SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE

Second Mid-Term Review for the Trade Related Facility

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 2 – Infrastructure, sustainable growth and jobs
EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

FED/2019/407563

Contracting Authority: EU Delegation to Botswana and SADC

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background

These Terms of Reference concern a Mid Term Evaluation of the SADC Trade Related Facility (TRF) programme – to be contracted through EU Framework contract.

Within the Regional Indicative Programme (RIP) of the 10th EDF, 2 focal areas were identified for cooperation within the SADC region: (1) Regional Economic Integration and (2) Regional Political Cooperation. The general objective of the 1st focal area is to provide broad-based support to deepen SADC economic integration and trade policies, including investment promotion, regional infrastructure and food security.

The TRF Contribution Agreement (value of €31.6m) was signed on 28th July 2014 and formal implementation started on 01st October 2014; however, actual implementation of activities under the Contribution Agreement began with the arrival of the technical assistance team on 05th January 2015 and will continue until 30th September 2019. While Financing Agreements were signed by 27 July 2017, project implementation in most beneficiary countries only commenced after receipt of the 30% advance payment, which in some cases was used to mobilise implementation arrangements such as recruitment of Project Management Units (PMUs) staff Indicative nominal allocations (INA) were outlined in the Contribution Agreement, with scope for reallocation based on Member State performance and the recommendations of the two mid-term reviews planned under the TRF, while there was also the possibility of reallocation between the STP and EPA windows, if required.

The TRF Programme intends to focus on the implementation of regional programmes and EPA related commitments at the national level. As such, TRF is a Member States driven and focused programme, where a critical role is foreseen for the SADC structures at the national level, such as the SADC National Committees and Focal Points. TRF aims to boost intra-regional and inter-regional trade through stronger implementation and domestication of the SADC Trade Protocol (STP). Simultaneously, the TRF wants to provide opportunities to the SADC-EU Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) countries to take full advantage of this trade agreement and will thus provide support to address EPA related challenges and support its implementation. As such, the main beneficiaries of TRF are the Directorate for Trade, Industry, Finance and Investment (TIFI) and the SADC Member States.

The TRF programme is one of a complementary package of programmes supporting the regional economic integration agenda. The other programmes in the package are the Project Preparation Development Facility (PPDF) and the Regional Economic Integration Support (REIS) programme. The PPDF is funding the preparation of financing proposals for sizeable economic infrastructure investment projects within the SADC region. Thus, the PPDF aims to address the infrastructure aspect of the constraints to higher levels of economic growth and deeper regional integration. The REIS has a regional focus and looks to enhance institutional capacities in the SADC Secretariat in trade and investment related areas through addressing implementation and domestication of the SADC Trade Protocol and the SADC Finance and Investment Protocol; REIS is also providing support to the negotiations and implementation of the SADC-EU EPA.

Under the 11th EDF this programme will be complementary to the programme in support of the Investment and Business Environment (SIBE) and the EU-SADC Trade Facilitation Programme as well as the Support to the Industrialisation and the Productive sectors (SIPS). The ongoing Transport and Transit Facilitation Programme addresses transport related Non-Tariff Barriers that hamper intra-regional trade across the Tripartite region.

1.2   The Action to be evaluated

Title of the Action to be evaluated	Support to the SADC Trade Related Facility
Budget of the Action to be evaluated	EUR 31,600,000
CRIS number of the Action to be evaluated	FED/2014/346-288
Dates of the Action to be evaluated	• Start: 28/07/2014 • End: 30/09/2021

The TRF programme has the following objectives, results and key activities:

The **Overall Objective of the Programme** is to improve the participation of SADC Member States in regional and international trade in order to contribute to sustainable development in the SADC region.

The **Specific Objective of the Programme** is to enhance the implementation of the STP and the SADC EPA to increase intra-regional and inter-regional trade flows of the concerned SADC Member States.

The Contribution Agreement introduces **2 Key Result Areas** (KRAs) for the TRF programme:

- Key Result Area 1: STP window – higher level of compliance and implementation of the STP's commitments by the SADC Member States is achieved;
- Key Result Area 2: EPA window – SADC EPA Member States are better prepared to effectively implement and monitor the EPA and benefit from it, particularly in terms of improved market access.

The **activities** (in brief) under each KRA as envisaged in the Contribution Agreement are described as follows:

KRA 1: STP window – higher level of compliance and implementation of the STP's commitments by the SADC Member States is achieved.

This window will focus on removal of Non-Tariff Barriers (NTB) for all goods (including agricultural) and services, including: (1) enhanced customs cooperation; (2) TBT/SPS; (3) Rules of Origin; (4) Trade Facilitation; (5) Industrial Development; (6) Trade Promotion and Development; and (7) Trade in Services.

KRA 2: EPA window – SADC EPA Member States are better prepared to effectively implement and monitor the EPA and benefit from it, particularly in terms of improved market access.

This window may support activities similar to those carried out under the STP window, such as NTBs, Rules of Origin, Trade Facilitation, SPS/TBT and Trade in Services. But it will also support additional (and exclusive) activities, including: (1) Trade Defence Instruments; (2) Tariffs; (3) Trade Related Adjustment; and (4) Competition Policy.

TRF has two main components of support: financial support to SADC Member States and technical assistance. The financial support (EUR 20 million) intends to fund directly programmes and projects at the national level in the eligible Member States with the objective to strengthen implementation of regional trade commitments by those countries.

A Call of Applications was issued and countries submitted project proposals. This resulted in 12 contracts with 12 SADC member states being signed, most of them in July 2017. All Member States opted to adopt a project-based approach for implementation (though 6 could qualify for Budget Support), which has resulted in all Member States implementing projects in accordance with relevant SADC financial and procurement rules and procedures. This development contributed to unforeseen delays in project roll-

out and implementation arising from many Member States not having the capacity to implement projects using SADC financial/procurement rules and procedures. However, with targeted capacity-development and training provided under TRF, this aspect was rectified.

The technical assistance (TA) part of TRF has been providing a team of three long-term Key Experts (KEs) – a dedicated Team Leader, as well as a key expert on the SADC Trade Protocol and a key expert on the Economic Partnership Agreement – supporting the IDT Department within the SADC Secretariat as well as the SADC Member States to implement fully and benefit from the TRF. After a restructuring of the FSU to better focus on project management, the FSU TA team has been reduced to two Experts i.e. one team leader and one technical expert, with support from a project administrator. The experts are housed within the Facility Support Unit (FSU), an external PMU contracted through the SADC Secretariat on the basis of a service contract, implemented by GFA Consulting.

1.3   Stakeholders of the Action

The SADC Secretariat and MS as implementing bodies will be the main stakeholders and the direct beneficiaries of the TRF. Several national institutions and organisations, notably the ministries in charge of trade, industry, agriculture, the SADC national contact points, relevant inter-ministerial committees on TBT, SPS, etc. have an important role in the implementation of activities which they are expected to benefit from in terms of capacity strengthening.

1.4   Other available information

- Contribution Agreement FED/2014/346/288 "support the SADC TRF" and Annexes;
- Interim reports;
- First MTR done in 2016: Annex VII contains a summary of the conclusions of the first MTR and follow-up action;
- ROM December 2017;
- ROM December 2018.

2   DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	Mid-term
Coverage	The Action in its entirety
Geographic scope	SADC and its member states
Period to be evaluated	from 01/January/2017 to date

This will be a second MTR of the programme, further to the agreed 2 year no cost extension of its operational duration up to 30 September 2021.

The second MTR will therefore evaluate the period not evaluated by the first MTR (roughly since January 2017). The second MTR will therefore *focus* on progress to date and, by explaining **why** progress is happening or is not happening as planned, provide recommendations on how to improve the Action during its residual duration in order to achieve the expected objectives, taking into account problems and opportunities. The evaluation should also review the Logframe and update and re-purpose it, if necessary, to ensure it is fit-for-purpose in the no-cost extension period.

The MTR will also provide recommendations on how to best link and synergise with forthcoming 11th EDF funded programmes and on lessons learnt regarding the implementation modality and conclusions for the next programming period.

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority[1] of the European Commission[2]. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results[3]** of Actions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs.**[4]

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek **to identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union, the interested stakeholders and the SADC Secretariat and SADC Member States with:

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the Trade Related Facility, paying particular attention to its intermediate results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
- identification of any likely gaps or unintended consequences arising from the delays and challenges encountered and/or the key issues to be addressed under the no-cost extension period;
- key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve current and future Actions;
- identification of any outstanding or unfinished aspects that may need to be addressed under any future programme and/or by other programmes/projects underway or planned.

In particular, this evaluation will serve to understand the performance of the Action, its enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of results as to inform the planning of the future EU interventions and Actions in the same sector.

The main users of this evaluation will be the Delegation of the European Union to Botswana and SADC, the SADC Secretariat and SADC Member States.

---

[1] COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/200; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

[2] SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf ; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf ; COM(2017) 651 final 'Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf

[3] Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf.

[4] The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC

2.2 Requested services

2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Action using four of the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and perspectives of impact. The criteria on relevance has been sufficiently analysed in the previous MTR as well as in ROM reports and does not require an update.

In particular this evaluation will assess the following:

- The materialisation of the expected results (or perhaps only some of them) and their facilitating and contrasting factors;
- The performance of the management at both regional (SADC Secretariat) and national levels (relevant Ministry and PMUs) and its capacity to adapt to changing conditions;
- The governing mechanisms of the Action.

In addition, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Action brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);
- the coherence of the Action itself, with the EU strategy in in the SADC region and with other EU policies and Member State Actions.

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed; the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Action, its governance and monitoring.

2.2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific Evaluation Questions as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager[5] and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

2.2.2.1 Achievement of purpose (Effectiveness)

The effectiveness criterion, concerns how far the project's results were attained, and the project's specific objective(s) achieved, or are expected to be achieved.

The analysis of Effectiveness will therefore focus on such issues as:

- whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received, as perceived by all key stakeholders;
- whether intended beneficiaries participated in the intervention;

---

[5] *The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational manager of the Action(s) under evaluation.*

- How flexibly management has adapted to ensure that the results would still achieve the purpose; and how well has it been supported in this by key stakeholders including the SADC Secretariat, the EU Delegation and the Steering Committee;

- Whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was appropriate.

2.2.2.2 Sound management and value for money (Efficiency)

The efficiency criterion concerns how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results (sometimes referred to as outputs), in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Comparison should be made against what was planned at both regional and national levels.

The assessment of Efficiency will therefore focus on such issues as:

- the quality of day-to-day management, for example in:

  a. operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs), and management of the budget (including cost control and whether an inadequate budget was a factor);

  b. management of personnel;

  c. whether management of risk has been adequate, i.e. whether flexibility has been demonstrated in response to changes in circumstances;

  d. the quality of information management and reporting, and the extent to which key stakeholders have been kept adequately informed of project activities (including beneficiaries/target groups);

  e. respect for deadlines.

- Extent to which the costs of the project have been justified by the benefits whether or not expressed in monetary terms in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches, taking account of contextual differences and eliminating market distortions;

- Technical assistance: how well did it help to provide appropriate solutions and develop local capacities and produce results;

- Quality of monitoring: its existence, accuracy and flexibility and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information;

- Did any unplanned outputs arise so far?

2.2.2.3 Likely continuation of achieved results (Sustainability)

- the ownership of objectives and achievements, e.g. how far all stakeholders were consulted on the objectives from the outset, and whether they agreed with them and continue to remain in agreement;

- policy support and the responsibility of the beneficiary institutions, e.g. how far donor policy and national policy are corresponding, the potential effects of any policy changes; how far the relevant national, sectoral and budgetary policies and priorities are affecting the project positively or adversely; and the level of support from governmental, public, business and civil society organizations.

- institutional capacity, e.g. (i) of the Governments (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) and counterpart institutions; the extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures; whether the institution appears likely to be capable of continuing the flow of benefits

after the project ends (is it well-led, with adequate and trained staff, sufficient budget and equipment?); whether counterparts have been properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially; and (ii) of SADC Secretariat (through technical assistance and budgetary support) the extent to which it can mobilise expertise internally to manage similar programme and build synergies with other cooperating partner institutions; the extent to which other programmes have been supported in sustaining their results for the future.

- the adequacy of the project budget for its purpose particularly phasing out prospects;

2.2.2.4 Achievement of wider effect (Impact)

- of policy at national level;

- of interventions on regional policy instruments;

- collaboration of Member States in areas of common interest (that promote the regional economic integration agenda);

- collaboration of member states towards enhancing the SADC EPA;

2.2.2.5 EC value added

Connection to the interventions of Member States. Extent to which the project/programme (its objectives, targeted beneficiaries, timing, etc .)

- is complementary to the intervention of EU Member States in the region.

- Is complementary to the SADC regional economic integration agenda.

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in three phases:

- Inception/desk
- Field
- Synthesis

The outputs of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

2.3.1 Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 0.

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and *meetings*
Inception/Desk Phase	• Initial document/data collection • Background analysis • Teleconference with EU Delegation, SADC Secretariat and FSU • Stakeholder analysis • Reconstruction (or as necessary, construction) of the Intervention Logic, and / or description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews) • Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix • In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions) • Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase • Methodological design of the Field Phase	• Meeting with EU Delegation to Botswana and SADC,SADC Secretariat and Technical Assistance Team • Inception report • Slide presentation of key findings • *Meeting with Reference Group (which will initiate the field phase)*
Field Phase (visit to some member states)	• Initial meetings with key informants • Gathering of primary evidence with the use of the interviews and other appropriate techniques • Data collection and analysis	• Initial meetings at SADC Secretariat with key informants • Initial meetings at level of visited country level with key informants and stakeholders • Intermediary Note • Slide Presentation of key findings of the field • Face to face debriefing with the Reference Group in Gaborone
Synthesis phase	• Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions) • Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations • Updating of the TRF Logframe, if required • Reporting	• Draft Final Report • Executive Summary according to the standard template published in the EVAL module • Reviewed/updated TRF Logframe • Final Report after comments

2.3.2 Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

The phase will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluators from home. It will then continue with a kick-off session in Gaborone between the EU delegation to Botswana and SADC and the SADC Secretariat as well as the FSU Team and the evaluators. Half-day presence of the evaluators is required. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex II).

Further to a first desk review of the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of EU support to SADC in the field of Trade and Regional Economic Integration, the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, will reconstruct or as necessary construct, the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated.

Furthermore, based on the Intervention Logic, the evaluators will develop a narrative explanation of the logic of the Action that describes how change is expected to happen within the Action, all along its results chain, i.e. Theory of Change. This explanation includes an assessment of the evidence underpinning this logic (especially between outputs and outcomes, and between outcomes and impact), and articulates the assumptions that must hold for the Action to work, as well as identification of the factors most likely to inhibit the change from happening.

Based on the Intervention Logic and the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases.

The methodological approach will be represented in an Evaluation Design Matrix[6], which will be included in the Inception Report. The **methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive**, **contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how actions have contributed to progress on gender equality**.

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception Report. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception Report**; its content is described in these TORs.

2.3.3 Desk Phase

This phase is when the document analysis takes place. The analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing literature relevant to the Action.

The analysis of the relevant documents shall be systematic and reflect the methodology developed and approved during the Inception Phase.

Selected phone interviews with some focal points in selected SADC Member States as well as with other institutions may be conducted during this phase to support the analysis of secondary sources.

---

[6] *The Evaluation Matrix is a tool to structure the evaluation analysis (by defining judgement criteria and indicators for each evaluation question). It helps also to consider the most appropriate and feasible data collection method for each of the questions,*

The activities to be conducted during this phase should allow for the provision of preliminary responses to each evaluation question, stating the information already gathered and its limitations. They will also identify the issues still to be covered and the preliminary hypotheses to be tested.

During this phase the evaluation team shall fine-tune the evaluation tools to be used during the Field Phase and describe the preparatory steps already taken and those to be taken for its organisation, including the list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.

At the end of the desk phase a **Slide Presentation** will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 0.

A presentation by the evaluation team to the Reference Group, if needed, will take place in Gaborone. One day presence of the evaluators is required (excluding travel time).

2.3.4   Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Slide Presentation and Inception Report by the Evaluation Manager.

The Field Phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Desk phase and further completing information through primary research.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation or not respecting the end of the validity of the specific contract, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the programme management, the EU Delegation to Botswana and SADC and the SADC Secretariat.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government authorities and agencies in SADC Member States. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the programme management (including TA Team and SADC Secretariat) and the EU Delegation to Botswana and SADC.

At the end of the Field Phase an **Intermediary Note** will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 0.

2.3.5   Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of **two distinct documents**: the **Executive Summary** and the **Final Report**, whose structures are described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present, in a single Report with Annexes, their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the structure in Annex III; a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well, following the compulsory format given in the EVAL module (see Annex III).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.

- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.

- The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will deliver and then present in Gaborone the **Draft Final Report** to the Reference Group to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. One day of presence of the evaluation team is required.

The Evaluation Manager consolidates the comments expressed by the Reference Group members and sends them to the evaluation team for the report revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the QAG will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required, and the evaluation team will be invited to comment on the conclusions formulated in the QAG (through the EVAL Module).

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team must explain the reasons in writing. After approval of the final report, the QAG will be updated and sent to the evaluators via EVAL Module.

2.4 Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

The invited Framework Contractors will submit their specific Contract Organisation and Methodology by using the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii). A short 5-page Methodology should be prepared by the proposed Evaluation Team and, based on their expertise and experience, outline how the evaluation mission will be conducted to ensure a quality outcome.

The evaluation methodology proposed to undertake the assignment will be described in the Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-i. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference and notably gender equality and the empowerment of women. This will include (if applicable) the communication action messages, materials and management structures.

By derogation of what is specified in the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i, the maximum length of the specific Contract Organisation and Methodology is 7 pages, written in Times New Roman 12 or Arial size 11, single interline, excluding the framework contractor's own annexes (maximum length of such annexes: 3 pages), additional to the Annexes foreseen as part of the present Specific ToRs. The timetable is not accounted and may be presented on an A3 page.

2.5 Management and Steering of the evaluation

2.5.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager of the EUD; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of the EUD to Botswana and SADC the SADC Secretariat and the FSU Team and one representative from the Steering Committee.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

- To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.

- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.
- To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
- To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

2.5.2   At the Contractor level

Further to the Requirements set in the art. 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of: the process; the evaluation design; the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

- Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood.
- Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.
- Ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

2.6   Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

3   EXPERTISE REQUIRED

3.1   Number of experts and of working days per category

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and in the field), per category of experts to be foreseen by the Contractor.

Category of experts	Minimum number of evaluators	Total minimum number of working days (cumulative)	(Out of which) minimum number of working days on mission (cumulative)
Cat I	2	90	50

Both Experts are expected to be Cat I expert. The team Leader in particular (to be identified in the Organisation and Methodology and in the Financial Offer) should possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than 45 working days, out of which 25 in the field (see section on "location of the assignment" for further details).

3.2   Expertise required

Requirements of each Expert

- Have a Master's Degree in the field of economics, trade, development studies, finance and investment, trade law or business management OR relevant work experience of at least 10 years which must be above the professional experience duration fixed in points b), d) and e) below;

- For the Team Leader (KE1), experience in leading multi-disciplinary teams and must have conducted at least three (3) high-level evaluations, including at least one (1) relating to trade and regional integration;
- For KE2, experience in the sector of Trade and/or Regional Economic Integration and/or any other relevant field and must have undertaken at least three (3) high-level evaluations, , including at least one (1) relating to trade and regional integration;
- demonstrable experience in programme/project management of developmental programmes;
- demonstrable experience in monitoring and evaluation of developmental programmes;
- specific work experience of at least 5 years, in relevant technical areas, in regional contexts (preferably in the SADC region);
- be competent in the use of word processing, spread-sheet and presentation software; and
- be fluent in written and spoken English (competence in French and/or Portuguese would be an advantage).

Requirements of the team

- demonstrable knowledge of the SADC RISDP II, Industrialisation Policy, SADC Trade Protocol and SADC-EU EPA;
- demonstrable knowledge or experience of issues related to customs cooperation;
- demonstrable knowledge or experience in working on trade in services issues;
- demonstrable knowledge or experience in working on issues related to Rules of Origin;
- demonstrable knowledge or experience of work in the area of Trade Facilitation;
- demonstrable knowledge or experience in the fields of standardisation, quality assurance, accreditation, metrology and conformity assessment and/or addressing SPS/TBT issues;
- demonstrable knowledge or experience in industrial development;
- demonstrable knowledge or experience in issues related to trade promotion and trade development;
- demonstrable knowledge or experience in work related to trade defence instruments (institutional and legal frameworks);
- demonstrable knowledge or experience in work related to tariffs;
- demonstrable knowledge or experience in issues around trade related adjustment;
- demonstrable knowledge or experience in working with competition policy;
- demonstrable knowledge or experience of working with Non-State Actors as well as government structures; and
- demonstrable affinity in promoting gender equality and inclusive development.

Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.

The European Union pursues an equal opportunities policy. Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended.

3.3 Presence of management team for briefing and/or debriefing

The presence of member(s) of the management team is not required for briefing or debriefing purposes.

4 LOCATION AND DURATION

4.1 Starting period

Provisional start of the assignment is beginning of September 2019.

4.2 Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar days

Maximum duration of the assignment: 180 calendar days.

This overall duration includes working days, week-ends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, and distribution of outputs.

4.3 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff[7]

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception Report). The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as '0').

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national / local or other stakeholders.

4.4 Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will take place in Botswana for the purposes of face-to-face engagements with the EU Delegation, SADC Secretariat and the FSU. Engagements with all participating Member States (and key national stakeholder representatives[8]) will be expected to be undertaken by e-mail and by telephone to ensure a comprehensive feedback process is assured.

However, travel to selected Member States[9] and face-to-face engagements with the key stakeholders will be required on a prioritised basis, under guidance from the Reference Group. Indicatively, prioritised Member States for which in-country travel and face-to-face engagements are anticipated are: Botswana, Eswatini, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi and Tanzania. The final selection of countries to be visited will be agreed with the evaluators at the Inception Phase and with guidance from the Reference Group.

5 REPORTING

5.1 Content, timing and submission

The outputs must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of Action is required (to be attached as Annex).

List of outputs:

---

[7] *As per art 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA*

[8] *Stakeholders include: SADC TRF National Focal Point; TRF Project Coordinator; MS National Steering Committee representatives; TRF Project Beneficiaries; National Ministries of relevance;*

[9] *12 Member States (out of 16 SADC MS) are participating under TRF i.e. Botswana; Eswatini; Lesotho; Madagascar; Malawi; Mauritius; Mozambique; Namibia; Seychelles; Tanzania; Zambia; Zimbabwe. 4 Member States are not participating i.e. Angola; Comoros; D.R. Congo; and South Africa. All 12 Member States participate under Window 1: STP and 5 Member States participate under Window 2: EPA (i.e. Botswana, Eswatini, Lesotho, Mozambique and Namibia.*

	Number of Pages *(excluding annexes)*	Main Content	Timing for submission

Inception Report	20 pages	• Intervention logic
		• Stakeholder map
		• Methodology for the evaluation, incl.:
		  ○ Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods
		  ○ Consultation strategy
		  ○ Field visit approach
		• Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures
		• Work plan
			End of Inception Phase

Desk Report	35 pages	• Preliminary answers to each Evaluation Question, with indication of the limitations of the available information • Data gaps to be addressed, issues still to be covered and hypotheses to be tested during the field visit	End of the Desk Phase
Intermediary Report	35 pages	• Activities conducted during the field phase • Difficulties encountered during the field phase and mitigation measures adopted • Key preliminary findings (combining desk and field ones)	End of the Field Phase
Draft Final Report	60 pages	• **Cf. detailed structure in Annex III**	End of Synthesis Phase
Draft Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template	N/A	• **Cf. detailed structure in Annex III**	End of Synthesis Phase
Final report	60 pages	• Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted	2 weeks after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.
Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template	N/A	• Same specifications as for the Draft Executive Summary, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted	Together with the final version of the Final Report

5.2 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

It is strongly recommended that the **submission of deliverables** by the selected contractor **be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module**, an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related Specific contract validity.

5.3 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 21 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

5.4 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex V). The Contractor is given – through the EVAL module - the possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. The QAG will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation by the Evaluation Manager of the FWC SIEA's Specific Contract Performance Evaluation.

5.5 Language

All reports shall be submitted in English.

The Executive Summary of the final report shall be furthermore translated into:

- French and Portuguese

5.6 Number of report copies

Apart from their submission -preferably via the EVAL Module-, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in 5 paper copies and in electronic version at no extra cost.

5.7 Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum letter size 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

FED/2019/407563

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 2

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price[10].

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

Criteria	Maximum
Total score for Organisation and Methodology	*40*
• Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	**10**
• Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	**22**
• Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium	**4**
• Organisation of tasks including timetable	**4**
Score for the expertise of the proposed team	*60*
OVERALL TOTAL SCORE	*100*

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

3. INTERVIEWS DURING THE EVALUATION OF THE OFFERS

During the evaluation process of the offers received the Contracting Authority reserves the right to interview by phone one or several members of the proposed evaluation teams.

---

[10] *For more details about the 80/20 rule, please see the PRAG, chapter 3.3.10.5 - https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/about-funding-and-procedures/procedures-and-practical-guide-prag_en*

ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Action(s) to be evaluated

- SADC Regional Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered

- Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors

- Action financing agreement and addenda

- Action's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports

- European Commission's Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Reports, and other external and internal monitoring reports of the Action

- Action's mid-term evaluation report and other relevant evaluations, audit, reports

- Calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the Action(s)

- Any other relevant document

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action.

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The contractor will deliver – **preferably through their uploading in the EVAL Module** - **two distinct documents**: the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary**. They must be consistent, concise and clear and free of linguistic errors both in the original version and in their translation – if foreseen.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 6. Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The presentation must be properly spaced and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

''*This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission*''.

Executive Summary	A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. It is to be prepared by using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module.

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

1. Introduction	A description of the Action, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.
2. Answered questions / Findings	A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning.
3. Overall assessment *(optional)*	A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.3 Lessons learnt

Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.

4.1 Conclusions

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

4.2 Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

5. Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:
- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses.
- Evaluation Matrix
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)
- Relevant geographic map(s) where the Action took place
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE

This annex must be included by Framework Contractors in their Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it. Framework Contractors can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

Activity	Location	Indicative Duration in working days[11]		Indicative Dates
		Team Leader	Evaluator …	
Inception phase: total days				
•				
•				
Desk phase: total days				
•				
•				
Field phase: total days				
•				
•				
Synthesis phase: total days				
•				
•				
Dissemination phase: total days				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

---

[11] *Add one column per each evaluator*

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (since the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included **in the EVAL Module**; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, which will have the possibility to include their comments.

Action (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report			

Evaluation data			
Evaluation title			
Evaluation managed by		Type of evaluation	
CRIS ref. of the evaluation contract		EVAL ref.	
Evaluation budget			
EUD/Unit in charge		Evaluation Manager	
Evaluation dates	Start:	End:	
Date of draft final report		Date of Response of the Services	
Comments			
Project data			
Main project evaluated			
CRIS # of evaluated project(s)			
DAC Sector			
Contractor's details			
Evaluation Team Leader		Evaluation Contractor	
Evaluation expert(s)			

Legend: scores and their meaning

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

The evaluation report is assessed as follows

1. Clarity of the report

This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:

- Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers
- Highlight the key messages
- The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced
- Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding
- Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report)
- Avoid unnecessary duplications
- Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors
- The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document

(i)

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology
- The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations
- The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures

(i)

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

3. Validity of Findings

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Findings derive from the evidence gathered
- Findings address all selected evaluation criteria
- Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources
- When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts
- The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors

(i)

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	**Contractor's comments**	

4. Validity of conclusions		

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis
- Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions
- Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation
- Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations
- (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	**Contractor's comments**	

5. Usefulness of recommendations		

This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:

- Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions
- Are concrete, achievable and realistic
- Are targeted to specific addressees
- Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound
- (If relevant) provide advice for the Action's exit strategy, post-Action sustainability or for adjusting Action's design or plans

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	**Contractor's comments**	

6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis *(if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)*		

This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which: • Lessons are identified • When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s)	(i)

Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Contractor's comments	**Contractor's comments**

Final comments on the overall quality of the report	**Overall score**

ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S)

Project Description	Verifiable Indicators	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions/Risks
Overall Objective: To improve the participation of SADC member states in regional and international trade in order to contribute to sustainable development in the SADC region.			• Stable political and economic relations between SADC MS and the EU is maintained. • Commitments towards SADC regional integration remains strong.
Specific Objective (purpose): To enhance the implementation of the commitments made in the SADC Trade Protocol and the EPA to increase intra-regional and inter-regional trade flows of the concerned Member States	• Level of compliance in the implementation of STP commitments by SADC Member States • Level of intra-SADC trade (%) • Status of Institutions, policies and regulatory frameworks in Member States to implement SADC-EU EPA commitments • Level of trade between the SADC EPA Group and EU • Share of manufacturing value added in GDP (%)	• Annual reports on the state of **implementation of the Protocol/EPA** • www.tradebarriers.org • EU Market Access Database • Joint SADC-EU Trade Council Reports • Annual World Bank Doing Business Reports • TRF progress reports • Member State reports • Surveys to business associations	• SADC MS remain committed to the implementation of the SADC Trade Protocol in goods and services. • SADC EPA Members States and the EU remain on track for the conclusion of a comprehensive SADC-EU EPA and its implementation schedule.

Expected Results:			
Key result 1: Higher level of compliance and implementation of the SADC Trade Protocol's commitments by the SADC MS is achieved. *(Immediate outcome indicators:* • Level of implementation of the commitments taken in the STP by end of the TRF. • The number of annual reported NTBs compared to the base line year by end of the TRF. • The number of days needed to conduct cross border trade (export and import) compared to the base line scenario by end of the TRF.		• TRF reports • MS Government reports to the TRF • Steering committee meeting reports • SADC Secretariat reports and website • World Bank (Logistics Performance Index and Ease of Doing Business reports) • World Economic Forum (Global Competitive Index reports) • UNDP reports • TradeMark South Africa reports • Media reports • www.tradebarriers.org • Minutes of SADC Technical Committees (Services, TBT SPS and Customs) • Evaluation reports (mid term and final) • www.TradeMap.org • worldbank.wits.org • IMF balance of payments data and National Statistics Data • REIS reports	**Risks** • MS may not have enough interest and motivation to apply for the TRF facility. • Political interference at the level of the Steering committee may influence the decisions on funding. • SADC Member States may not have sufficient accountability and control systems in place to ensure funds are utilized according to their objectives. • Member States may not have the resources, capacity or discipline to report to the FSU according to the requirements in the TRF guidelines and Financial Agreements. **Assumptions** • Stable political and economic situation in SADC MS is maintained.

• Customs clearance time in comparison to baseline period by the end of the project. • Share of manufacturing value added in GDP by the end of the TRF) *Outputs:* • Customs clearance systems and border procedures automated • Customs policies and procedures benchmarked to international best practice • One stop borders established • Coordinated/integrated border management programmes developed and implemented • Electronic system for issuance of certificates of origin implemented • Electronic single window systems developed and	• Number of countries with automated customs clearance systems • Number of one-stop border post projects developed and implemented		• SADC MS remain committed to the implementation the SADC Trade Protocol. • Tripartite process complements and does not supersede the SADC Trade Protocol • Contribution Agreement modalities and procedures effectively implemented by SADC and FSU.

implemented • Policy and regulatory reforms to eliminate NTBs undertaken • National NTB focal points and national monitoring committees strengthened • Impact assessment studies on products and sector specific rules of origin undertaken • Systems for effective implementation of rules of origin established • Regulatory impact assessments and reform for TBTs and SPS undertaken • Technical capacity for implementation and monitoring of SPS and TBT measures developed • Conformity Assessment Bodies accredited • SPS measures notified to the WTO by end of the TRF. • Regulatory frameworks for managing trade in services established • Sector specific industrial policy strategies developed • National trade promotion strategies and programmes	• Number of countries implementing Coordinated Border Management projects • Countries issuing certificates of origin electronically • Electronic Single Window projects developed and implemented • Number of countries undertaking assessment and reforms in SPS and TBT • SPS measures notified to the WTO • Complaints on NTBs • Countries with functional NTB's National Monitoring Committees • The number of accredited Conformity Assessment Bodies and the number of industries with accredited certification. • Countries undertaking regulatory reforms and commitments in prioritised services sectors • Countries undertaking measures to promote regional and international trade • Countries implementing policies and strategies in support of regional industrial		

developed	development initiatives • The rank of SADC MS in the Ease of Cross Border trading • The rank of SADC MS in the logistics performance index		
Key result 2: SADC EPA MS are better prepared to effectively implement and monitor concluded elements of the EPA. *(Immediate outcome indicators*: • Level of implementation of commitments under EPA and necessary capacities for such implementation • Level of SADC EPA MS's exports to EU compared to base line data by the end of the TRF. • Time to export to the EU market compared to baseline period • Documentation required to export to EU market compared		• TRF reports • MS Government reports to the TRF • Steering committee meeting reports • SADC Secretariat reports and website • World Bank (Logistics Performance Index and Ease of Doing Business reports) • World Economic Forum (Global Competitive Index reports) • UNDP reports • Media reports • Minutes of the EPA implementation structures (Joint Council, SADC EPA Technical and Ministerial meetings) • Evaluation reports (mid-term and final) • REIS reports	**Risks** • MS may not have enough interest and motivation to apply for the TRF facility. • Communication between the TRF and MS may not be effective. • Political interference at the level of the Steering committee may influence the decisions on funding. • SADC Member States may not have sufficient accountability and control systems in place to ensure funds are utilized according to their objectives. • Member States may not have the resources, capacity or discipline to report to the FSU according to the requirements in the TRF guidelines and

to baseline period)			Financial Agreements
			Assumptions
Outputs:			• Stable political and economic situation in SADC MS and the EU is maintained.
• Trade remedy authorities established • Trade remedy legislation developed or revised • Adjustment measures to deal with revenue losses identified and implemented • Strategic frameworks to deal with revenue losses are identified and put into practice • Competition policy framework established/strengthened	• Countries with trade remedy institutions • Countries with trade remedy legislation Studies on revenue implications of EPA implementation • Countries with competition policy frameworks		• SADC EPA Member States and the EU remain on track for the conclusion of a comprehensive SADC-EU EPA and committed to its implementation. • Contribution Agreement modalities and procedures effectively implemented by SADC and FSU.

MTR RECOMMENDATIONS				
Folio	**Recommendation**	**Comments/Remarks**	**Follow-up action**	**Report/Update**
1. Governance	The role and function of the Steering Committee needs to be strengthened, so as to become a body that steers by its decisions, rather than mainly being informed.	Steering Committee is already foreseen as 'steering body' and takes decisions	None	Complete
	The Steering Committee needs to be more comprehensively, timely and systematically informed. It needs to receive quarterly reports (technical and financial) on TRF performance and on its plans. However, it should not be involved in the TRF day to day management.	Quarterly reports proposed.	FSU to submit Quarterly reports to SC members, aligned to the frequency of SC meetings	The reporting cycle was interrupted as Steering Committee could not convene quarterly meetings as planned
	The reports need to have a standard format and be concise	Templates already exist	None	Complete
	The SC membership should be reduced to be effective. Except for the EUD, the rapporteur and the supervised body (TIFI management), it should not have observing members. Rapporteur should be the FSU Team Leader	Recommendation not accepted as the composition of the SC is defined by the Contribution Agreement and justification is not considered adequate	None	Complete
	TIFI Directorate, the implementing body, should report, not have a voting membership in the Steering	Recommendation not accepted as the composition of the SC	None	Complete

Committee.	is defined by the Contribution Agreement and justification is not considered adequate		
Decisions of the Steering Committee should be shared within the TRF network	To be shared with Focal Points and PMU as appropriate	FSU to distribute SC decisions to Focal Points, PMU's and SC Members and Observers	Record of Steering Committee meetings now available on drop-box and is shared with PMU's and SC Members
The EUD in Botswana should continue to play an active role. The EU Delegations in the Member States where submissions are prepared and projects implemented should be invited to give their assessments to the Steering Committee.	Already taking place in an informal manner through the services of the EUD in Botswana	None	Complete
All relevant documentation, i.e. the quarterly reports and supporting documents, should be provided to Steering Committee members latest one week ahead of meetings.	Agreed	FSU to avail documentation to SC Members a week before meeting	Documentation to be availed to SC Members at least one week before meetings and also through the drop-box
There should be no requirement for consensus in decisions (as prescribed in the Operational Guidelines	Recommendation not accepted as the decision-making process of the SC is defined by the	None	Complete

		Contribution Agreement and operational guidelines and justification is not considered adequate		
2. FSU	The reporting requirements for FSU should be reduced (currently it takes major time): ➢ One-page monthly report - on intranet. ➢ Quarterly standard report (to TIFI and Steering Committee), ahead of the quarterly meetings. ➢ Annual report. ➢ These reports should be concise and according to a prescribed structure. They may be supported by documentation.	Agreed	FSU to report: -monthly one pager; -Quarterly standard format -Annual report	On-going
	The functions of the FSU should emphasize its substantive technical role, rather than an administrative function. The substantive functions should include support to Member States in preparation of applications,	Recommendation is not accepted as the FSU is already playing primarily a technical role; administrative role of FSU is limited to	FSU functions going forward will be on monitoring and evaluation and technical support for implementation	Complete

participation in their evaluation, advice on implementation of the projects where necessary and required, and monitoring implementation. The involvement of short term experts should not be necessary.	reporting and management of the call for applications (which is a major component of TRF implementation)	of projects	
The open EPA expert post should be filled with an expert with substantive EPA experience. Beyond support to possible additional applications to the EPA window, the implementation of respective projects and their monitoring will require expertise that is not available within the Secretariat.	Not relevant as position was filled prior to the finalization of the evaluation exercise	None	Completed
The FSU experts should participate in the two evaluation steps in cases where they have subject and/or country expertise. Decisions at both evaluation steps should be well documented in concise reports.	Not relevant as the evaluation of applications was finalized prior to the conclusion of the MTR report	None	Completed
The FSU should only be accountable to TIFI. The entire TRF programme, in turn is accountable to the SC, the oversight body.	This is the set-up as reflected in the Contribution Agreement where the FSU is the secretariat for the SC which has oversight over the	None	Completed

		programme			
	Less use should be made of short-term experts. Support to Member States should be made by FSU staff. The M&E framework and communication policy should be done in-house.	Partly agreed, but STE will be necessary for specialized inputs where currently FSU does not have direct expertise	FSU developed Communication and Visibility plan but has used STE for M&E support. Going forward FSU Experts and SADC staff will provide technical support to Member States as required	On-going
	The documentation system should be strengthened. Key documents (project document, Inception Report, quarterly reports) should be made available on an intranet.	Agreed	FSU to create project documentation directory	A shared drop-box folder has been developed which provides access to key project documentation
3. Relation to TIFI	The TRF Task Manager needs to have terms of reference and a clear role known to all stakeholders. S/he should have authority to lead FSU. The Team Leader of the FSU should have a managing role and report to the Task Manager.	Recommendation is not accepted as the TOR for the task manager are already in place	None	Completed
	Possibilities to relocate the FSU either to the Secretariat or to the sub-office where the REIS programme is located. This would improve the information	Recommendation is not accepted, due to limitations in office space within SADC buildings (REIS is also	None	Competed

	flow and stimulate better coordination.	housed in an external building and would not add value in terms of information sharing)		
	TRF should be treated as an autonomous body and be measured and managed according to its own results. Its members should generally not be required to attend TIFI meetings. Rather, they should receive their minutes where relevant.	Recommendation is not accepted as it is factually incorrect; TRF is a programme within the department of TIFI and as such reporting against TRF achievements is part of regular TIFI reporting; TRF staff is not required to attend/substitute TIFI staff but is invited for reasons of information sharing	None	Completed
	TRF should be integrated into SADC website based communication system (as REIS is).	The TRF Web-page is hosted on the SADC Web-page under the TIFI Directorate as are other projects. Information and updates are uploaded on the web-page and information articles are included in the monthly SADC Newsletter which is also published on the	None	Completed

		website		
4. Logical Framework	It should be reformulated to reduce and limit performance indicators. These should monitor TRF activities and outputs, rather than attempting to measure the wider integration process (see attached proposal for revised logical framework in Annex 7).	Recommendation is accepted and will be taken up as part of the development of the TRF M&E framework	TRF M&E Framework being formulated and logical framework elements to be included;	This is on-going. Indicators of performance for both the Overall Programme and national projects have been rationalized with regional focus being on implementation of STP and EPA commitments and national projects being assessed on completion of outputs.
5. Communication and Visibility and Information	-The information flow and exchange with other programmes, notably REIS, should be strengthened. -Information provision to stakeholders should be strengthened, notably on the progress of country programme implementation and their progress.	Agreed	FSU to facilitate information sharing with active EU and other Donor supported programmes, Steering Committee Members and Observers and Focal Points and PMU's in Member States	This is on-going through publications on the TRF web-page, Articles in the Inside SADC newsletter and through postings on drop-box in the shared folder and in national project folders
	An intranet with limited access for those involved in project	Agreed	FSU to create project documentation	A shared drop-box folder for relevant project

	implementation should be established with core information on projects.		directory and information sharing system	documentation has been created and is operational
	Peer-learning among Member States in programme implementation should be encouraged. Lessons from application preparation, implementation and monitoring should be exchanged.	Agreed	FSU to arrange Annual Coordination meetings and platforms for sharing knowledge. FSU to further share updates on implementation of projects in Member States among the 12 Beneficiary countries to facilitate peer review and sharing of experiences	The TRF Publicity Event held in Pretoria in August 2017 provided such a platform. This is to be followed up with similar events in July 2018 and in August 2019 where presentations will reflect successes and failures being experienced in the implementation of national projects.
	The communication and visibility plan should be revisited. Planned outputs should be reduced. The work should concentrate on the website. Interest can be built up through regular updates.	Recommendation is partially accepted and the communication strategy will be revised; the communication efforts should not concentrate only on the website however and this part of the recommendation is rejected	TRF Communication and Visibility Plan revised as recommended	Completed

6. Prescribed use of SADC Finance and Procurement	According to comments from some Member States, the use of EDF rules on country level should be considered because of the large number of EDF projects implemented in Member States. These rules are known by Member States. In the RISM programme (using EDF rules) the experience has been that while countries had initial problems to apply these rules and procedures, they eventually learned them and the National Authorizing Officers have been able to assist and advise	Recommendation not accepted as the use of SADC procurement procedures is defined by the Contribution agreement and justification is not considered adequate	None	Completed
7.	Relations to the stakeholders need to be strengthened, beyond awareness rising. In particular, relations and interaction with the private sector should be strengthened, among others through regular updates. This engagement could have several pillars. First, more provision on the aims and particularly on the progress of the TRF should be provided (on country programmes).	Agreed	FSU to create platforms and instruments for more dissemination of project related information. The Programme is now beyond the awareness raising stage and will now be disseminating updates on implementation of national projects through various media such as SADC Newsletters, Brochures and	The main vehicles for such communication will be the drop-box, TRF web-page, Inside SADC Newsletter and periodic TRF Progress Updates on project implementation. There will also be independent assessments on benefits arising from implementation of national projects and these will be distributed as

			through Focal Points and national PMU's	reports and case studies
	Second, the involvement of the private sector representative organisations (chambers of commerce, sector associations where appropriate) at the different stages of the project preparation and implementation should be discussed with the National Focal Points. Even when projects focus exclusively on activities and capacity building of public agencies, these would gain from feedback of the private sector. After all, in almost all cases the private sector is involved in international trade.	Agreed	FSU and Secretariat to share information on programme implementation with private sector APEX bodies. The FSU will actively establish communication lines with APEX bodies in Member States implementing TRF projects for dissemination of information and will encourage Focal Points and PMU's to incorporate Private sector representation on national project Steering Committees	As above
	Third, although most regional umbrella bodies of the private sector are weak, the project should interact with them both by providing	Agreed and already being implemented	Private sector representatives are members of the Steering Committee	Complete

	information and requesting advice.			
	The SADC Secretariat needs to consider ways to reduce the complexities and rigidities of its procedures; particularly in terms of tendering, contracting, monitoring and the processing of disbursing funds.	Recommendation is not accepted as it goes beyond the scope of the TRF programme; moreover, SADC procedures are not deemed more complex than other procedures for international organizations	None	Complete
	Consideration needs to be given to improving and monitoring the quality of reports prepared by short-term experts. Some consideration should be given to the revision of short-term experts' ToRs to tailor them more to specific cases.	Agreed	Preparation and monitoring of STE inputs will be strengthened through internal control and quality assurance processes	Complete
Request Handling	There are some areas that need improvement with regard to the efficiency of request handling. One is the need to address the significant delay in processing requests from Member States. The provision of timely and appropriate feedback to beneficiaries who submitted requests should also be given due emphasis.	Agreed	FSU to provide timely responses and information to Focal Points and relevant authorities in Member states. FSU to develop service standards and communicate	On-going and being actively monitored

			them to Focal Points and PMU's	
Programme monitoring and follow-up	The monitoring activities and outputs under the TRF programme so far have focused mainly on the status of requests. When the implementation of the projects will start, the FSU technical advisers will have to focus on collecting and synthesising information on the qualitative results and achievements of supported projects. In particular, the monitoring system does not include mechanisms to follow up the results and impacts of completed projects. Therefore, it is recommended to put in place a monitoring system that captures adequately the progress and achievements in terms of meeting programme results and objectives. If the monitoring and evaluation system needs to be focused on spending and percentage of activities implemented, this monitoring and evaluation system has also to concentrate on content as the national level proposals are so diversified.	Agreed	FSU establishing an M&E framework that focuses on results	The main monitoring instrument is the Performance Assessment Framework focussing primarily on completion of outputs. This means that the TRF programme will have limited scope to assess outcomes and impacts.
SADC Secretariat should increase its engagement and monitoring efforts	FSU should be integrated within TIFI. The only condition is that FSU technical advisers will only have to	Recommendation is not accepted as this is already the case; relocation of TRF to the	None	Complete

	work on the TRF and not on other TFI issues. The relocation to SADC is recommended to strengthen coordination. TRF work plans and reporting are understood to be integrated into TIFI plans and reporting.	main SADC building is not feasible due to limitations of space		
	It is recommended that SADC Secretariat gets more actively engaged in supervision and follow-up of the TRF programme, without necessarily interfering with project management. This would potentially enhance effectiveness and efficiency, in addition to the overall transparency and accountability of the FSU. This may include SADC Secretariat:
➢ Insisting on a clear results-based framework with realistic/measurable indicators. ➢ Organising during Steering Committees consultations on project progress and implementation, including close on-going monitoring and	Agreed on close on-going monitoring and follow up of project reports	ID&T and Other relevant SADC Secretariat Directorates to be involved in monitoring and support of implementation of TRF supported projects	The TRF Programme has been mainstreamed in activities of technical officers in the ID&T Directorate

	follow-up of project reports.			
	➢ Demanding very strict audit procedures of implementing organisations and establishing strict measures that can be used if they are not followed;			
	➢ Engaging with other existing and potential donors in the same area of support.			