understanding of export procedures.” It was summarised that ITC “have professionalised us.” It was reported training provided had enabled the company to diversify and modernize its products for European market requirements. A need for continued assistance in identifying new market opportunities was outlined, as was the need for a silk training centre and more Cambodian Sericulture as most raw materials “were still being imported from Vietnam, Thailand and China”.

KRAWAN HOUSE: A Case Study

It was reported by Ms. Hok Thannan of Kravan House that company exports had increased by about 20—30 per cent overall as a result of the CEDEP I support to the silk sector. The quality of their products had also increased as a result of improved design and dyeing. Kravan House had also been able to employ additional workers. In 2012 the company had had about 20 weavers and 20 home based women working on sewing and dyeing. By 2016 they had doubled those numbers, enhanced their contacts with additional weaving communities and had also established a home based training centre. Ms. Thok Hanan reported how “the orders we got by participating in Ambiente trade fair in Frankfurt encouraged us to make the investment which is a big step for us” Seventy five per cent of workers were women and 60 per cent of their workers were disabled. Many of the women were female headed households and the project had reportedly empowered women, enabling them to support child education. Weavers from Preaek Chrey Village in Prey Veng province indicated that “our income has increased as we rarely stopped production since 2012 and silk is our second main income.”

Training provided by the ITC was reported by Ms. Thanan as very effective especially in the areas of “design, enhancing communication abilities and an understanding of export procedures.” It was summarised that ITC “have professionalised us.” It was reported training provided had enabled the company to diversify and modernize its products for European market requirements. A need for continued assistance in identifying new market opportunities was outlined, as was the need for a silk training centre and more Cambodian Sericulture as most raw materials “were still being imported from Vietnam, Thailand and China”.

Improved quality of produce was a reported impact for both milled rice and high value silk. For milled rice it was evident the training received in HACCP and GMP was facilitating exports to European markets and this was widely reported by millers. With ITC support, improved design, product development and diversification was enabling silk export particularly to European and North American markets.

The development of the CRF and the SDC were important results of the project and specifically responded to impact indicators in the Log frames. These were the result of considerable Government and private sector dialogue (facilitated by the project) and should ultimately better enable the institutional environment for export. It is evident both organisations (especially the SDC) remain in their early stages, however, and strong regional competition, supply side constraints and service provision to memberships will likely prove to be particular challenges. Access to finance and high costs of production also remain challenges to suppliers.

Regarding the government framework for monitoring and evaluating AFT, CEDEP I had a positive impact on the MoC. While CEDEP I support cannot (and should not) be disaggregated from support provided by the TDSP or EIF Tier 1, the period of CEDEP I saw a significant enhancement of monitoring capacity and strong integration of projects into government priorities through Trade SWAp Roadmaps, measuring against KPIs and success stories prepared in partnership with the implementing components. It is evaluated the reported disconnect between MIEs and the MoC was reduced during CEDEP I as ownership from the government was strengthened.

30 The USD amount for this was not reported.
Sustainability is evaluated overall as moderately satisfactory as there have been some developments since the compilation of the MTE report which rated sustainability as unsatisfactory. There remain some moderate shortcomings in the achievement of objectives with challenges to sustainability being consistent across all implementing entities. These relate to the need for more capacity building for the apex bodies and the need to integrate CEDEP I outcomes into future donor programmes.

While potential sustainability appears generally apparent for individual associations and exporting companies supported by the programme (especially the lead firms in milled rice), the need to implement the policy frameworks introduced for both rice and silk remain paramount.

It was reported that strengthening the CRF remains a challenge as it has gone through several major internal organizational changes with some management and advisory staff leaving. The CRF reported that while it had received about 40 per cent of its operational budget from the RGC in 2015, it had not received any money for 2016 severely curtailing its activities. The CRF also faces additional challenges with reports that there is some division among members and a lack of an overall coherent approach to mobilising funds and tackling some of the major challenges facing the Cambodian rice sector. One rice miller also reported that “when suppliers meet buyers Cambodians are undercutting one another and the future remains unclear.” Some rice millers also questioned the capacity of the CRF to provide the services they needed. This could potentially pose a threat to institutional and financial stability.

The development and promotion of a rice branding campaign was specified by the IFC as needing further support beyond the proposed extension period. In addition, the milled rice component is also currently facing strong regional competition, with imported rice from neighbouring countries, porous borders, and a lack of production support. It has been reported by the CRF that about 40 per cent of the small- and medium-sized rice millers and exporters are close to stopping production and going bankrupt. One large scale miller reported that “we are not exporting sufficient quantities to keep costs low and our export costs are double those of Thailand”.

Sustainability for the SDC and the silk sector as a whole was a frequently cited concern from senior committee members and stakeholders. Village Works outlined how “the handicrafts sector in Cambodia is not very big and while we are financially sustainable, we still need external support to expand our types of design.” A need for more dissemination of technical knowledge and support from the SDC was also a frequently cited issue by stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Without further support from DP’s it was reported implementation of the silk strategy would also be a considerable challenge. It is evaluated however, the committee and strategies are in place and strong commitment from the RGC should enable funds to be identified.

CEDEP I was not implemented in isolation from donor programs, DP’s and government priorities and there is continuing donor interest in both rice and silk which the MoC and relevant DP’s are already investigating. IFC and the MoC are continuing discussions with a range of DP’s including IFAD, AfD, ADB, USAID and CAVAC/DFAT to explore potential interest for further support to the sector and CRF and SDC. In addition, IFC reported it was developing its 2016—2020 national programme and assessing ways to support the rice and other agro-sectors in Cambodia, inclusive of industry association strengthening.

It is notable that the capacity built within MoC-DICO under the EIF Tier 1, TDSP, CEDEP I and CEDEP II appears to be enabling this negotiation, though to some extent donors are still driving the process.

While largely outside the scope of the project there remain constraints to sustainable export promotion that can potentially offset gains made by the government in improving the institutional and policy environment for trade and investment, and reduces the effects of comparative advantages. Several senior officials indicated that with the exception of garments, export was not a sufficiently high priority for the RGC.

Infrastructure and production costs remain a constraint. Facing some of the highest energy and transportation costs in the region, export components have a significant challenge to overcome with respect to competitiveness. Poor quality and absent infrastructure will continue to offset some of the gains made in export competitiveness.

Access to finance for businesses engaged in the agricultural sector remains difficult. Producers and small holders lack access to savings facilities or hesitate to take on credit and consequently do not invest in equipment, land and working capital to enhance efficiency and productivity.
MoC-DICO continues to face challenges with respect to funding for its consultants and it is evaluated that capacity building is not yet complete for the MoC Evaluation staff. It was reported that “while DICO is highly technically proficient and skilled, more capacity is needed for the Ministry.” Currently it is noted by the evaluation that ongoing support is evident for the majority of consultants under CEDEP II.

The NIU developed an Annual Capacity Development Plan in form of training plan consistent with the MoC’s Capacity Development Master Plan to ensure the sustainability of that capacity in the future through organizational, human resource management and motivational measures. However, capacity building for institution building is a long term process and it was evident specific support is still needed to develop effective impact monitoring, ensure donor contribution to the rice and silk sector policies and provide ongoing support to sustain apex body development.

The CEDEP I final evaluation would concur with the final evaluation for the EIF Tier 1 that “strengthening of the government staff recruitment and selection process with longer term target oriented capacity development, gradual reduction of consultant deployments, performance appraisal and staff retention system are needed to overcome this consultant dependency in the near future.”

Regarding institutional sustainability the EIF concluded that as a permanent country-owned mechanism which has had appropriate TA from the ITC, the SDC should be able to support the development of the silk sector beyond the life of the project. While the final evaluation concurs with the EIF it should be noted that without exception the government board members of the SDC expressed significant concern about the sustainability of the silk sector and the need for further TA to implement the silk strategy.

The final evaluation also found as with the EIF, that there was some trickle-down effect with an increase in the number of weavers. Training had also been provided for weavers to meet necessary supply quality. Some weavers reported increased earnings which were invested in housing, food and education. However, the sustainability of this was not certain as some weavers who had experienced more work in 2014 and 2015 were experiencing a reduction by 2016. Ultimately they remained solely dependent on consistent market demand.
CONCLUSIONS

The EIF supported CEDEP I has been successfully implemented with only minor shortcomings in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. Components were not completed against original timeframes, but project documents were ambitious and the work plans and log frames were not fully developed until implementation. NCEs were necessary for all components but these were judged necessary to improve sustainability of the implementing components and to accommodate for changes in the institutional framework with the abolition of the POC. MIE’s did respond to recommendations from the EIF ES and the MTE and incorporate these into amended work plans. The use of budgets and recruitment was transparent, it is still evaluated however, synergies between the various activities were not fully explored.

It is evaluated the structure of the programme was correct, though in the future there should be an enhanced role for line ministries and there is a need to fully develop the capacity of MoC to operate without consultants. The selection of IFC and ITC greatly enhanced effectiveness and stakeholders across all components stressed the relevance of sector interventions, especially the need for capacity building, and identifying external markets for export. CEDEP I contributed to the growth of exports through market expansion and diversification including development of products and services that moved the sectors up the value chain allowing penetration into new import markets.

Considering the relatively modest budget for each component it is evaluated the project was cost effective. Relevant national and international TA was evident across all components and significant value addition was provided by implementing CEDEP I based on previous experience and in the case of the IFC incorporating it into a wider donor programme approach. Trade SWAp, with its CTIS and Roadmaps enhanced the effectiveness of donor money provided by AFT enabling the government to specifically focus support towards its own long term sectoral support strategies. Outcomes offer the possibilities for up scaling and replication and further DP support is possible.

Overall, the programme was well managed and working relationships between the MIE’s developed during the course of implementation. National ownership became more evident towards the latter half of the project and was a result of more leadership from the MOC and the creation of CRF and SDC as nationally responsible sector entities. These bodies were created as a result of significant public private dialogue.

While also attributable to support from TDSP and EIF Tier 1 (and it is too early to determine long-term impact) the potential short to medium-term impact of the project has been proven. Government-Private Sector dialogue led to apex bodies, support to an enabling institutional environment for export was improved, and an enhanced capacity of the RGC to monitor and lead the implementation of all AFT and TRTA developed. This is evidenced by the comprehensive Government planning and implementation frameworks in place such as the Trade SWAp with an NIU and its Roadmaps and Medium Term Plan. It is also evidenced by the increase in export in chosen priority sectors.

What is currently lacking is committed financial support for new priority sectors. This has implications for the NIU as a lot of the work has been done by consultants and more needs to be done to transfer implementation and results monitoring capacities to national staff.

The MoC will very likely continue to lead export related programmes with donors and RGC ministries. Specific capacity has been strengthened (over the period of CEDEP I) in linking component activities to government identified priorities from Trade SWAp, coordinating the AFT and TRTA agenda and disseminating relevant documentation throughout ministries as well as preparing reports for relevant implementation committees and steering committees.

Sustainability seems assured for direct beneficiaries in the milled rice and high value silk sectors and women’s empowerment was a positive effect, especially for high value silk. Beneficiaries across both components are already operationalizing their training and exploiting new market opportunities and are using their own money to increase the quality and quantities necessary for export. They face regional competition, however and it cannot be assured all will be successful.

For the national apex bodies and strategies the systems are in place but there was a widely expressed need for further support from both the government and the international community. While this is to be expected, it is evaluated support may be critical for the silk ‘sector’.

The full potential impact of the programme has not yet been realized. There remains a need to develop a better understanding of the positive and negative impact of AFT on poverty, whether to inform direct targeting of assistance or to ensure the effects of AFT are known.

To better appreciate impact within the next phase of the programme there is a need to focus on measurements against impact indicators. This ranges, for example, from increases in incomes for targeted beneficiaries (and primary producers) to better measurement against ‘national’ impact indicators and KPIs that already exist in the Log frame and Roadmaps.
Recommendations are based solely on the findings of the Final Evaluation and result from extensive consultation with a wide range of stakeholders including donors and DP’s, Ministries and Core Teams, MIE’s, CRF and SDC board members and project beneficiaries. Recommendations also derive from an examination of other relevant evaluations such as the MTE of CEDEP I and II and recommendations and findings of the EIF ES and TFM. Where relevant, recommendations specify the responsible entities.

Recommendations adopt a forward looking approach based on the experience of implementation of CEDEP I. It is anticipated recommendations will be of use to the MoC-DICO when it implements future priorities identified in the CTIS and more globally for the EIF. The component recommendations should be of use to DP’s who intend to support activities on milled rice or high value silk.

**Recommendations at the Programme level**

Responsible entities to implement programme level recommendations include the RGC, especially the MoC-DICO and private sector departments, and DP’s.

**Relevance and programme design**

1. If future projects include trade related export activity, donors should follow the Trade SWAp framework to encourage national ownership, complementarity and alignment with government priorities. This recommendation also aligns closely to the EU evaluation recommendation for the EU-IFC Programme for the development of SMES in the Agro Industry Sector. Responsible entities DP’s and MoC.

2. Formulation of comprehensive and detailed sustainability strategies at the individual sector level during planning would enhance the relevance of sectors interventions and their potential for sustainability without further DP support. Responsible entities DP’s and MoC.

3. Activities toward sustainability and exit strategies, such as the creation of apex bodies, need to be prioritized at the outset of activity for timely delivery of project components. Responsible entities DP’s and MoC.

4. Programme Logical Frameworks and project documents must have SMART indicators and articulate linkages to government strategies for poverty reduction. Indicators in Logical Frameworks for job and income creation and poverty reduction should be developed. Provide baseline figures with clear numbers of beneficiaries and measure against impact indicators. Responsible entities DP’s and MoC-DICO.

5. Look for complementarities, synergies and lessons learned from both current and past relevant donor support programmes. Responsible entities DP’s and MoC-DICO.

6. Project documents should fully articulate gender and youth targets. Responsible entities DP’s and MoC-DICO.

7. Relevance of component outcomes would be enhanced by ensuring the Outcomes and Indicators in the Programme Logical Frameworks fully match the Outcomes articulated for the relevant sectors in the CTIS for 2014-2018 as well as RGC priorities outlined in poverty reduction strategies such as the RSIII and MoC MTP. Responsible entities DP’s and MoC-DICO.

8. Supply side constraints must be clearly identified in project documents and how these will be overcome should be articulated. Responsible entities MoC-DICO, DP’s.

9. Re-emphasize the goal, purpose and implementation modality of the programme with principal stakeholders to enhance understanding of the Trade SWAp outcomes and outputs. Responsible entities MoC-DICO.

10. Longer time frames should be considered when the aim of the project is a pro-poor transformation of an export sector requiring the development of institutional frameworks and policies. This would also allow improved monitoring at the impact level.

**Efficiency**

1. Where possible replicate the lead firm approach of the IFC. Responsible entities DP’s and MoC.

2. Where possible replicate the vertically integrated value chain approach of the ITC. Responsible entities DP’s and MoC.

3. When there is future implementation, consider incentive mechanisms for maintaining and deepening inter-ministerial coordination through the Core groups established for CEDEP I. It is concurrently recommended to further define the specific responsibilities of the Core Teams and how these differ from PSC’s and Boards. Responsible entities MoC-DICO and DP’s.

**Effectiveness**

1. While promoting export diversification, it is recommended to partner closely with ministries, organisations and DP’s supporting the development of supply side capacities.
Significant project value is added when export promotion projects like CEDEP I operate a supply and demand programmatic approach. Responsible entities DP’s and MoC.

2. Enhance the synergy and coordination with other line ministries to promote exports in joint marketing efforts. For example, the MoC and Ministry of Culture launch a joint campaign to promote silk export. Responsible entities MoC.

3. Develop a clear capacity building and exit plan for consultants within MoC-DICO Capacity Building is a long term investment and capacities within DICO need to be maintained and strengthened. Responsible entities MoC-DICO.

4. Ensure complementarities and synergies are developed between various project components. Responsible entities MoC.

5. MIE’s should at all times promote the full involvement of line ministries. Some disconnect appears apparent with MIEs implementing a ‘standalone project’ and reporting mainly to their donor. Responsible entities DP’s.

6. Financial information including procurements and disbursement records should be provided to MoC-DICO by MIE’s for information management and capacity building purposes. Responsible entities DP’s.

Impact

1. MoC and DP’s need to better articulate the impacts of project interventions Responsible entities MoC-DICO, DP’s.

2. Investigate and report the total volume of AfT disbursements to Cambodia. Responsible entities MoC-DICO.

3. Considering the independently evaluated success of CEDEP I milled rice and high value silk investigate replication and up scaling of project results or formulating follow up projects. Responsible entities MoC-DICO, DP’s.

Sustainability

1. Ensure financial sustainability for the Evaluation function of MoC-DICO to retain its human resource, operational and advisory capacities for Trade SWAp beyond CEDEP I and EIF Tier 1. Responsible entities MoC-DICO, DP’s including the EIF.

2. MoC-RGC should continue to advocate for favourable trade tariffs, to improve infrastructure, access to finance and cheaper electricity costs. This is necessary for export to become competitive and sustainable. Responsible entities MoC-DICO, DP’s.

3. The MoC-RGC should work with DPs to continue to build the capacity of the CRF and SDC. Responsible entities RGC, MoC-DICO, DP’s.

4. The MoC-RGC should continue to focus support on the development and promotion of “Made in Cambodia” product brands like Angkor Malis and on improving the institutional and policy environment for trade and investment. Responsible entities include the DPSD, the Trade Promotion Department and the Private Sector.

5. Provide donors with more extensive lessons learned from implementation to provide relevant information when they plan funding complementary activities. Responsible entities MoC-DICO, DP’s.

Recommendations at the component level

Milled Rice: Main Responsible Entities are the Cambodian Rice Federation/IFC and DP’s.

1. Continue to promote Cambodian brand image and product certification for both domestic and international markets. Responsible entities also include the MoC, DPSD, the Trade Promotion Department and the Private Sector.

2. Finalize the project completion and final report for CEDEP I.

3. Consider whether there is a role for the MOC-DICO under remaining EIF Tier 2 funds to play a role in the upcoming evaluation on the employment impact of the Cambodian Rice Sector Support Project (RSSP). Responsible entities also include MoC –DICO.

4. It is recommended to continue support to both product and market diversification to increase competitiveness in world markets. There is a concurrent need for further technical support for trade promotion, marketing and branding. This recommendation also aligns closely to the EU evaluation recommendation for the EU-IFC Programme for the development of the of SMES in the Agro Industry Sector.

5. It was recommended by millers that more support be provided to processing to better develop and diversify rice products. It is recommended to focus more on niche markets such as organic produce, rice brand oil and rice paper.

6. Investigate co-financing mechanisms so that rural banks can provide credit. Many banks are not willing to invest.

7. The CRF could consider offering training in food safety services for millers. The CRF could also support its members to reach the OSH levels necessary for third party certification.

High Value Silk: Main Responsible Entities are the Silk
Development and Promotion Committee/MoC and DP's:

1. The MOC and SDC should investigate potential sources of future funding for the silk component with both DP’s and the RGC. There is a unanimously identified need to provide further support to the SDC and the silk industry is in very early stages regarding export.

2. It is recommended to focus more on fair trade rather than only high end markets as this is where the greatest number of potential buyers was identified.

3. It is recommended to provide ongoing support for new product designs to continue competitiveness and ensure demand from foreign markets.

4. The SDC, the MoC and Provincial Departments have agreed in principle to create a National Institute for Silk. The administrative arrangements, institutional funding and sustainability options for this should be developed.

5. The administrative arrangements for the proposed annual national silk day should be developed.

Evaluation Function and Organisation of Core Teams: Responsible Entities are the MoC-DICO the RGC and DP’s:

1. Disseminate the key findings of the final evaluation with principal stakeholders in a timely manner, once approved by the EIF ES and the MIE’s and SSC-TD-TRI.

2. Strengthen the measurement and reporting against the highest level impact indicators of the components. This includes measurements against the project document impacts, the RS III, Trade SWAp Goals and outcomes and specific KPI’s.
Significant project value is added when export promotion projects like CEDEP I partner with organisations /donors operating a programme approach supporting the development of supply side capacities.

Government support particularly in the areas of budget allocation, the development of export promotion (and support) policies and continuous dialogue with the private sector is necessary for sustainability beyond TRTA.

Sustainability is more likely for projects that operate within a broad programme framework which includes projects being supported by other donors.

Sustainability and ownership are key challenges requiring a significant focus on exit strategies for the institutional level. This needs to be a priority at the earliest stages of implementation.

National ownership and sustainability is significantly enhanced through the creation of national sector bodies to implement component activities and provide follow up.

Development of value chains to include export can be a significant driver to enhancing supply through increased demand.

To be fully efficient budgets should be adequate for downstream interventions to help overcome supply side constraints. The majority of budgets were spent on TA and upstream elements.

Longer timeframes may be necessary to implement and monitor projects that are trying to transform value chains towards expanded export.

The effectiveness and impact of national TRTA is dependent on the private sector business environment within Cambodia but regional competition can be an equally decisive factor. Thailand, Vietnam and China remain dominant regional markets and there is a need to clearly define the regional and global value added of Cambodian products.

When there are different projects that contribute to a programme it will take time before the project components work together effectively and efficiently. This is especially the case where different agencies implement different components.
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1. Background:

In December 2007, the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) launched the Cambodia Trade Integration Strategy (DTIS 2007), which describes a comprehensive reform program to improve the business environment and create the conditions to help exporters strengthen their supply capacity. Cambodia exporters are bound to improve their competitiveness to offset the negative impact of disappearing tariff preferences and advantages and to take advantage of market access offered under bilateral and multilateral trade arrangements. In this perspective, urgent reforms are imperative in trade facilitation, investment facilitation, intellectual property protection, technical standards and packaging, sanitary and phyto-sanitary standards, trade information and promotion. To operationalize the DTIS 2007, the Ministry of Commerce, in partnership with key stakeholders and the support of Cambodia’s development partners, launched in 2008 a Trade Sector-wide Approach (aka Trade SWAp), structuring the DTIS implementation along three pillars: (1) Reforms and cross-cutting issues, (2) Products and services development and (3) Capacity development for trade.

In 2011, Cambodia's undertook a trade policy review (TPR) under the WTO. While praising Cambodia for its robust economic development and steady growth, the WTO TPR members recommended that Cambodia accelerates its trade diversification, both in terms of products and services. Trade expansion and trade-related investment are critical ingredients to achieving the economic growth objectives stated in the RGC Rectangular Strategy. The competitiveness of Cambodian exporters can increase only if the RGC contributes to improving the business environment, by implementing trade reforms and improving governance in the trade sector.

Consequently, the Trade SWAp’s vision is the following: “In the next ten years, the RGC will be increasingly valued for its integrity, for its capacity to articulate and implement trade policies and strategies in consultation with all trade stakeholders and for its ability to enforce trade regulations aiming at strengthening competitiveness in existing export industries and at promoting export diversification”. The vision will be pursued by maximizing the benefit of AIT and enhancing policy dialogue with the private sector, civil society and development partners.

The Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF) for Trade-Related Technical Assistance (TRTA) to least-developed countries (LDCs) is a process that was first established in 1997 to support LDC governments in trade capacity building and integrating trade issues into overall national development strategies. The EIF has three main objectives: (1) to “mainstream” (integrate) trade into the national strategic development plan (NSDP) such as the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) of least-developed countries and (2) to assist in the coordinated delivery of TRTA in response to needs identified by the LDCs and build capacity to trade, which also includes addressing critical supply side constraints. The EIF is built on the principles of country ownership and partnership.

The Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) has established a Trade Sector-Wide Approach, (Trade SWAp) under the leadership of the Ministry of Commerce (MoC), to better manage and coordinate the use and implementation of its Aid for Trade. Trade SWAp has three main strategic “Pillars.” Pillar 2 focuses on strengthening the export supply capacity of 19 potential sectors.

To support the implementation of the Trade SWAp, the Cambodia Export Diversification and Expansion Program (CEDEP
I), which is funded by the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF) Trust Fund, aims at strengthening and diversifying export supply capacity in selected Pillar 2 sectors: High Value Silk and Milled Rice. The program also includes an Evaluation Function Component intended, in part, to strengthen the capacity of the Department of International Cooperation (DICO), within the MoC, to monitor and evaluate substantive progress of Cambodia’s Trade SWAp. CEDEP I was approved by the EIF Board on 6 August 2012 with a total budget of US$2,407,714 for three years project implementation (2012 - 2014).

1.1 Project Objective

The overall objective of the EIF Tier 2-CEDEP I is to strengthen and diversify export supply capacity in milled rice and high-value silk sectors and enhance the capacity of DICO at the MoC to monitor and evaluate substantive progress of Cambodia’s Trade SWAp.

1.2 Project Components

The CEDEP I project includes 3 main components—Main Implementing Entities (MIEs) which signed MoU with the EIF Trust Fund Manager separately:

Component 1: Milled Rice

The International Finance Corporation (IFC/The World Bank Group) is responsible for the implementation of the component on exports of milled rice. The MoU between the EIF TFM and IFC was signed on December 14th, 2012. The total project budget is $1,680,572 (budget EIF Tier 2 is $1,112,847, private sector contribution of $408,000, and in-kind contribution from IFC is $159,725). The project original closing date was on 31 December 2015. The project extension (No-cost Extension) approved and the closing date revised to 30 June 2016.

Component 2: High-Value Silk

The International Trade Centre (ITC) (UNCTAD/WTO) is responsible for the implementation of the component on export of high-value silk. The Implementation Letter between the EIF TFM and ITC was signed on September 25th, 2012. The total project budget is $1,389,897 (budget from EIF Tier 2 is $1,004,347, government contribution is $167,400, private sector contribution of $40,000, and in-kind contribution from ITC is $178,150). The project original closing date was 25 September 2015. The project extension (No-cost Extension) approved on 14 July 2015 protracted the closing date to 31 March 2016.

Component 3: Evaluation Function and the Organization of the Core Team

The MoC/DICO is responsible for the Evaluation Function component. The MoU between the EIF TFM and MoC/DICO was signed on October 25th, 2012 and amended on August 14th, 2014. The total project budget is US$312,960 (budget from EIF Tier 2 is $290,520 and government contribution is $22,440). The project original closing date was on 25 October 2015. The project extension (No-cost Extension) approved and the closing date revised to 26 October 2016.

The Ministry of Commerce, acting as a Secretariat of the Trade SWAp, has put in place National Implementation Unit (NIU) which is DICO that ensures increased ownership of the country’s Aid-for-Trade agenda through the SWAp mechanisms. In particular, it can count on robust institutional arrangements such as the Implementing Committee (IC), the Sub-Steering Committee on Trade Development and Trade-Related Investment (SSC.TD-TRI), the SWAp Implementation Committee, and the SWAp Pillar Working Groups.

2. Objectives of the Assignment:

The objectives of the final evaluation are to assist DICO in their final evaluation:

- Provide an independent evaluation of the project’s performance against the overall project objectives, outcomes and impact as stated in the project logical framework for both Cambodia (CEDEP I’s Components and global EIF results framework),
- Provide an assessment of the original project design, and the overall implementation,
- Define the impacts and results of the projects, especially related to employment generation, export improvement, and poverty reduction,
• Assess the EIF’s role in supporting the CEDEP I project implementation,
• Provide lessons learned and experiences in project implementation that can be applied in the Cambodia future project or other EIF countries, and
• Provide clear recommendations on how the design could have been improved to achieve greater impact and sustain-ability of project activities.

For that purpose, the Ministry of Commerce is seeking the support of an Individual Consultant to conduct CEDEP I final evaluation in line with OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, the recommendations of the EIF/ES\(^{32}\), the current Trade SWAp structure and implementation and make recommendations on ways and means to improve its efficiency. The Lead International Consultant will work together with a National Consultant who will have separate complementary TOR. It is expected that the incumbent would observe at all times in the highest standard of professional ethics and integrity, and promote results-ori-
•
3. Description of services:

The Lead Consultant will be based in DICO, MoC (DICO is acting as the Trade SWAp Secretariat, National Implementation Unit of the EIF and Executive Agency of the Trade Development Support Program). She/he will work under the general direct supervision and guidance of the EIF Focal Point and in collaboration with the NIU Director. The consultant’s assignment is expected to be for a maximum of 30 (thirty) working days, most of them in-country.

The Consultant will conduct an independent evaluation of Cambodia’s CEDEP I project, during quarter three of 2016. The consultant must use the OECD/DAC Criteria for evaluating development assistance\(^ {33}\).

Indicative Evaluation Areas

The following are indicative areas to be covered by the evaluation questions:

1. An assessment/overview of the overall EIF institutional set-up in the country (Focal Point, National Implementing Unit, IC, SSC.TD.TRI, Donor Facilitator) and the organizational links to key ministries and other relevant bodies;
2. Results and activities for the Tier 2-CEDEP I project;
3. Review of trade mainstreaming processes in the country (In line with the EIF Logical framework);
4. Trade Policy/export development strategy;
5. Engagement with Private sector and other non-governmental stakeholders on trade and trade policy issues;
6. Donor coordination on trade related assistance;
7. Wider mobilization of funds for TRA – formulation of Medium Term Plan 2016-2020
8. Sustainability; and
9. Impact

Some of the indicative questions the Final Evaluation shall seek to answer are as follows:

Project Relevance

The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor

• How does the CEDEP I project, including its sub-components align with and support Cambodia’s trade development policies as prescribed in the National Strategic Development Plans (NSDP), the RGC’s Rectangular Strategy (RS), the National Poverty Reduction Strategy, National Trade Strategy and Policy, and the 12-point Action Plan for Trade Facilitation and Investment?
• How well the project is coherently articulated in terms of its goal and outcomes?
• How well does the project complement other trade related projects/programmes in the country, including projects in the relevant sector? For example, Trade Development Support Programme (TDSP).
• How well does the project address the specific issues of the targeted sector/sub-sector, including Policy Paper on the

\(^{32}\) EIF/ES, End Phase Project Evaluation Guidance Note (2015)
Promotion of Paddy Production and Rice Export adopted on July 25, 2010 and the Sector-Wide Strategy for the Cambodian Silk Sector first established in 2006 and the Cambodia National Silk Strategy 2016-2020?

Effectiveness

A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives

- Is the CEDEP I project results framework/logframe well-conceived to achieve the project objective? Were baseline data established to measure progress?
- Have the quantity and quality of the outputs produced so far been satisfactory? Are the outputs transforming into or likely to transform into outcomes?
- In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be overcome?
- Is the project making sufficient progress towards achieving its planned objectives?
- Does project governance facilitate good results and efficient delivery? Is there a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
- Does the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners?
- Do stakeholders have a good grasp of the project approach?
- How effective is communication between the MIE, NIU (if relevant), the private sector, donors and agencies, other stakeholders and the related government line ministries?
- Is a monitoring and evaluation system in place and how effective is it to measure progress towards results?
- Is an internal control system of financial and fiduciary arrangements in place?
- How effective is the sharing and utilization by the MIE and stakeholders of M&E results, including lessons learned?

Efficiency

Efficiency measures the outputs — qualitative and quantitative — in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

- Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically by MIEs, Government and other donors (if relevant) to achieve outcomes?
- Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- In general, do the results being achieved justify the costs?

Potential Impact

The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main potential impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative potential impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions.

- To what extent is the project making significant contribution to broader and longer-term national development impact? Or how likely is it that it eventually will?
- Can any unintended positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project’s interventions?
- Will the project be likely to achieve its planned objectives upon completion? Can observed changes be linked to the project’s intervention?

Sustainability

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

- How effective has the project been in establishing national ownership? How have in-country stakeholders, including
the private sector been involved in project implementation?
- Are the project results likely to be durable and anchored in national institutions?
- Are government and related national institutions likely to maintain the project financially once external funding ends?
- Has the project prepared for an exit plan to ensure a proper hand-over to the Government of Cambodia/DICO and institutions after the project ends?
- Are national partners able, willing and committed to continue with the project?
- Are project human resources institutionalized to ensure continuity of project impacts and achievement of objectives?

Specific duties for delivering the outputs will include, but will not be limited to:
- Get him/herself knowledgeable on the DTIS 2007, CTIS 2014-2018, the Trade Swap Roadmaps;
- Review CEDEP I Project Proposal, and MoUs between TFM and MIEs;
- Review MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT (October – November 2014)
- Review the individual components narrative reports of CEDEP I (semi-annual and annual) produced by the three MIEs in 2012/2013/2014/2015/2016
- Review the individual components project related documents including strategy development, study or assessment reports produced by the three MIEs of CEDEP I (2012-2016);
- Medium Term Plan (MTP) Report and Concept Notes 2016-2020;
- Study relevant national development policies and strategies (Rectangular Development Strategies, Trade Facilitation 12-point action plan, NSDP, etc.);
- Take into consideration the different TDSP supervision mission aide memoires, external review, EIF TFM and EIF ES regular supervision mission recommendations;
- Work with the EIF team in the Ministry of Commerce and liaise with the UNOPS/TFM in Bangkok, the IFC and ITC representatives and project teams in both Cambodia and respective HQ and the EIF ES team in Geneva, as need be;
- Liaise regularly with the NIU to share progress, challenges and potential issues and constraints
- Integrate all comments received from the MoC, SSC.TD.TRI, ES, TFM and other stakeholders when and if applicable into the final version of the evaluation report; and

4. Evaluation Methodology

It is expected that a flexible and an appropriate method will be used for providing data and description of the final evaluation. Proposed evaluation methodology to be used could include: The consultant shall:

**Document Review**
- Conduct a review of all project related documents. These include
  - DTIS 2007, CTIS 2014-2018, the Trade Swap Roadmaps;
  - CEDEP I Project Proposal, and MoUs between TFM and MIEs;
  - MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT (October – November 2014)
  - Individual components narrative reports of CEDEP I (semi-annual and annual) produced by the three MIEs in 2012/2013/2014/2015/2016
  - Individual components project related documents including strategy development, study or assessment reports produced by the three MIEs of CEDEP I (2012-2016);
  - Medium Term Plan (MTP) Report and Concept Notes 2016-2020;
  - Relevant national development policies and strategies (Rectangular Development Strategies, Trade Facilitation 12-point action plan, NSDP, etc.);
  - The different TDSP supervision mission aide memoires, external review, EIF TFM and EIF ES regular supervision mission recommendations;

**Interviews**
- Conduct individual meetings with key informants.
- Conduct field level assessment through stakeholder interviews, surveys and field visits;
• Conduct interviews with all key stakeholders as agreed at inception, including government institutions, private sector, development partners, and donor facilitator.
• Facilitate and coordinate a consultative meeting to present the evaluation findings.

5. Consultant’s Activities
The International Consultant will undertake the following activities:
• Working closely with the National Consultant to undertake an in-depth review of the available literature and documents of the projects;
• Develop methodologies and tools to be used for data collection for the evaluation, ensure that the data is collected in project target areas and prepare an analysis in consultation with the national consultants;
• Work in close collaboration with the National Consultant to conduct a series of meetings and consultations with line Ministries, the World Bank, key members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), the Core Team Members, the Cambodia Rice Federation (CRF), the Silk Development Commission (SDC), project beneficiaries, and other relevant key stakeholders on the achievements and challenges of the CEDEP I project;
• Discuss evaluation findings periodically with MoC/DICO, MIEs, and other stakeholders;
• Working closely with the National Consultant to prepare a draft evaluation report and organize and facilitate a workshop to discuss the overall findings and recommendations with MoC/DICO, and other relevant key stakeholders;
• On the basis of the above workshop, prepare a final report incorporating the comments and agreed revisions to the report.

5. Main outputs/deliverables/timeline and payment terms
The evaluation is expected to start in July and finish before 30, August 2016. The division of labour and coordination between the International Consultant and National Consultant has to be clearly reflected in the Inception Report.

The consultant will produce the following outputs:
• Inception report: The consultant will be required to submit an inception report within 5 days of the start of the contract. The inception report will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed work plan, and list of meetings/institutions to be met. The inception report shall be delivered to the NIU/DICO Director for review and approval prior to commencing fieldwork. (25% lump sum paid 15 days after invoice).
• Draft evaluation report: A Draft Report that presents the consultant’s findings (in English) that shall be submitted within 15 days after mobilization. DICO review the draft evaluation report as well as submits the draft, without changes, to the key stakeholders of the evaluation. The stakeholders review the report and submit comments on the content of the draft report to DICO. (25% lump sum paid 15 days after invoice).
• Workshop on presentations of the evaluation findings: A workshop during which the findings are discussed (at least 3 days after submission of the draft report).
• Final evaluation report: A Final Report that includes the comments received during and after the Workshop; DICO forwards the consolidated comments to the consultant to prepare the final report; the consultant completes the final report and submits it electronically to DICO within 10 days of receiving feedback from all key stakeholders on the draft report. DICO forwards the final evaluation report to key stakeholders who have participated in the evaluation. The executive summary of the final report should be translated into Khmer. The last payment (50 %) will be made after final approval by the EIF Focal Point.

The evaluation report is the key output of the evaluation. The evaluation report (draft and final) will provide answers to the project-specific evaluation questions, derived from an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, potential impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation report should not usually exceed 35 pages, excluding annexes. The final evaluation report should include the following items:

1. Cover page
2. Executive summary (maximum of 3 pages)
3. Brief background on the Project
4. Purpose, scope and stakeholders of Evaluation
5. Methodology
6. Review of Project design and implementation
6. Qualification and Selection Criteria of Consultant

- Master Degree in International Trade, International Economics or Development Studies;
- At least 8 years of relevant professional work experience in monitoring and evaluation works in developing countries;
- Proven experience in developing and evaluating strategies, programme and project documents in the context of trade-related technical assistance projects and programmes, with strong focus on Aid Effectiveness;
- Proven experience in working with trade development projects and programmes, particularly Aid for Trade, sector-specific issues, and development issues; good understanding of the EIF will be an added advantage;
- Proven experience in working with Governments and networking with national and international stakeholders, preferably in Asian LDCs in the area of trade mainstreaming and trade related technical assistance;
- A strong and proven track record in applying qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods;
- Data analysis and interpretation skills;
- Good report writing skills; and
- Facilitation skills.

Qualifications to be qualitatively evaluated:

- Familiarity with donor agencies procedures, Monitoring and Evaluation practices and in the use of basket funds, trust funds and budget support for development projects; and
- Proficiency in written and spoken English.

7. Management arrangements

The overall management of the EIF Tier 2 project evaluation will remain with the EIF National Implementation Unit (NIU)/DICO. The day-to-day supervision of the independent final evaluation will rest with the EIF National Project Manager, in close consultation with the NIU/DICO Director and EIF Focal Point. Administrative support (meeting arrangements, reporting to NIU, contract support) will be provided by the EIF administrative assistant. The Lead consultant will have access to DICO’s office facilities in the Ministry of Commerce.

8. Evaluation Ethics

- Evaluators must have personal and professional integrity.
- Evaluators must respect the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and ensure that sensitive data cannot be traced to its source.
- Evaluators must take care that those involved in evaluations have a chance to examine the statements attributed to them.
- Evaluators must be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environments in which they work.
- In light of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender inequality.
- Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Also, the evaluators are not expected to evaluate the personal performance of individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with due consideration for this principle.

9. APPENDICES

Appendix 1: EIF Tier 2 CEDEP I Project Documents
Appendix 2: EIF Compendium
Appendix 3: Criteria for the selection of proposals
### Annex 2: Evaluation Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Issues</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Data Collection / Analysis Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of objectives and ownership of project</td>
<td>Are the objectives of the programme consistent with Government policies and strategies</td>
<td>Objectives consistent with Government policies and lessons learned</td>
<td>Trade SWAp, NSDPS, CTIS Rectangular Strategy Previous evaluation</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the objectives of the programme consistent with partner policies and priorities?</td>
<td>Objectives consistent with partner policies and priorities</td>
<td>Partner policies</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the objectives of the project/programme consistent with target group needs and priorities?</td>
<td>Target group needs being met</td>
<td>Beneficiaries MIEs</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussions Key Informant Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Outcomes and Outputs</td>
<td>What have been the positive and negative outcomes in the target areas/component sectors since the beginning of the programme?</td>
<td>The extent to which the Programme is meeting the individual component objectives</td>
<td>MIEs, Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussions Key Informant Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What have been the positive and negative outcomes for target beneficiaries since the beginning of the project/programme?</td>
<td>Increased trade/ income/opportunities among the target beneficiaries</td>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussions On-site visits to majority of Provinces where MIEs are operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How should failure in bringing about intended outcomes be explained? Were the assumptions underpinning the project/programme not correct?</td>
<td>Project logic adequate Assumptions realistic</td>
<td>Programme document narrative Previous evaluations</td>
<td>Review of logical framework against project document narrative Review of logical framework against lessons learned from previous evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Outcome to Impact</td>
<td>What are the positive developments to which the programme is likely to contribute?</td>
<td>The extent to which trade is increasing across the three Pillar 2 sectors supported by CEDEP</td>
<td>Project data bases Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Analysis of information in databases Focus Group Discussions On-site beneficiary visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the actual or possible negative consequences of the project/programme?</td>
<td>Environmental issues, land issues misallocation of community resources</td>
<td>Beneficiaries MIEs, PSCs, Core Teams</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussions On-site beneficiary visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cambodia Export Diversification and Expansion Programme Phase I (CEDEP I) - Final Evaluation Report

#### Table: Key Areas of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of benefits</td>
<td>What is the expected duration of the different project/programme benefits after project/programme completion?</td>
<td>The positive developments above (from outcome to impact) are sustained</td>
<td>As above (from outcome to impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the main risks to the expected sustainability of the benefits?</td>
<td>Assumptions and risk assessment adequate</td>
<td>Project document and logical framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government counterpart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency (including procurement)</td>
<td>Were project funds available in a timely manner?</td>
<td>Funds available in timely manner</td>
<td>Field-based project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/Project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was project monitoring and reporting adequate?</td>
<td>Project monitoring and reporting was adequate</td>
<td>Progress reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DICO management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-effectiveness (inputs assessed in relation to outcomes)</td>
<td>Expenditure pattern as compared to budget?</td>
<td>Budget use and transparency and justification of budget revisions</td>
<td>Project monitoring and reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarities and synergies between the components</td>
<td>Which complementarities and synergies were created between MICs</td>
<td>Shared office and support staff Management meetings and consultations (field and HQ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint activities in implementation</td>
<td>Programme and MIE management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned</td>
<td>Which are the lessons learned?</td>
<td>Not known – will be evolving and follow from evaluation findings and assessment</td>
<td>Evaluation findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall analysis of evaluation findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Annex 3: List of Individuals seen and contacted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>H.E. Tekreth Kamrang</td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>MoC EIF Focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mr. Chhieng Pich</td>
<td>Director of DICO/ EIF and TDSP</td>
<td>MoC NIU CEDEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>HE Mao Thora</td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Chair SDC-PSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Mr. Thou Panha</td>
<td>EIF Programme Manager</td>
<td>MoC EIF Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Prince Sisowath Phearnuroth</td>
<td>Senior Technical Advisor, Project Coordinator</td>
<td>The International Trade Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Mr. Sven Callebaut</td>
<td>International Trade Advisor</td>
<td>MoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Mrs. Sylvie Bétemps Cochin</td>
<td>Trade Promotion Officer, Project Manager</td>
<td>The International Trade Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mr. Renato Lee</td>
<td>TDSP Advisor</td>
<td>MoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Mr. Jean Marie Brun</td>
<td>Project Management Advisor</td>
<td>SNEC-Support to commercialization of Cambodia rice project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Mr. James Edwin</td>
<td>Coordinator, M&amp;E</td>
<td>EIF-Executive Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Mr. Ratnasabapathy Manivannan</td>
<td>Regional Portfolio Manager</td>
<td>UNOPS EIF-TFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Mr. Daniel Gonzalez Levassor</td>
<td>EU Delegation to Cambodia (Trade)</td>
<td>EU- EIF Donor Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Mr. You Mab</td>
<td>Deputy Director General</td>
<td>MoC, General Directorate of Domestic trade, in charge of PSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Mr. SUON Prasith</td>
<td>Deputy Director General</td>
<td>MoC General Directorate of International Trade (Former EIF Programme Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Mr. Kith Pheara</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>MoC, General Directorate of Trade Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Mr. HEUNG Chak</td>
<td>Chief of Market Promotion Strategy Office</td>
<td>MoC/Department of Market Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Ms. Mao Kannha</td>
<td>M&amp;E CEDEP I Consultant</td>
<td>MOC-DICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Mrs. Mam Many</td>
<td>Deputy Director, M&amp;E</td>
<td>MoC-DICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Ms. Po Rathana</td>
<td>M&amp;E Officer</td>
<td>MOC-DICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Mr. Bas Rozemuller</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Mr. Duong Sarak</td>
<td>Head of Office</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Mr. Sem Viryak</td>
<td>M&amp;E Officer</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Mr. Charles Lor</td>
<td>Regional M&amp;E Specialist</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Mr. Sok Vannara</td>
<td>Operations Officer, Trade and Competitiveness</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Mr. Oum EngSetha</td>
<td>Chief Officer Department of rice Crops</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Mr. Um Serivuth</td>
<td>Deputy Director National productivity centre</td>
<td>Ministry of Industry and Handicrafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Mr. Poeuv Bunrith</td>
<td>Global Market Access Coordinator</td>
<td>Cambodian Rice Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Mr. Phang Phalla</td>
<td>Rice Farming Productivity Manager</td>
<td>Cambodian Rice Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Ms. Seng Thavy</td>
<td>Administrative Officer</td>
<td>Cambodian Rice Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Mr. Oung Sokhon</td>
<td>Director of Private Sector Development Department</td>
<td>SDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
<td>Organization/Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ms. Onie Luna</td>
<td>International Advisor</td>
<td>The International Trade Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mr. Nigel Smith</td>
<td>Regional Advisor</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mrs. Soth Sithon</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Economy Development</td>
<td>Ministry of Women Affair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mr. Jerry Lay</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>City Rice Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mr. Ki Dina</td>
<td>General Director</td>
<td>White Gold Import Export Co., Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mr. Heang Kimsour</td>
<td>Managing Director &amp; Export Sales</td>
<td>Eang Heang Milling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mr. Lim Pisan</td>
<td>Trading Manager</td>
<td>Golden Daun Keo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mr. Hong Yun</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Indochina Rice Mill Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mrs. Hok Thanan</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Kravan House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mrs. Norm Bunnak</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Village Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mr. Jan Hansen</td>
<td>Senior Country Economist</td>
<td>ADB, Cambodia Resident mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mrs. Nhean Veasna</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Women for Women/Happy Silk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mr Wenguo Cai</td>
<td>Evaluation Team Leader</td>
<td>EU Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Dr Sin Sovath</td>
<td>Evaluation Consultant</td>
<td>EU Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mr. Billy Ward</td>
<td>Evaluation Consultant</td>
<td>EU Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Mrs. Oum Yul</td>
<td>Silk Trader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Mrs. Phun Chanthou</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Mrs. Phun Phany</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mrs. Moeun Savoeun</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mrs. Bon Neth</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ms. Ros Sarith</td>
<td>Silk Trader &amp; Weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Mrs. Thai Bunny</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mrs. Chea Mom</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sok Sovann</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 4: Evaluation Overall Workplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deliverable/Milestone</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 August 2016</td>
<td>Desk study of project documents &amp; relevant narrative reports of CEDEP I</td>
<td></td>
<td>International and National Consultant</td>
<td>MoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11 August</td>
<td>Design a suitable initial evaluation methodology including a draft inception report</td>
<td>Inception report - Methodology, KII guidelines</td>
<td>International and National Consultant</td>
<td>MoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12 August</td>
<td>Develop a detailed field assessment plan</td>
<td>Mission Plan Completed (Ongoing throughout Evaluation)</td>
<td>International and National Consultant</td>
<td>MoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 August</td>
<td>Update Inception Report based on DICO feedback</td>
<td>Final Inception Report</td>
<td>International and National Consultant</td>
<td>MoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-31 August</td>
<td>Conduct field assessment in Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Reports of meetings with Direct beneficiaries and companies</td>
<td>International and National Consultant</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23 August</td>
<td>Field Mission Battambang (Milled Rice)</td>
<td>Reports of meetings with Direct beneficiaries and companies</td>
<td>International and National Consultant</td>
<td>Battambang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August</td>
<td>Attend EU Presentation</td>
<td>EU Findings</td>
<td>International and National Consultant</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 August</td>
<td>Field Mission Prey Veng (silk)</td>
<td>Reports of meetings with Direct beneficiaries and companies</td>
<td>International and National Consultant</td>
<td>Prey Veng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sept.</td>
<td>Annual Team Building Workshop</td>
<td>Presentation of Preliminary Findings</td>
<td>International and National Consultant</td>
<td>Siem Reap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sept.</td>
<td>Finalization of report upon receipt of feedback from MoC, SSC-TD-TRI</td>
<td>Submission of Midterm report covering project EIF Tier 1 CEDEP</td>
<td>International and National Consultant</td>
<td>Home based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 5: Summary and Goal of Project Development Impacts, Outcomes (and Objectives of Pillar 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Impacts</th>
<th>Trade SWAp</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Trade SWAp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILLED RICE</strong></td>
<td>Consistent with the five goals pursued under Cambodia’s Trade SWAp.</td>
<td><strong>Outcome #1:</strong> The Enabling Environment for the Cambodian Private Sector to meet the Government’s Target of <strong>One Million MT of Milled Rice Exports</strong> is enhanced and sustained through the creation of an Association of Rice Exporters. Dialogue on rice exports and implementation of rice policy is enhanced in the G-PS Forum or other venues.</td>
<td>Consistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of Trade SWAp Pillar 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact #1:</strong> Rice being the largest employment sector of the Cambodian economy, <strong>development of milled rice exports will have a positive impact on poverty reduction,</strong> especially through income growth in many regions of the country. Development of the sector supports Cambodia’s efforts to meet its MDGs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact #2:</strong> The competitiveness of Cambodian rice exports is increased resulting in <strong>better earnings</strong> of rice millers and farmers in the milled rice supply chain, led by its <strong>higher value</strong> fragrant rice segment.</td>
<td>Consistent with the five goals pursued under Cambodia’s Trade SWAp.</td>
<td><strong>Outcome #2:</strong> Cambodian Rice Millers are successful in identifying several <strong>new major import market opportunities</strong> (in addition to EU and Russia) and signing contracts in at least three new markets.</td>
<td>Consistent with Objective 3 of Trade SWAp Pillar 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH VALUE SILK</strong></td>
<td>Consistent with the five goals pursued under Cambodia’s Trade SWAp.</td>
<td><strong>Outcome #3:</strong> Cambodian Rice Millers are successful completing export contracts in the <strong>three targeted markets</strong> by meeting quantities, quality, and price requested by importers, especially with respect to fragrant rice which is developed as the leading Cambodian rice brand and meeting SPS standards requested by importers.</td>
<td>Consistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of Trade SWAp Pillar 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact #1:</strong> Increased competitiveness of the Cambodian silk sector with a positive impact on poverty reduction through employment creation and income growth, especially among women, thereby contributing to meet Cambodia’s MDGs.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outcome #1:</strong> Market Development. <strong>Increased export sales</strong> of handmade high value silk products by <strong>8 to 12 Cambodian silk exporters</strong> and their respective production networks of female weavers in rural villages, to <strong>up to 5 selected importing markets</strong>, and to international visitors.</td>
<td>Consistent with Objective 3 of Trade SWAp Pillar 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact #2:</strong> Focus on high value silk exports will contribute to developing Cambodia’s image of an economy that can compete not only on price but also on quality.</td>
<td>Consistent with the five goals pursued</td>
<td><strong>Outcome #2:</strong> Product Development, <strong>Improved quality and product design</strong> of handmade Cambodian silk products to meet market.</td>
<td>Consistent with Objectives 2 and...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Function Component and Core Teams</td>
<td>demand requirements for targeted export markets and from international visitors</td>
<td>3 of Trade SWAp Pillar 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 1: Enhancing the Government’s ability to lead and drive its Aid for Trade as a means to strengthen the effectiveness of the mainstreaming of Trade in its development policies and the development of its institutions</td>
<td>Consistent with Cambodia’s Trade SWAp Goal #5.</td>
<td>Consistent with Objectives 2 and 3 of Trade SWAp Pillar 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #1: Strengthen the NIU’s capacity to monitor and evaluate progress made under Trade SWAp, including evaluating impacts and results of technical assistance</td>
<td>Consistent with Objectives 3 and 4 of Trade SWAp Pillar 3</td>
<td>Consistent with Objectives 3 and 4 of Trade SWAp Pillar 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #2: Strengthening the NIU’s capacity to disseminate progress and results of technical assistance under Trade SWAp</td>
<td>Consistent with Objectives 3 and 4 of Trade SWAp Pillar 3</td>
<td>Consistent with Objectives 3 and 4 of Trade SWAp Pillar 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6: KII guideline with ministries, stakeholders and core teams

1. In what ways does the project address the needs of the beneficiaries? (Relevance). (E.g. Employment generation, Export Improvement, Poverty reduction);
2. Are there areas in which the project is achieving less than it could? Why? How can these constraints be overcome? (Effectiveness);
3. How effective is communication between the MIE, NIU (if relevant), the private sector, donors and agencies, other stakeholders and the related government line ministries? (Effectiveness);
4. Is the core team set-up well organized? Are the roles and responsibilities of team members clear to you? Why and why not? (Effectiveness);
5. What should be done differently to achieve optimal impact? (Efficiency);
6. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically by MIEs, Government and other donors to achieve outcomes? (Efficiency);
7. What are the most significant impacts of the project? Why do you think so? (Impact);
8. Do you think that EIF contributes to poverty reduction? Why? (Impact);
9. Based on your observation, are there any significant indirect impacts? (Impact);
10. How effective has the project been in establishing national ownership? How have in-country stakeholders, including the private sector been involved in project implementation? (Sustainability);
11. Are the project results likely to be durable and anchored in national institutions (Sustainability)?;
12. Do you think that the government and related national institutions are likely to maintain the project financially once external funding ends? (Sustainability);
13. What is the exit plan to ensure a proper hand-over to the Government/DICO and institutions after the project ends? (Sustainability);
14. Do you think that the national partners are able, willing and committed to continue with the project? (Sustainability)

Annex 7: FGD guideline with beneficiaries

Generic questions have been designed that can be asked across multiple components. This makes comparison of qualitative data easier.
1. What kind of support do you receive from ITC or IFC? Based on your opinion why this project supports you? (Relevance);
2. Do you receive support from any other projects? How different is the support that you receive from ITC or IFC? Which one do you prefer? (Effectiveness);
3. Are there ways the project could do things better/ more efficiently? (Efficiency);
4. What have been the changes in the quantity and quality (standards) of your goods/products? (Effectiveness);
5. Have you been able to diversify your products/goods and has their value increased? (effectiveness-impact);
6. With the support of ITC or IFC, what are the positive and negative changes with your organization/association? (Impact);
7. With the support given, do you think that it will help to grow your business? Why or why not? (Sustainability);
8. Do you believe the changes introduced by the project are sustainable? (Sustainability);
9. For the future project, what kind of support do you need the most? Why? (Future plan)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEDEP I Component</th>
<th>Approved Budget in MoU (EIF only)</th>
<th>Funds used</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funds used</td>
<td>Disbursement rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milled Rice Component</td>
<td>1,112,847.00</td>
<td>708,109.00</td>
<td>100% (from TFM)</td>
<td>404,738.00</td>
<td>This figure is as at 31 Dec 2015 Final report from IFC is still awaited, in which the final funds used should be reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Value Silk</td>
<td>1,004,347.00</td>
<td>920,283.00</td>
<td>100% (from TFM)</td>
<td>29,373.00</td>
<td>Latest figures according to ITC. Final Financial Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Function and Organization of Core Team Component</td>
<td>290,520.00</td>
<td>139,978.14</td>
<td>43.26%</td>
<td>283,684.00</td>
<td>65,520.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 10: DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance

Relevance
The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.
In evaluating the relevance of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- To what extent are the objectives of the Programme still valid?
- Are the activities and outputs of the Programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Are the activities and outputs of the Programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

Effectiveness
A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.
In evaluating the effectiveness of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

Efficiency
Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

When evaluating the efficiency of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- Were activities cost-efficient?
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

Impact
The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions.

When evaluating the impact of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- What has happened as a result of the programme or project?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
- How many people have been affected?

Sustainability
Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

When evaluating the sustainability of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project continue after donor funding ceased?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?
