

Country Name	<b>Improving Small-Scale Farmers' Market-Oriented Agriculture Project</b>
Arab Republic of Egypt	

**I. Project Outline**

Background	<p>JICA implemented the “The Project for the Master Plan Study for Rural Development through Improving Marketing Agricultural Produce for Small Scale Farmers in Upper Egypt” (IMAP) in Minia and Assiut Governorates (2010 to 2012), and formulated a Master Plan (M/P) with the development goal of increasing small-scale farmers’ income. The M/P proposed a development approach to improve the income of small-scale farmers by promoting market-oriented agriculture and improving farming techniques, which the Government of Egypt would work to implement in the future. In order to promote the approach, it was important to provide technical extension and marketing support to change farmers’ attitudes and improve their technical skills. However, due to a lack of capacity and budget for extension staff, guidance on new farming technologies and farm management improvement, as well as marketing support, had not been sufficiently provided.</p> <p>While agricultural cooperatives were organized in all rural areas and had the potential as farmers’ organizations, with land, buildings, and other assets, as well as full-time staff with relatively high levels of education, they lacked the capacity and experience related to farmers’ commercial activities, and were thus unable to fully perform their functions.</p>				
Objectives of the Project	<p>Through (i) establishing market-oriented extension approach, (ii) examining and developing agricultural techniques for value-added products, (iii) strengthening capacities for making and implementing action plans of the agricultural cooperatives, and (iv) deploying farming methods based on the market-oriented approach within the target agriculture cooperatives, the project aims at increasing the agricultural incomes of the target and surrounding small-scale farmers who practice the ISMAP Approach (Improving Small-scale Farmers’ Market-oriented Agriculture Project)* and thereby contributing to increasing the agricultural incomes of the small-scale farmers in the target and surrounding villages in Minia and Assiut Governorates.</p> <p>*The ISMAP Approach was developed based on SHEP Approach (Smallholder Horticulture Empowerment &amp; Promotion Approach, developed in Kenya through technical cooperation project). SHEP is an approach which realizes “Market-Oriented Agriculture” and converts farmers mind from “grow and sell” to “grow to sell”. Characteristics of SHEP approach include conducting market surveys by farmers themselves, establishing business linkages between farmers and business service providers, and promoting gender equality.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall Goal: Agricultural incomes of the small-scale farmers in the target villages and surrounding villages<sup>*1</sup> in Minia and Assiut Governorates are increased.</li> <li>Project Purpose: Agricultural incomes of the target small-scale farmers and surrounding small-scale farmers<sup>*2</sup> who practice the ISMAP Approach are increased.</li> </ol> <p>*1) Definition of the “surrounding villages” is two surrounding villages per one target village in the Project. The Overall Goal aims at disseminating the ISMAP Approach to increase the farmers’ incomes at the village level.</p> <p>*2) Definition of the “surrounding small-scale farmers” is two surrounding farmers per one targeted farmer. The Project Purpose aims for the ISMAP Approach to be effectively applied to the targeted farmers and also aims for the surrounding small-scale farmers to understand its effectiveness and apply this approach.</p> <p>Note: Approximately 40 target small-scale farmers from all 20 districts in Minia and Assiut County (20 districts x 40 = 800 farmers) and 2 per target small-scale farmer as surrounding small-scale farmers (800 x 2 = 1,600 farmers)</p>				
Activities of the project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project site: All districts in Minia and Assiut Governorates (9 and 11 districts each). One village per district was selected (Total 20 villages).</li> <li>Main activities: (i) establishing market-oriented extension approach, (ii) examining and developing agricultural techniques for value-added products, (iii) strengthening capacities for making and implementing action plans of the agricultural cooperatives, and (iv) deploying farming methods based on the market-oriented approach within the target agriculture cooperatives.</li> <li>Inputs (to carry out above activities)</li> </ol> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>Japanese Side</b>            1) Experts: 6 persons            2) Trainees received: 29 persons            3) Equipment: printers, digital camera, etc.            4) Local cost: cost for transportation, training, etc.         </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>Egyptian Side</b>            1) Staff allocated: 47 persons            2) Facility: Office space for the Japanese experts            3) Project running cost: Salary of counterparts, utilities, and a part of expenses for training of trainers (TOT)         </td> </tr> </table>			<b>Japanese Side</b> 1) Experts: 6 persons 2) Trainees received: 29 persons 3) Equipment: printers, digital camera, etc. 4) Local cost: cost for transportation, training, etc.	<b>Egyptian Side</b> 1) Staff allocated: 47 persons 2) Facility: Office space for the Japanese experts 3) Project running cost: Salary of counterparts, utilities, and a part of expenses for training of trainers (TOT)
<b>Japanese Side</b> 1) Experts: 6 persons 2) Trainees received: 29 persons 3) Equipment: printers, digital camera, etc. 4) Local cost: cost for transportation, training, etc.	<b>Egyptian Side</b> 1) Staff allocated: 47 persons 2) Facility: Office space for the Japanese experts 3) Project running cost: Salary of counterparts, utilities, and a part of expenses for training of trainers (TOT)				
Project Period	(ex-ante) May 2013 – April 2018 [60 months] (actual) May 2014 – May 2019 [60 months] <sup>1</sup>	Project Cost (Japanese side only)	(ex-ante) 507 million yen, (actual) 466 million yen		
Implementing Agency	Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR)				

<sup>1</sup> The actual project period was from May 30, 2014 to May 29, 2019.

Cooperation Agency in Japan	Sanyu Consultants Inc.
-----------------------------	------------------------

## II. Result of the Evaluation

<Special Perspectives Considered in the Ex-Post Evaluation>

- Continuation status of Indicator 1 and 3 of the Project Purpose were verified under the Overall Goal.

### Relevance/Coherence

[Relevance]

<Consistency with the Development Policy of Egypt at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation >

The project was consistent with the development policy of Egypt at the time of ex-ante evaluation. In its “Sustainable Agricultural Development Strategy 2030 (SADS) Towards 2030,” MALR set forth its vision of “achieving integrated economic and social development based on a continuously and rapidly growing and dynamic agricultural sector, with attention to pro-poor and rural poverty reduction.” Its strategic objectives include “improving the competitiveness of agricultural products in national and international markets”, “improving living standards in rural areas, and “reducing poverty rates” among others.

<Consistency with the Development Needs of Egypt at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation >

The project was consistent with the development needs of Egypt at the time of ex-ante evaluation. As mentioned above (“Background”), although market-oriented agriculture was proposed, guidance on new cultivation technologies and farm management improvement, as well as marketing support had not been sufficiently provided due to the lack of capacity and budget of extension staff.

<Appropriateness of Project Design/Approach>

The project design/approach was highly appropriate. Key points in the project design that contributed to the equitable delivery of benefits to vulnerable communities included sharing goals with farmers, raising awareness through surveys and dialogues, and providing technical training in agriculture. In addition, the project tackled social norms by providing separate activities for women, selecting tasks that can be done from home, and supporting individual activities while encouraging information sharing through regular meetings. Workshops were also held to help both men and women understand and appreciate of each other’s activities at the village level.

The project made effective use of the lessons learned from past similar projects in Egypt and Kenya. The project introduced the new farming techniques first to experienced farmers, then further down to the less experienced ones or those who had no experience in cultivating horticulture crops. Baseline surveys also were utilized to plan the activities suitable for each village. The “Farmer to Farmer Approach” was utilized even after the project completion, based on the experiences from the past projects.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, the relevance of the project is ③<sup>2</sup>.

[Coherence]

<Consistency with Japan’s ODA Policy at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation>

The project was consistent with the Japan’s ODA policy to Egypt at the time of ex-ante evaluation. Under the “Country Assistance Program for the Arab Republic of Egypt” formulated in the fiscal year of 2008, “Poverty reduction and improvement of living standards (expansion and improvement of public services, agricultural and rural development, improvement of social welfare)” was one of the priority areas.

<Collaboration/Coordination with JICA’s other interventions>

The collaboration/coordination between the project and other similar SHEP projects supported by JICA was planned during the project period and was implemented and the positive effect(s) was/were confirmed at the time of ex-post evaluation.

The project kept close communication with other similar SHEP projects in Africa during the project period. Also, after the project completion, the JICA Egypt Office supported the staff of MALR to communicate with other experiences in implementing SHEP in Morocco, Palestine, and Sudan, through international workshops they held in 2020 and 2021. The linkage proved to be very useful during the time of preparing the proposal to JICA for the second phase of this project, as it included several lessons learned from other experiences, such as using internet and smartphones for closer communications between the agriculture extension workers and the small-scale farmers, and between whole-sale market vendors and the farmers. Because of this, the implementing agency was able to continue its work with the farmers after the project completion, further contributing to achieving the project objectives.

<Cooperation with other institutions/ Coordination with international framework>

Any cooperation/coordination with other development partners was not clearly planned at the time of ex-ante evaluation or during the project period. Nonetheless, the project team exchanged information and collaborated with other development partners working on market-oriented projects in the Upper Egypt region, facilitating regular communication through monthly newsletters. Notably, the project also partnered with UN Women, conducting a joint seminar to share gender mainstreaming activity results and present UN Women’s programs. The seminar also included valuable joint panel discussions, showcasing the project’s commitment to effective cooperation and alignment with international frameworks.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, the coherence of the project is ③.

[Evaluation Result of Relevance/Coherence]

In the light above, the relevance/coherence of the project is ③.

### 2 Effectiveness/Impact

<Status of Achievement of the Project Purpose at the Time of Project Completion>

At the time of project completion, the Project Purpose was mostly achieved as planned. The agricultural incomes of the small-scale farmers who practice the ISMAP Approach increased (Indicator 1), women who practiced the ISMAP Approach made a business plan and practiced the market-oriented activity based on the plan, (Indicator 2), and small-scale farmers who practiced the ISMAP Approach changed their farming style toward market based (Indicator 4). Meanwhile, increase in the agricultural incomes of surrounding small-scale farmers who practiced ISMAP Approach remained partial (Indicator 3).

<sup>2</sup> ④ : very high, ③ : high, ② : moderately low, ① : low

<Continuation Status of Project Effects at the Time of Ex-Post Evaluation>

By the time of the ex-post evaluation, the project effects have continued.

The effects of the project have continued for women who practiced the ISMAP Approach. Many women continued engaging in the market-oriented activities and their income increased. In addition, the ISMAP Implement Unit, a dedicated unit for implementing the ISMAP Approach which was established during the project period, implemented the approach in other governorates where the participating women practiced market-oriented activities and experienced income growth by these activities. The small-scale farmers who practiced the ISMAP Approach have continued their farming style towards market-based practices, and the ISMAP Approach has been extended to non-target farmers within the target villages. Continuation status of Indicator 1 and 3 were verified under the Overall Goal.

<Status of Achievement of the Overall Goal at the Time of Ex-Post Evaluation>

At the time of ex-post evaluation, the Overall Goal has been partially achieved. At Minia Governorate, the average agricultural income of small-scale farmers who applied the ISMAP Approach in the target villages increased from 13,076 EGP in 2017S (Summer) & 2017-18W (Winter) Crops to 25,000 EGP in 2022, which is 91.2% increase. In the meantime, the increase in Assuit Governorate from 2016-17W & 2017S Crops (highest during the project implementation) to 2022 is 4.7%.

The ISMAP approach been extended through multiple channels. The ISMAP Implementation Unit provided training to the extension officers in both governorates, sharing the knowledge that they gained during the project period. In addition to preparing the teaching materials for the training of the farmers, the Unit also provided training directly to women in the newly extended villages. The cooperatives and the extension officers mainly encouraged the farmers to apply the project's income generating activities, in addition to providing the technical support they got from the ISMAP Implementation Unit. The farmers applied what they learned from the project activities, and some of them tried to encourage other farmers to adopt the project's approach (Farmer to Farmer Extension). In addition, the more experienced farmers who were targeted by the project, became role models for other farmers and were called, sometimes, to talk about their experience to the new participating farmers in the newly targeted villages.

<Other Impacts at the Time of Ex-Post Evaluation>

In addition to the improvement in production and income of women mentioned above, the project has had several positive impacts related to gender issue. It successfully promoted social and economic awareness among rural women, elevating their influence and contributions to household economies. Also, the project fostered changes in men's perceptions, recognizing women as influential partners in family economics. Further, after the successful results of the applying the ISMAP activities for women in the project, a new unit was established under the Marketing Department of the Central Administration for Agriculture Cooperatives (CAAC), called the "Women Support Unit", to carry out the same activities to other governorates.

Negative impacts on environment-have not been observed.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, the effectiveness/impact of the project is ③.

Achievement of Project Purpose and Overall Goal

Aim	Indicators	Results	Source										
(Project Purpose) Agricultural incomes of the target small-scale farmers and surrounding small-scale farmers who practice the ISMAP Approach are increased.	Indicator 1 The agricultural incomes of the small-scale farmers who practice the ISMAP Approach are increased by 6% - 37% by household and village.	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): mostly achieved as planned (partially continued) (Project Completion) Minia Governorate: Annual net income per feddan (approximately 0.42ha)	JICA documents										
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>15S &amp; 15-16 W Crops (Baseline)</th> <th>16S &amp; 16-17W Crops (increase (%))</th> <th>16-17W &amp; 17S Crops (increase (%))</th> <th>17S &amp; 17-18W Crops (increase (%))</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Average of the 9 target villages (increase (%))</td> <td>7,700 EGP</td> <td>12,879 (+67.3%)</td> <td>11,886 (+54.4%)</td> <td>13,076 (+69.8%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			15S & 15-16 W Crops (Baseline)	16S & 16-17W Crops (increase (%))	16-17W & 17S Crops (increase (%))	17S & 17-18W Crops (increase (%))	Average of the 9 target villages (increase (%))	7,700 EGP	12,879 (+67.3%)	11,886 (+54.4%)	13,076 (+69.8%)
				15S & 15-16 W Crops (Baseline)	16S & 16-17W Crops (increase (%))	16-17W & 17S Crops (increase (%))	17S & 17-18W Crops (increase (%))						
		Average of the 9 target villages (increase (%))		7,700 EGP	12,879 (+67.3%)	11,886 (+54.4%)	13,076 (+69.8%)						
		Assuit Governorate: Annual net income per feddan (approximately 0.42ha)											
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>15S &amp; 15-16 W Crops (Baseline)</th> <th>16S &amp; 16-17W Crops (increase (%))</th> <th>16-17W &amp; 17S Crops (increase (%))</th> <th>17S &amp; 17-18W Crops (increase (%))</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Average of 11 target villages (increase (%))</td> <td>6,974 EGP</td> <td>11,745 (+68.4%)</td> <td>13,372 (+91.8%)</td> <td>6,967.6 (-0.1%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		15S & 15-16 W Crops (Baseline)	16S & 16-17W Crops (increase (%))	16-17W & 17S Crops (increase (%))	17S & 17-18W Crops (increase (%))	Average of 11 target villages (increase (%))	6,974 EGP	11,745 (+68.4%)	13,372 (+91.8%)	6,967.6 (-0.1%)			
	15S & 15-16 W Crops (Baseline)	16S & 16-17W Crops (increase (%))	16-17W & 17S Crops (increase (%))	17S & 17-18W Crops (increase (%))									
Average of 11 target villages (increase (%))	6,974 EGP	11,745 (+68.4%)	13,372 (+91.8%)	6,967.6 (-0.1%)									
(Ex-Post Evaluation) See the Overall Goal below.													
Indicator 2 At least 30% of the women who practice the ISMAP Approach have made a business plan and practiced the market-oriented activity based on the plan.		Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): mostly achieved as planned (continued) (Project Completion) Out of 66 women who participated in the training of business planning, 52 (79%) prepared business plans and practiced the market-oriented activities based on the plan. Out of 47 women who responded, 41 women increased their incomes (87%). (Ex-Post Evaluation)	JICA documents, MALR										
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many women engaged in market-oriented activities, such as marketing their products and undertaking income-generating endeavors like baking goods and raising ducks and birds. As a result, their income increased.</li> <li>- Additionally, the ISMAP Implementation Unit in Cairo has implemented the ISMAP Approach practices in other governorates, such as Dakahlia, Gharbiya and Fayoum governorates, a significant percentage of participating women (79%) prepared their economic plans and practiced market-oriented activities, accordingly, resulting in 47 out of 52 women experiencing income growth.</li> </ul>											

	<p>Indicator 3 The agricultural incomes of surrounding small-scale farmers who practice ISMAP Approach are increased.</p>	<p>Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): partially achieved (partially continued) Minia Governorate</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2">Nos of Surrounding farmers</th> <th colspan="6">Percentage of Surrounding Farmers whose income had increase</th> </tr> <tr> <th>15S</th> <th>15/16 W</th> <th>16S</th> <th>16/17 W</th> <th>17S</th> <th>17/18 W</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Target villages in the 1st cycle</td> <td>16</td> <td>9 (%)</td> <td>9 (%)</td> <td>40 (%)</td> <td>71 (%)</td> <td>100 (%)</td> <td>100 (%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Target villages in the 2nd cycle</td> <td>15</td> <td>---</td> <td>---</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>40 (%)</td> <td>100(%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Target villages in the 3rd cycle</td> <td>14</td> <td>---</td> <td>---</td> <td>---</td> <td>36 (%)</td> <td>93 (%)</td> <td>93 (%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>45</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Assuit Governorate</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2">Nos of Surrounding Farmers</th> <th colspan="6">Percentage of Surrounding Farmers whose income had increased (%)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>15S</th> <th>15/16 W</th> <th>16S</th> <th>16/17 W</th> <th>17S</th> <th>17/18 W</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Target villages in the 1st cycle</td> <td>15</td> <td>0</td> <td>33 (%)</td> <td>33 (%)</td> <td>56 (%)</td> <td>69 (%)</td> <td>64 (%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Target villages in the 2nd cycle</td> <td>20</td> <td>---</td> <td>---</td> <td>50 (%)</td> <td>61 (%)</td> <td>50 (%)</td> <td>55 (%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Target villages in the 3rd cycle</td> <td>20</td> <td>---</td> <td>---</td> <td>---</td> <td>55 (%)</td> <td>55 (%)</td> <td>35 (%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>55</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Ex-Post Evaluation) See the Overall Goal below.</p>		Nos of Surrounding farmers	Percentage of Surrounding Farmers whose income had increase						15S	15/16 W	16S	16/17 W	17S	17/18 W	Target villages in the 1st cycle	16	9 (%)	9 (%)	40 (%)	71 (%)	100 (%)	100 (%)	Target villages in the 2nd cycle	15	---	---	0	0	40 (%)	100(%)	Target villages in the 3rd cycle	14	---	---	---	36 (%)	93 (%)	93 (%)	Total	45								Nos of Surrounding Farmers	Percentage of Surrounding Farmers whose income had increased (%)						15S	15/16 W	16S	16/17 W	17S	17/18 W	Target villages in the 1st cycle	15	0	33 (%)	33 (%)	56 (%)	69 (%)	64 (%)	Target villages in the 2nd cycle	20	---	---	50 (%)	61 (%)	50 (%)	55 (%)	Target villages in the 3rd cycle	20	---	---	---	55 (%)	55 (%)	35 (%)	Total	55							<p>JICA documents</p>
	Nos of Surrounding farmers	Percentage of Surrounding Farmers whose income had increase																																																																																													
		15S	15/16 W	16S	16/17 W	17S	17/18 W																																																																																								
Target villages in the 1st cycle	16	9 (%)	9 (%)	40 (%)	71 (%)	100 (%)	100 (%)																																																																																								
Target villages in the 2nd cycle	15	---	---	0	0	40 (%)	100(%)																																																																																								
Target villages in the 3rd cycle	14	---	---	---	36 (%)	93 (%)	93 (%)																																																																																								
Total	45																																																																																														
	Nos of Surrounding Farmers	Percentage of Surrounding Farmers whose income had increased (%)																																																																																													
		15S	15/16 W	16S	16/17 W	17S	17/18 W																																																																																								
Target villages in the 1st cycle	15	0	33 (%)	33 (%)	56 (%)	69 (%)	64 (%)																																																																																								
Target villages in the 2nd cycle	20	---	---	50 (%)	61 (%)	50 (%)	55 (%)																																																																																								
Target villages in the 3rd cycle	20	---	---	---	55 (%)	55 (%)	35 (%)																																																																																								
Total	55																																																																																														
	<p>Indicator 4 More than half of the small-scale farmers who practice ISMAP Approach changed their farming style toward market based.</p>	<p>Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): mostly achieved as planned (continued) (Project Completion) A survey was conducted by the Project Team in October 2018 to see whether the small-scale farmers who had practiced ISMAP Approach in the past changed their farming style toward market based. In Minia, out of 166 farmers interviewed, 141 farmers (84.9%) responded that they had introduced farming plans based on ISMAP Approach and still continues applying them. While, in Assuit, out of 259 farmers interviewed, 230 farmers (88.8%) responded that they had introduced farming plans based on ISMAP Approach and still continues applying them. (Ex-Post Evaluation) - The small-scale farmers who practiced the ISMAP Approach have continued their farming style towards market-based practices. - The ISMAP Approach has been extended to non-target farmers within the target villages.</p>	<p>JICA documents, MALR</p>																																																																																												
<p>(Overall Goal) Agricultural incomes of the small-scale farmers in the target villages and surrounding villages in Minia and Assiut Governorates are increased.</p>	<p>Indicator 1 Average agricultural income of the small-scale farmers in the target villages and surrounding villages in Minia and Assiut Governorates is increased by 19%.</p>	<p>Status of the Achievement: mostly achieved as planned (Ex-Post Evaluation) Minia Governorate</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2020</th> <th>2021</th> <th>2022</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Number of villages the approach is extended</td> <td>15</td> <td>21</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Number of small-scale farmers who applied the approach in 1 above.</td> <td>216</td> <td>276</td> <td>316</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Average agricultural income of the small-scale farmers who practice the ISMAP approach in the target villages (Annually) (EGP)</td> <td>14,000 (+82%)</td> <td>18,000 (+134%)</td> <td>25,000 (+225%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Average agricultural income of the small-scale farmers who applied the approach in the surrounding villages (Annually) (EGP)</td> <td>11,000</td> <td>14,000</td> <td>16,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Assuit Governorate</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2020</th> <th>2021</th> <th>2022</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Number of villages the approach is extended</td> <td>15</td> <td>19</td> <td>19</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2020	2021	2022	1. Number of villages the approach is extended	15	21	27	2. Number of small-scale farmers who applied the approach in 1 above.	216	276	316	3. Average agricultural income of the small-scale farmers who practice the ISMAP approach in the target villages (Annually) (EGP)	14,000 (+82%)	18,000 (+134%)	25,000 (+225%)	4. Average agricultural income of the small-scale farmers who applied the approach in the surrounding villages (Annually) (EGP)	11,000	14,000	16,000		2020	2021	2022	1. Number of villages the approach is extended	15	19	19	<p>MALR</p>																																																																
	2020	2021	2022																																																																																												
1. Number of villages the approach is extended	15	21	27																																																																																												
2. Number of small-scale farmers who applied the approach in 1 above.	216	276	316																																																																																												
3. Average agricultural income of the small-scale farmers who practice the ISMAP approach in the target villages (Annually) (EGP)	14,000 (+82%)	18,000 (+134%)	25,000 (+225%)																																																																																												
4. Average agricultural income of the small-scale farmers who applied the approach in the surrounding villages (Annually) (EGP)	11,000	14,000	16,000																																																																																												
	2020	2021	2022																																																																																												
1. Number of villages the approach is extended	15	19	19																																																																																												

2. Number of small-scale farmers who applied the approach in 1 above.	379	500	500
3. Average agricultural income of the small-scale farmers who practice the ISMAP approach in the target villages (Annually) (EGP)	11,000 (+58%)	14,000 (+101%)	14,000 (+101%)
4. Average agricultural income of the small-scale farmers who applied the approach in the surrounding villages (Annually) (EGP)	9,500	11,000	11,000

### 3 Efficiency

The project cost was within the plan (the ratio against the plan: 92%) and the project period was as planned (the ratio against the plan: 100%).

	Project Cost (Japanese side only, yen)	Project Period (months)
Plan (ex-ante)	507 million	60
Actual	466 million	60
Ratio (%)	92%	100 %

Outputs were produced as planned.

In the light above, the efficiency of the project is ④.

### 4 Sustainability

#### <Policy Aspect>

No specific policies or plans were set, however after the completion of the project, a ministerial decree was issued to establish “ISMAP Implementation Unit” within the structure of the Ministry to continue the activities of the project and expand it to other governorates. This unit was established in 2019, and it was still performing until the time of the ex-post evaluation.

#### <Institutional/Organizational Aspect>

As mentioned above, the ISMAP Implementation Unit was established within the CAAC. The ISMAP Implementation Unit have been functioning adequately both at the central level and the Minia and Assuit Governorates. Eight staff members have been assigned at the central level and 10 each have been assigned to the Minia and Assuit Governorates, which has been sufficient. In addition to the ISMAP Implementation Unit, a separate unit for rural women demonstrates a concrete effort towards sustaining and advancing the project’s approach and gender mainstreaming efforts was established.

#### <Technical Aspect>

The implementing agency has had an established technical level and managed to maintain their technical skills since the project completion. Though there was a system for training and exchange technical knowledge among the staff of different units as well, the system was not an official one, and the official training has been suspended due to the lack of budget since 2020.

#### <Financial Aspect>

At the time of the ex-post evaluation, the financial situation of the implementing agency has not been secured to ensure the continuation of project effects. Budget allocations from the government to MALR has been insufficient and not consistently available for sustaining project activities. The implementing agency has been actively seeking alternative funding sources through collaborations with NGOs and international development partners, but this remains a challenge due to the economic conditions of the country.

#### <Environmental and Social Aspect>

Risks in the environmental and social aspects have been monitored. Necessary countermeasures have been taken based on the monitoring results.

#### <Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, some problems have been observed in terms of the financial aspect of the implementing agency. Therefore, the sustainability of the project effects is ③.

### 5 Summary of the Evaluation

The project mostly achieved the Project Purpose as planned, as the agricultural income of the target small-scale farmers increased, they adopted the market-oriented farming style and women made a business plan and practice the market-oriented activity. The project partially achieved the Overall Goal, as the agricultural income of small-scale farmers in the target and surrounding villages increased as planned in Minia Governorates, however, the target was not achieved in the Assuit Governorate. As for the sustainability, some problems have been observed in terms of the financial aspect, however, no problems have been observed in the policy, institutional/organizational, and technical aspects.

Considering all of the above points, this project is evaluated to be highly satisfactory.

## III. Non-score Items

#### Adaption and Contribution:

Duties of JICA was fulfilled, JICA provided supervisions and supports to the implementing agency, and JICA’s communications and partnerships with the implementing agency were good.

#### Additionality and Creative Values:

The establishment of a new extension approach in Egypt that will be always called the ISMAP Approach, derived from JICA’s SHEP approach. MALR acknowledged this contribution by establishing the ISMAP Implementation Unit.

#### IV. Recommendations & Lessons Learned

##### Recommendations for Implementing Agency:

- The ISMAP Implementation Unit, and the Financial Department of MALR are recommended to develop a diversified funding strategy that includes collaboration with NGOs, international development partners, and private sector partners, by establishing a dedicated teams for seeking alternative funding sources.
- The ISMAP Implementation Unit is recommended to develop a comprehensive training plan for extension officers and staff members to continuously update technical skills and knowledge related to the ISMAP Approach. Collaboration with agricultural research institutions to stay updated on innovative practices is recommended.

##### Lessons Learned for JICA:

- The project should have developed a diversified funding strategy, including collaboration with other stakeholders such as NGOs, Farmers' Union, Development Partners and others to improve the financial resilience of the implementation unit to enable it to sustain the outcomes of the project and continue its impact.
- During the project, the ISMAP Implementation Unit, a dedicated unit for ISMAP implementation was established. This is a good practice that could be applied in similar projects to ensure the commitment of the implementing agency to continue and sustain the project impact further after its completion.
- It was significant that the ISMAP Unit led the Arab bloc international workshop after the project was completed, which gave the ISMAP Unit confidence in its activities. It was also significant that the knowledge was shared in the Arab bloc rather than in African countries due to cultural and language similarities. The counterparts of new projects to be launched in other countries could also be invited to Egypt, and seeing the actual sites helped them to grasp the image of their own projects, thus creating a positive synergy effect.



“One of the women farmers in Assiut Governorate who participated in the ISMAP activities managed to establish and increase her income from raising poultry and ducks, and by the time of the ex-post evaluation she expanded her activities to include cattle raising.”



“A member of the ISMAP Implementation Unit in Minia Governorate following-up with one of the farmers who continues the ISMAP practices after the completion of the project activities.”