K4D Knowledge, evidence and learning for development

Programmes to Develop and Grow Value Chains: Evidence from Egypt and Other Developing Countries

Kelbesa Megersa
Institute of Development Studies
04 Sept 2020

Question

a) How successful are interventions to develop and grow value chains in developing countries and what are the outcomes (e.g. greater employment, productivity, industry growth or increased output/exports). Are there any lessons from Egypt relating to specific value chains which have been successful?

b) Have interventions relating to value chains in developing countries adopted a pro-poor or sustainable approach? Have micro, small, and medium enterprises become linked to local and global value chains and has this approach been successful?

Contents

1. Overview

Changes in business relationships resulting from interventions and programming of Value Chain Development (VCD) are likely to produce significant benefits both for participants in a specific value chain – as well as for the overall market system in a country. In this regard, development agencies (or their VCD guidance documents) underscore VCD interventions with improved outcomes for disadvantaged communities. For example, DFID states that VCD provides opportunities to improve the lives of poor people (effectively and sustainably) by understanding and influencing market systems (DFID, 2016; 2008). Further, the ILO envisions an enhanced overall market climate, as well as enhanced employment opportunities and income as VCD outcomes (Mayoux and Mackie 2008). UNIDO stresses on VCDs having significant impacts on poverty and gender equality (UNIDO, 2011; Donovan et al., 2015).

The creation of 'pro-poor' or 'inclusive' value chains seek to increase access to information, inputs, and services by marginalised market actors and people (e.g. small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and women). Importance is put on the establishment of more equal business relationships between various actors along the nodes of a value chain, with anticipations that positive results will accrue further downstream in the value chain for SMEs as well as for their major/bigger business partners. Development initiatives and strategies typically concentrate on promoting stronger linkages between these actors and extending the provision of reliable and efficient resources – both from inside and outside the value chain (Kaplinsky 2016; Stoian et al., 2018).

Some of the key donor interventions in Egypt targeting the development and growth of value chains are provided below – together with brief descriptions of their outcomes in terms of employment, productivity, industry growth, etc.

- The **'pro-poor Horticulture Value Chains in Upper Egypt'** programme (funded by UNDP, UNIDO, UN WOMEN, and ILO) has helped to link okra farmers with input suppliers and food-processing companies. The farmers were able to increase their productivity and receive higher prices for their products, as a result of the development of the value chain and their integration in it.
- The '**Egypt Enterprise Development Project'** (funded by the Canadian International Development Agency) worked to **develop and grow the artichokes value chain** by broadening the availability of (affordable and gender-responsive) non-financial services to MSMEs – also particularly supporting female-run MSMEs. To achieve its targets, the project created six regional enterprise development centres. In doing so, the project has **boosted job creation – also among women workers.**
- The '**Support to Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises in Organic Clusters Project'** (funded by the African Development Bank) has **helped to map organic clusters and value chains**. It has also reviewed existing national programmes that were launched to support these clusters. The project supported the growth of MSMEs (and their value chains) as well as their contribution to job creation and economic growth. As such, it has worked to establish an 'enabling environment' for MSMEs **across major cross-cutting subsectors**. The project has identified a large number of economically viable organic clusters across Egypt. The project has also shown that MSME cluster (and value chain) development is an efficient/effective way of supporting the growth of MSMEs.

- The ‘**Rural Income and Economic Enhancement Project’** (funded by the African Development Bank) has **filled a gap in the Egyptian financial market and created opportunities to improve agricultural value chains**. It has supported agriculture-derived livelihoods of poor rural producers and micro and small enterprises. It has helped to realise efficient markets and local-level value addition. By helping to channel loans through partner local financial institutions, the project has helped deliver over 80,000 (small and micro) loans to beneficiaries (where 45% of them were women or women-run micro and small enterprises). The project has also helped to boost job creation and agri-business lending.
- The ‘**Value Chain Development Programme’** (funded by the Industrial Modernisation Centre of Egypt) has helped to analyse diverse product value chains. It has been operating to **improve vertical (and horizontal) integration of SMEs and their competitiveness – particularly in the textiles, chemicals, engineering, food, and agro-business value chains.**

It is important to note that these programmes are often run by local partner government agencies and private sector actors (together with the donors). Their success is, therefore, in no small part dependent on the effectiveness of these actors and the quality of the partnerships.

Interventions by donors to develop value chains in other countries also provide similar lessons to those from Egypt:

- The ‘Trade and Global Value Chains Initiative’ (funded by DFID) has worked as a ‘catalytic fund’ developing value chains in Bangladesh, Kenya, and South Africa. By working with private sector partners, it has **improved working conditions and enhanced job opportunities for poor workers and smallholder farmers. It has also supported the long-term resilience of global supply chains involving poor communities** in these countries. It has directly benefited over 100,000 people.
- The ‘SMART-Fish’ programme in Indonesia (funded by the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs) has provided advice to the Indonesian government on ways to enact favourable policies to **support the growth of fisheries value chains and exports**. The project has also helped to improve competitiveness, compliance with international standards, entry into global value chains – and, overall, increased the value of Indonesian fisheries exports.
- The ‘Edible Oil Value Chain Enhancement programme’ in Ethiopia (funded by UNIDO, FAO, and ILO) has tried to **address the challenges (e.g. supply chain bottlenecks, processing capacity, access to markets, etc.) limiting the growth of oilseeds value chains**. The programme has particularly helped to increase the productivity and competitiveness of oil seeds producers and processors (i.e. small farmers and small and medium enterprises).

While preparing this rapid evidence review, different types of relevant literature have been looked at. This includes reports issued by development agencies that are either funding value chains development programmes or taking part in the design, implementation, or review of such projects. This is particularly the case in the evidence review on specific value chains development projects. Further, some academic publications are used for general overview of value chains concepts, identification of key issues, and to draw broad conclusions.

The rest of the report is structured as follows. Section 2 briefly looks at the concepts and definitions of ‘value chains’ and ‘value chains development’. The section shows that there is no universally accepted description of these concepts among development agencies and scholars – although the different characterisations imply similar notions. Section 3 discusses about the ‘pro-poor’ dimensions of value chains development interventions. It particularly looks at the growing interest of value chains development by donors and why they are trying to make their interventions ‘pro-poor’. Section 4 provides case studies from Egypt on programmes focusing on the development and growth of value chains in different sectors. For each project, the section provides brief programme summaries, programme details, programme objectives, and impacts. Section 5 provides similar examples to that of section 4 but from examples in other developing countries (i.e. Bangladesh, Kenya, South Africa, Ethiopia, and Indonesia).

It is worth noting that the value chains development programmes and interventions described in Section 4 and 5 are not systematically selected. Rather, the selection follows existing assessments and reviews of good value chains development programmes by major development agencies such as USAID[1], UNIDO[2] and DFID[3]. It is also important to mention that the literature on value chains development in developing countries is mostly on the agriculture sector. Most donor programming and intervention (especially with ‘pro-poor’ agenda) is also carried out on agricultural value chains. As such, the general evidence base and specific programmes (also those reviewed and included in this report) are somewhat skewed to the sector.

2. Defining ‘Value Chains’ and ‘Value Chains Development’

2.1 Value Chains

Several development agencies (DFID included) and development experts make use of different terms to describe market actors and the arrangements for production and marketing of value chain products and services in various sectors. Some of the terminologies employed include ‘value chain’, ‘supply chain’, ‘market system’, ‘market chain’, and other sector-specific terms (such as ‘agri-food chain’). Nonetheless, for simplicity, ‘Value Chain’ definitions can be classified into some distinct categories (Donovan et al., 2015):

- **Value chains defined as a set of activities:** World Bank’s Value Chains Guide, for instance, remarks that ‘value chain’ refers to a “range of value-adding activities required to bring a product or service through the different phases of production, including procurement of raw materials and other inputs” (Webber and Labaste, 2010, p. 9). Furthermore, comparable (i.e. activities-based definitions of the term ‘value chain’) are used by other major development agencies such as Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), International Labour Organization (ILO), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) (Donovan et al., 2015).

[1] http://www.seedegypt.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/D-CODE-USAID-SEED-Project-Value-Chain-Assesssment.September-2016.public.pdf
[2] https://www.unido.org/resources-evaluation-and-internal-oversight-evaluation/reports-project-evaluations
[3] https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/search?query=value+chain+development&includeClosed=0

- **Value chains defined as a set of actors:** 'value chain' can also describe "actors connected along a chain producing, transforming, and bringing goods and services to end-consumers through a sequenced set of activities" (UNIDO, 2011, p. 3).
- **Value chains defined as a strategic network**: In this instance, 'value chain' does not merely belong to a specific space – rather, it is created to respond to consumer demand adequately. Specifically, 'value chains' has been defined here as a strategic network connecting numerous autonomous business organisations, where members in the network participate in extensive collaborations (Hobbs et al., 2000; Lundy et al., 2007).[4]

2.2 Value Chains Development (VCD)

Donovan et al. (2015) argue that two broad types of definitions for VCD can be drawn from VCD guidance documents of major development agencies:

i) **an actor/chain type definition of VCD** that focuses on strengthening specific market actors and enhancing relations among – for instance – SMEs or smallholders and other actors in a chain; and

ii) **a business-environment type definition of VCD** that focuses on enhancing the business climate in which value chain actors operate.

From their survey of several VCD guides published by key development agencies, Donovan et al. (2015) note that **key development agencies principally follow an actor/network centred definition of VCD for their programmes in their partner developing countries.** For example:

- USAID believes that VCD is realised by building win-win relationships between chain actors. As such, VCD aims to expand competitiveness for a subset of chain actors, which lead to – for instance – more income for SMEs (Donovan et al., 2015).
- World Bank's guide on value chain concepts and applications (Webber and Labaste, 2010, p. 12) defines VCD as actions that "upgrade the whole system to the benefit of all value chain participants".
- VCD guides by FAO, GTZ, and ILO also essentially follow definitions that are like the definitions followed by USAID and World Bank. Nevertheless, some actor-centred definitions of VCD (e.g. ILO and GTZ) moreover employ an activity-based definition for value chain (Donovan et al., 2015).

The various interpretations and understanding of VCD among different development agencies imply that better clarity is needed in the conceptual frameworks that underpin value chains programming directed at attaining development goals through work with resource-poor actors. Donovan et al. (2015) contend that an actor- or network-centred definition presents a more unified conceptual framework when VCD is focused on a targeted group of chain actors.

[4] In line with this, DFID also defines a 'market system' (i.e. market network) as a "multi-player, multi-function arrangement comprising three main sets of functions (core, rules, and supporting) undertaken by different players…through which exchange takes place, develops, adapts, and grows" (DFID, 2008. p.6).

The Department for International Development (DFID), International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), and the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) approach consider improving the environment in which SMEs and other chain actors produce and market products as the basis for achieving VCD (DFID, 2008). [5] Moreover, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation notes that VCD analysis should focus on gaining an understanding of the context in which producers and small traders operate as participants of the value chain (SDC, 2008). Likewise, IIED considers VCD to centre on understanding the institutional framework in which SMEs, smallholders and other chain actors work and find out opportunities for influencing institutional change in a way that generates opportunities and benefits for them (Donovan et al., 2015).[6]

3. Donors and (Pro-Poor) Value Chains Development

3.1 The Growing Interest in Value Chains Development by Donors

The growing interest in value chain development (VCD) arises from an enhanced knowledge among development agencies that success in increasingly complex value chains necessitates more effective collaboration among chain actors, including producers, processors, and retailers (Hobbs et al., 2000; Donovan et al., 2015). Major factors that have inspired interest in VCD include: rising urban demand for added-value products in developing countries, more strict quality and safety criteria by governments and private firms, the rise of niche markets (e.g. fair trade and organic produce), and worry over the scarcity of raw materials (Donovan et al., 2015).

VCD has turned into a key element of poverty-reduction strategy for various development agencies, donors, and governments. As such, VCD features prominently in recent development programming aimed at stimulating economic growth and increasing the competitiveness of key sectors in developing countries (e.g. see Section 5 and 6). The VCD strategy induces governments and civil society to look past individual actors, e.g. SMEs or the poor, when considering how to attain development goals. By concentrating on the value chain and the links among the actors within it, development interventions by donors can better identify shared obstacles among actors in the chain and solutions that generate win-win outcomes. Improved value chain relations and overall chain performance are expected to generate substantial benefits in terms of economic performance and reduction in poverty. The potential to incorporate medium and large-scale businesses as vital partners in VCD offers development organisations the chance to attain positive outcomes at a larger scale, with perhaps bigger impact and sustainability (Humphrey and Navas-Alemán, 2010; Staritz, 2012; Donovan et al., 2015).

VCD also responds to the need to revive development processes that led to the creation of crucial development goals in the past (e.g. the Millennium Development Goals), which viewed increased income as a prerequisite to the security of livelihoods and a good standard of living. The fast increase in demand for goods in which SMEs or smallholders are deemed to have a comparative advantage has been seen as a chance to link economic growth

[5] http://www.value-chains.org/dyn/bds/docs/681/op%20guide%202008.pdf
[6] Focusing on the business environment reflects the impact of conversations on globalising food markets and debates among practitioners regarding attempts to make markets work for the poor (Donovan et al., 2015; Reardon et al., 2003; and Ferrand et al., 2004).

and poverty reduction targets (Donovan et al., 2015; Weinberger and Lumpkin, 2007; Bacon, 2005).[7]

3.2 Making Value Chains Development Intervention Pro-Poor

In recent years, main development organisations involved in promoting value chain growth in developing countries have increasingly classified their activities as "inclusive." This reflects an active interest in introducing pro-poor development programmes, i.e. value chains that involve and greatly support large numbers of disadvantaged businesses and marginalised people (e.g. SMEs, small-scale merchants, or customers) (Harper et al., 2015; Stoian et al., 2018).

Furthermore, it is increasingly accepted (by development agencies and development scholars alike) that disparities often exist within a specific value chain node, dependent on gender, age, ethnicity, as well as other dimensions of social distinction. Failure to counter these disparities is problematic from a gender perspective and may potentially undermine the ability of VCD to lead to both economic and social change (Bamber and Staritz, 2016; Stoian et al . , 2018; Coles and Mitchell, 2011).

Women and men are generally involved in different value chains. These inequities exist across different operations in the same value chain or across separate value chains. Gender-based value chain research is increasingly highlighting gender segmentation across value chain nodes and the gaps in average returns to labour for women and men (Ingram et al. 2014; Stoian et al. 2018).[8]

The VCD literature recognises that value chains are rooted in socio-cultural contexts in which informal gender roles and values, attitudes, and power relations function at different levels (i.e. from the household and group level to the national and global economy). These social norms, relationships and structures also form the unequal capacity of women and men to engage in and benefit from VCD (Rubin and Manfre 2014; Stoian et al. 2018).

VCD's interest (in achieving equitable outcomes) is highlighted in approaches to women's economic progress, with scholars promoting the effective implementation of the gender perspective in value chain analysis and associated development programming by donors and governments. Gender-based challenges and opportunities to increase women's involvement in value chains appear prominently in development agencies' reports, frequently with a heavy emphasis on women's ability to boost income and make independent decisions (Stoian et al., 2018; Rubin and Manfre, 2014).

[7] With the rise of value chains in development programming, donors began to develop programs / interventions, as well as guidance and diagnostic tools that help practitioners perform value chain analysis, generally as inputs for the design of interventions. Nevertheless, recent research have shown that there are substantial differences in how various donors (or their guidance documents) perceive value chain concepts, that may have significant implications for how interventions are designed and what their development impacts may ultimately be (Donovan et al., 2015; Nang'ole et al., 2011; Webber and Labaste, 2010).
[88] Role of women in value chains, nevertheless, frequently lack visibility because of their over representation in home-based work, the informal sector, and part-time work (Shackleton et al. 2011; Stoian et al., 2018).

4. Egypt: Programmes on Value Chains Development

4.1 Pro-poor Horticulture Value Chains in Upper Egypt programme (SALASEL)

Brief Programme Summary:

- **Sector of Value Chains**: Okra and green beans
- **Donor**: UNDP (Lead Agency); UNIDO; UN WOMEN; and ILO
- **Budget**: Total: USD 7,499,704; UNDP: USD 3,246,561; UNIDO: USD 2,521,455; ILO: USD 1,005,800; UN WOMEN: USD 725,888
- **Start and End Date**: January 2010 to June 2013
- **Partner(s)**: Egyptian Ministries of Trade and Industry, Investment, International Cooperation, and Foreign Affairs

Programme Details:[9]

The SALASEL ("Chains") Joint Program included four major United Nations (UN) agencies, namely the UNDP, UNIDO, ILO and UN Women, in cooperation with the Egyptian Ministry of Industry and Trade and the Ministry of Investment. The program was initiated at three locations in the poorest Upper Egyptian governorates (ILO, 2016). The implementation strategy of the program was focused on the structural and capacity improvement of existing three Post-Harvest Centers (PHCs) and six Farmers' Associations (FAs) established in the previous donor assistance in Upper Egypt (USAID, 2016).

The programme employed an innovative approach, combining assistance to service providers and beneficiaries to develop sustainable agribusiness. The initiatives of the programme aided operators and entrepreneurs deal with technical regulations, standards, codes of good practices and conformity assessments. Furthermore, **operators and entrepreneurs were aided with business development and advisory services, entrepreneurship development, gender equity and marketing activities** (ILO, 2016).

Programme Objectives:

The SALASEL programme was principally intended to help pro-poor horticulture value chains in Upper Egypt to enhance their position in export and domestic markets. This was accomplished by fostering equitable partnerships among small farmers and private sector investors in effective pro-poor horticulture value chains in the poorest six Upper Egyptian Governorates – i.e., Beni Suef, Luxor, Sohag, Menya, Qena and Assiut (ILO, 2013).

The program also concentrated on the entrepreneurial development of small farmers, by increasing their business knowledge and skills, and by promoting their integration into entrepreneurial forms. The program also targeted small farmers by helping farmers'

[9] More information on the programme is available at https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_220651.pdf

associations to provide necessary business services (e.g. extension services, inputs, information services, legal and contractual advice) to enable them to take part in value chain governance (USAID, 2016).

The programme also aimed to use lessons learned and best practises (i.e. on the development of value chains) with the Government of Egypt in a policy dialogue on the challenges of pro-poor private sector growth in Upper Egypt's horticultural sector (USAID, 2016).

Programme Impact:

SALASEL provided guidance on horticulture (okra and green beans) produced by members of the farmer's association**. The programme also helped to link okra farmers with reliable input suppliers as well as with six food processing firms offering even higher prices to the farmers' products (USAID, 2016).**

The programme has proved that farmers in Upper Egypt can increase productivity and be "included" in the process of improving the value chain. The programme has also shown that future pro-poor programmes for rural areas require a specific concept of beneficiaries (pro-poor target) with an acceptable plan to support the targeted population through the allocation of resources. The presence of women in field offices has been an asset (ILO, 2013).

The results of the program would likely have a significant long-term effect on the development of the horticultural sector in Upper Egypt. The successes of the programme in the growth of the horticultural sector in Upper Egypt and in the implementation of the sustainability plan have given rise to the participation and involvement of the organisations required for its continuation through post-project interventions (ILO, 2013).

The accomplishments of the Women's Entrepreneurship Program have included the election of six women's committees to targeted farmer organisations – three of which were helped to create their own business plans. One key lesson learned from this project is the need to include women in field offices and to ease day-to-day work with farmers, particularly women farmers. Another lesson was the need to adhere to (a proper) selection criteria of beneficiaries, as some farmers' associations do not represent the poor well (ILO, 2016).

4.2 Egypt Enterprise Development Project (EEDP)

Brief Programme Summary:

- **Sector of Value Chains**: Artichokes
- **Donor**: Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)/Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFTAD)
- **Budget**: USD 4,950,000
- **Start and End Date**:[10] 23-05-2008 to 31-12-2014

[10] The project continued to offer technical assistance to SMEs till 2016 (ILO, 2016)

- **Partner(s)**: El Mobadara

Programme Details:

The goal of the EEDP is to support Egypt's efforts to reduce poverty among marginalised groups , particularly women and youth, and to promote better employment opportunities through the creation of small and medium-sized enterprises. The **programmes include the delivery of non-financial services to Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs)** in six selected governorates in Egypt (i.e. Qena, Sohag, Banisuef, Fayoum, Gharbia and Behira) (ILO, 2016).

El Mobadara was the executive agency for the implementation of the CAD$4.75 million CIDA-funded Egypt Enterprise Development Project (EEDP) in 2008. The EEDP is a five-year project **with the intention of generating better employment opportunities (and poverty reduction) through support for small and medium-sized enterprises with a focus on Egypt's disadvantaged groups, especially women and young people** (OECD, 2013).

The Business Development Support (BDS) sector in Egypt is still emerging, with programmes for micro-enterprise owners in limited niche markets. There is, however, evidence of programmes in place to promote the growth of conventional BDS service providers and other intermediaries, e.g. educators. For example, **the EEDP project involved capacity building for Regional Enterprise Development Centres** (REDECs) to design and deliver responsive BDSs to clients. Both male and female team members took part in the projects, which also included partner NGOs, members of the EEDP board and bank employees (ILO, 2016).

Programme Objectives:

The main objective of the project is to offer demand-driven non-financial services to MSMEs in the six selected Egyptian governorates in an efficient and sustainable manner. The programme focused on building capacity in six REDECs to deliver gender-responsive, environmentally sensitive, and demand-driven BDS services to existing MSMEs and start-ups. Apart from the CIDA funding, the Social Fund for Development (SFD) has provided a credit line of CAD$24 million to El Mobadara to enable micro-credit lending in the six governorates where EEDP operations were carried out (OECD, 2013).

The intended outcome of the EEDP is to increase the availability of accessible, appropriate and gender-responsive non-financial services to MSMEs through the REDECs with the objective of providing BDS packages to about 6,000 start-ups and existing MSMEs, and also improved access to affordable financial services aimed at male-and female-owned MSMEs to help the development of at least 15,000 jobs (OECD, 2013).

Integrating gender equity in the BDS for MSME clients was a clear cross-cutting goal of the EEDP. The goal was to enable female entrepreneurs to grow and strengthen their small and medium-sized businesses and to migrate from the informal sector to the formal sector. This is done by providing access to BDS resources that respond to the needs of women entrepreneurs, increasing awareness of gender equality among REDECs. In addition, provisions of training to their staff realised a better understanding of gender equality and enhancing their ability to incorporate the gender perspective of all REDEC operations, including the application of gender-sensitive value chain analysis. Annual and monthly targets were set for the inclusion of women in

BDS services and the evaluation of client satisfaction was carried out on a semi-annual basis. In addition, a pledge was made to provide soft loans to women entrepreneurs (OECD, 2013).

Programme Impact:

The creation of six Regional Enterprise Development Centers and capacity-building support for local professionals was a key outcome of the project. The total number of **jobs created** between 2012 and 2013 was 1,455 - of which **about 41% were women** (ILO, 2016).

4.3 Rural Income and Economic Enhancement Project (RIEEP)

Brief Programme Summary:

- **Sector of Value Chains**: Identifying prime cross-cutting subsectors and the guiding operational principles
- **Donor**: African Development Banks (AfDB)
- **Budget/cost**: USD 73 million[11]
- **Start and End Date**: 2010-2015
- **Partner(s)**: Social Fund for Development (SFD)

Programme Details:

The RIEEP project was launched to fill the financial market gap and create opportunities to improve the livelihoods of poor rural producers in agriculture and to enable smallholder producers to benefit from efficient markets and local value addition. The project was a long-term sovereign loan from AfDB to the Government of Egypt with a subsidiary contract to lend to Egypt, which will then lend a loan to Partner Financial Intermediaries (PFIs) for lending to agribusiness firms. The project, with a total cost of USD 73 million over a five-year period, sought to finance at least 4,800 small-scale agribusiness firms and 20,000 micro-enterprises, creating more than 60,500 jobs over the five-year period in which the project was active (AfDB, 2020).

Programme Objectives:

The key overall objective of the programme was to improve the socio-economic livelihoods of economically active rural smallholder farmers participating in the production, processing and marketing of targeted agricultural commodities. Specific expected results were increased sub-loans to SME recipients, increased job creation, enhanced share of agribusiness lending in the portfolios of two partner financial institutions (PFIs) and increased agribusiness and/or dairy trade by participating farmers' associations. The intended beneficiaries were members of farmer association, service providers and PFIs, and micro-and small-scale rural entrepreneurs (AfDB, 2015).

[11] https://projectsportal.afdb.org/dataportal/VProject/show/P-EG-IE0-003#home

The desired outputs also included training of farmers' associations, the creation of new business links, the development and financing of business plans, training of service providers, training of PFI staff and enhanced access to credit by micro-enterprises and smallholder agribusinesses (AfDB, 2015).

The project had two core components (AfDB, 2015):

i) **Capacity Building** by which it would seek to fund: (a) a participatory value chain analysis of horticulture and dairy products; (b) the establishment of business links among farmer associations and the private sector of agribusiness in the value chain, through enhanced market opportunities information, value addition (processing), the development of entrepreneurial and business skills as well as credible trade relations;

ii) Access to finance by which it would attempt to address the financial constraints faced by agribusiness institutions. This was to be achieved by providing a USD 70 million long-term loan to the Government of Egypt (GoE), which would (in turn) on-lend it to to SFD under the same terms and conditions as the Loan Agreement between AfDB and GoE. SFD, then, would provide these resources to economically viable micro and small enterprises, including farmer associations, cooperatives and service providers participating in agribusiness for work and investment capital needs via targeted intermediaries with at least 60% of the loan proceeds to be paid out to MSEs in Upper Egypt.

Programme Impact:

All in all, as the outcome **targets were attained or exceeded and the project performance was rated "Highly Satisfactory"** (AfDB, 2015). The key specific project outcomes included the following (AfDB, 2015):

- **Rise in the number of SME sub-loans disbursed to recipients** – the target was surpassed as the project resulted in a total of 81,693 loans (i.e. 3,429 small loans and 78,264 microloans), 45% of which went to women , compared to a target of 9,186 (3,323 small and 5,863 microloans), with 45% expected to go to women.
- **Increase in the number of jobs created (and share of women)** – the target has also been substantially exceeded (79,447 actual jobs compared to the assessment target of 50,000); nevertheless, no exact figures were reported.
- **Rise in the percentage of agribusiness lending within the portfolios of Partner Fina ncial Institutions (PFI)** – the targets in this regard were similarly exceeded – i.e., there was a 53% rise in the volume of the agribusiness portfolio at the National Bank of Egypt (NBE), covering 30% of its SME portfolio and a 21.1% rise in the portfolio of the Industrial and Development Workers Bank (IDWB) in comparison with the appraisal targets of 25% and 16%, respectively.

4.4 Support to Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises in Organic Clusters Project

Brief Programme Summary:

- **Sector of Value Chains**: Identifying all organic clusters (No specific value chain focus)
- **Donor**: African Development Banks (AFDB)
- **Budget**: USD 1,770,000
- **Start and End Date**:[12] April 2014 – December 2015
- **Partner(s)**: Social Fund for Development (SFD)

Programme Details:

The project is set up to map organic clusters in Egypt as well as to study and evaluate current national initiatives to help organic clusters. Evaluations of selected organic clusters and value chain analysis were also carried out by the project. The project also aimed to develop policy briefs and institutional and operational capacity building for major support institutions and stakeholders working with organic MSME clusters (USAID, 2016).

The project was initiated with the assumption that small and medium-sized enterprises are important drivers of poverty reduction and job creation in Egypt, accounting for over 99.7% of all private non-agricultural enterprises in the country, 85 % of non-agricultural private-sector jobs and almost 40 % of total jobs. Over the last few years, small and medium-sized enterprises have been the primary takers of labour force entrants and have made a major contribution to the generation of jobs, although mainly in the informal sector. MSMEs are also the main provider of goods and services for local markets, especially for low-income segments with limited purchasing power. It is widely believed that the small and medium-sized enterprises and the informal sector (in general) have served as a robust buffer, offsetting the impact of economic crisis on Egyptians, especially vulnerable groups (AfDB, 2020b).[13]

Programme Objectives:

The key objective of the project is to create an overall enabling climate for small and medium-sized enterprises operating in organic clusters and to increase their contribution to economic growth and employment. The main beneficiaries of this national initiative would be the owners and staff of the MSMEs in the organic clusters, many of whom are young people and women (AfDB, 2013).

[12] https://www.menatransitionfund.org/sites/mena_trans_fund/files/documents/EG%20AfDB%20MSME%20in%20Organic%20Clusters%20Project%20Document.docx

[13] Notwithstanding its potential, the MSME sector in Egypt is faced with a multitude of limitations that hamper its productivity and influence its role as an economic catalyst. Apart from the known financial restrictions, small and medium-sized enterprises are confronted with a variety of non-financial barriers, such as acquiring desired inputs, producing and marketing a competitive product, acquiring knowledge on the latest know-how and market requirements, and also an insufficient institutional, legal and regulatory environment (AfDB, 2020b).

Programme Impact:

The project outlined a series of organic clusters in Egypt (about 140 of them) (USAID, 2016). Examples of such clusters in Egypt include Damietta, Shubra El-Kheima, Manasra, Mahal-El Kubra and Kaha. Several of these clusters are set up in the various industrial areas and economic zones that exist in Egypt. These clusters are estimated to exist in more than 102 industrial areas, and they are at different stages of development. There are also many 'unplanned' or organic clusters that have developed over the years (AfDB, 2013).

The project has shown that cluster creation is an efficient and successful way of promoting and unlocking the potential of small and medium-sized enterprises. Clusters are a favourable environment for promoting competition, creativity, and development within and between small and medium-sized enterprises. Clusters empower these businesses to use their collective power to increase access to capital, networking opportunities, strategic knowledge, and business partnerships. In addition, government, private sector, and NGO support helps to grow cluster communities and the benefits often spill over into adjacent manufacturing, service and commercial areas that favour large communities (AfDB, 2013).

Organic clusters in Egypt currently have considerable potential, which, unless well exploited, can become a burden that affects the productivity and export capacity of the country. While organic small and medium-sized enterprises are efficient, there are a range of quality-related challenges that need to be addressed. Poorly packaged foods, for example, can lead to serious health concerns; similarly, faulty products in the automotive industry supply chain can lead to automobile accidents and loss of human life. In addition to producing low quality and faulty products, the productive activities of small and medium-sized businesses in the clusters tend to destroy the environment and provide indecent jobs in all industries. Thus, donor interventions and programmes like this can help in awareness-raising, promotion of value-chain growth and incorporation of informal businesses into the formal sector (AfDB, 2013).

4.5 Value Chain Development Programme (VCDP)

Brief Programme Summary:

- **Sector of Value Chains**: Textiles value chains; Chemical sector; Engineering sector; as well as food, and agro-business value chains (See also the 'Programme Impact' subsection for further details on these sectors).
- **Donor**: Industrial Modernisation Centre (IMC)
- **Budget**: Unknown
- **Start and End Date**: Ongoing
- **Partner(s)**: Federation of Egyptian Industries (FEI), specialised Technology centres, Investors associations in industrial areas

Programme Details:

This is one of the key programmes run by the Egyptian Industrial Modernization Center (IMC) and focuses on evaluating commodity value chains, from raw materials to eventual endusers, in order to find growth opportunities that lead to the sustainable creation and enhancement of value chains (IMC, 2020).

Programme Objectives:

The programme aims at boosting vertical integration, improving business links between small and medium-sized enterprises, enhancing the competitiveness of the Egyptian food industry, and creating a national supplier base for local and global industry leaders. The programme also works on horizontal integration in order to strengthen teamwork and enhance the negotiating opportunities for medium and small enterprises, to set up a database for Egyptian industrial products, and to provide a package of specialised technical support services (IMC, 2020; USAID, 2016).

Programme Impact:

The programme has **helped create a database for Egyptian industrial products** and to work with related facilities to **enhance integration between factories as well as provide high-performance technical support** for the development of import substitutes and better opportunities for access to different markets (USAID, 2016).

In its current/initial phase, development projects under this programme focus on certain segments that have the possibility to enhance the performance of the whole value chain. Notably, the programme is working to develop value chains in the following sectors of the Egyptian economy:

- **Textiles, home textiles and ready-made garments subsectors** (i.e. accessories, terry towels and shirt value chains);
- **Chemical sector** (i.e. plastic and detergents value chains);
- **Engineering sector** (i.e. automotive feeding industries, white goods & metal forming value chains); and
- **Food and agro-business** (i.e. confectionery, olive, and dairy products value chains).

Note: Although very relevant, VCDP programme documents (e.g. business case, evaluation reports, etc.) are not publicly available. This particularly limits the information on programme impacts and outcome.

5. Other Countries: Programmes on Value Chains Development

5.1 Bangladesh, Kenya, and South Africa: Trade and Global Value Chains Initiative (TGVCI)

Brief Programme Summary:

- **Sector of Value Chains**: Industrial development; Business policy and administration
- **Donor**: DFID
- **Budget**: GBP 4,467,580
- **Start and End Date**: Sept 2013 to Feb 2017
- **Partner(s)**: Natural Resource Governance Institute; Coffey International Development; Cardno Emerging Markets

Programme Details:

TGVCI was introduced in 2013 as a catalytic fund, working with firms to enhance working conditions and job opportunities for poor workers and smallholder farmers and to promote the long-term resilience of global supply chains. TGVCI has co-funded projects in partnerships that included major food and clothing retailers. These interventions were expected to benefit workers and smallholder farmers in the horticulture sector in Kenya and South Africa as well as the Ready-Made Garment (RMG) sector in Bangladesh. The nature of the selected sectors offered the option of including a specific focus on women's empowerment. The workforce at Bangladesh's clothing sector is composed of 80 per cent of women. Similarly, women represent a large proportion of the wage workforce in South Africa (over 50 per cent) and Kenya (over 60 per cent). Indicators of the programme were explicitly divided by gender to monitor the gender balance of participants (DFID, 2017; DFID, 2016).

Programme Objectives:

The key objective of the initiative is to create more socially and economically sustainable value chains that will result in increased integration of developing countries into global value chains. It supports the creation of more jobs, rising household incomes, and poverty alleviation – all of which will increase resilience to climate change and environmental degradation. The expected specific outcomes of the programme include (among others): i) improved capacity of suppliers in developing countries to meet efficiency and product quality requirements, as well as moving up the value chain in selected value chains, and ii) better-informed enterprises and actors in value chain regarding the benefits of investing in social upgrading (DFID, 2016).

Programme Impact:

The TGVCI successfully put together 20 projects in Kenya, Bangladesh, and South Africa on a matched funding basis and in two rounds. Out of the 20 projects19 were completed. Some of the key specific outcomes included the following (DFID, 2017):

- TGVCI directly benefited upwards of 100,000 people and indirectly benefited over a million people who work in export-oriented farms, agro-processing centres and manufacturing plants in Kenya, South Africa, and Bangladesh. Of these, some 34,000 women (nearly 0.5 million women indirectly) contributed to women's economic empowerment.
- UK and developing country private sector partners provided 50 % of project implementation costs, displaying that TGVCI is a genuine public-private partnership, and an illustration of UK aid leveraging private sector finance. No money was directly invested in the businesses themselves. Instead, the funding was used to co-finance development projects that might not otherwise have taken off the ground.
- Many of the retailers involved in TGVCI projects have noted that they want to continue or expand the models tested and proven by TGVCI.
- TGVCI's lessons have been learned and disseminated in DFID on how best to work with the UK private sector in development. This can assist DFID plan future collaborations with the UK private sector to develop supply and value chain trading with the UK's future potential trading partners.

The programme spent less than its initially planned budget because the overall value of the approved projects was lower than expected and also because of a higher commitment from private sector partners in some cases (DFID, 2017).

5.2 Indonesia: SMART-Fish programme

Brief Programme Summary:

- **Sector of Value Chains**: Fisheries Sector
- **Donor**: Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO)
- **Budget**: USD 4.5 Million
- **Start and End Date**: March 2013 to May 2019
- **Partner(s)**: Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF); Ministry of Industry (MoI), Ministry of Trade (MoT)

Programme Details:

The SMART-Fish Indonesia programme **supports three value chains of Seaweed, Pangasius and Pole-and-Line (P&L) Tuna with the aim to increase their competitiveness and sustainability for improved local and international market access** (UNIDO, 2020).

The preparation of the project began in 2010 and included a comprehensive participatory assessment of the needs of the Indonesian fisheries sector, involving a wide range of stakeholders. The work sought to identify barriers that prevent Indonesia from growing, exporting, and adding value to its seafood sector and identifying the actions needed to overcome these obstacles. Project identification profited from a comprehensive study of the Indonesian fisheries export sector, which analysed the value chains for chosen Indonesian fisheries products and identified ways wherein the overall chain could be modified and augmented. This work was conducted with the close involvement of all relevant stakeholders (especially the private sector), and included in-depth research on the demand and supply of fishery products and the established policy frameworks (UNIDO, 2019b).

Programme Objectives:

The objective of the project was to boost the value of Indonesian fisheries exports by offering government advice on implementing policies to create favourable export conditions, improve competitiveness, enhance compliance with international market requirements, and facilitate entry into global value chains. The project included six key components, namely: – i) Institutionalise public-private sector dialogue; ii) Reinforce local business support services to exporting SMEs in particular fisheries; iii) Advance educational programmes in productivity, sustainability and innovation for fisheries; iv) Pilot a traceability system for fisheries - and other maritime products; v) Assist in product quality certification process and upgrading of sustainability standards for critical markets; and vi) Work on the promotion of Indonesian fisheries exports for selected value chains (UNIDO, 2019b).

Programme Impact:

The project boosted capacities across the pangasius, seaweed and pole and line tuna (P&L tuna) value chains in Indonesia. Overall, the project involved 5,939 participants in 145 events that had taken place in 37 Indonesian districts and 16 provinces (UNIDO, 2019b).

In particular, the first component of the projects (i.e. institutionalised public-private sector dialogue) supported 17 **policy dialogues and numerous technical seminars. That helped to develop channels of communication between three value chain producer associations, a research organisation, the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF) and local government authorities.** Through these dialogues, value chain stakeholders have been able to contribute to important policy decisions that have helped to stabilise the market, such as the enforcement of restrictions on low-quality catfish in the country and the promotion of Indonesian pangasius in international markets. Round tables led to the establishment of the Tropical Seaweed Innovation Network and also allowed stakeholders to express their concerns to the MMAF on the data supporting current policies on marine algae and P&L tuna, which restrict the development of these two value chains (UNIDO, 2019b).

5.3 Ethiopia: Edible Oil Value Chain Enhancement

Brief Programme Summary:

- **Sector of Value Chains**: Edible Oil; Private Sector Development
- **Donor**: UNIDO (lead agency); FAO; ILO
- **Budget**: USD $2,999,956; UNIDO: USD 1,156,724; FAO: USD 1,061,062; ILO: USD 782,170
- **Start and End Date**: January 2010 to December 2012; No-cost extension granted to end June 2013.

- **Partner(s)**: Ministry of Industry (lead ministry); Ministry of Agriculture; and Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs

Programme Details:

The Edible Oil Value Chain Enhancement Joint Program was **designed as a pilot project to deal with the issues of the oilseed sector in Ethiopia.** The programme worked to promote the development of an efficient oilseed value chain which would encourage entrepreneurship, offer capital and services to farmers, increase demand for agricultural products and link farmers to markets, address the production, handling, processing, marketing and distribution of oilseeds. The programme anticipated that employment and income would be generated and that the productivity and quality of oil seeds and the production of edible oil would be augmented. The aim of the process was to boost food security and innovation across the value chain, raise farmers' incomes, processors and traders, and thus address three Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), such as poverty reduction, gender equality and sustainable development (Newkirk, 2013).

Programme Objectives:

The stated objective of the programme was to improve the sustainable supply of raw materials to the desired quantity and quality, promote efficient processing capacity and improve market access through effective integration and the leading role of the private sector in the whole value chain. The programme did not attempt to provide producer-oriented support for production – it rather intended to integrate the private sector in all aspects of the value chain, from production to processing to marketing and business support services. The programme was primarily targeted at small farmers and small and medium-sized enterprises in the Oromia and Amhara regions of Ethiopia, as well as their supporting public bodies and private sector counterparts. The programme aimed at pioneering the private sector led the supply of raw materials, capacity building for improved processing technologies and the development of linkages for access to finance and access to local and international markets (Newkirk, 2013).

Programme Impact:

Outcome (i) The productivity and competitiveness of the private sector led to an increase in the production of oilseeds by agriculture: the programme has made an important contribution to the achievement of this outcome in the context of the pilot programme. The productivity and competitiveness of oilseeds have been enhanced for the group of oilseed farmers who have participated in the programme and for their related primary cooperatives. Much more work remains to be done, and many more farmers and primary cooperatives must participate in the programme or the related programme in order to make a significant contribution to the sector and to Ethiopia as a whole, but the project has clearly shown the direction that this work should take (Newkirk, 2013).

Outcome (ii) Capacity and competitiveness of stakeholders for the processing of edible oil seeds is enhanced:

The programme has made a significant contribution to this outcome. Oilseed processors have experienced, and have expressed, renewed confidence in the sector and through linkages within the processing component of the value chain and up and down the value chain (but particularly with seed growers and their related cooperatives and cooperatives). These links, which operate within the framework of the sector cluster arrangement, are the strongest indicator in the programme of the future directions needed, both for the potential scale-up of the programme and for the development of the sector at a national level. There is a significant potential in Ethiopia for domestic production of edible oil to replace imports, and the programme has shown that it is particularly effective and successful in improving processor competitiveness and capacity to achieve this result. With one specific development, the programme has gone well beyond its design and has set out a clear plan for potentially critical changes in the structure and functioning of the oilseed sector in the future. This development, the establishment of joint processing facilities in both the Amhara and Oromia regions, was an exemplary demonstration of a public private partnership and paved the way for potentially significant developments in the sector (Newkirk, 2013).

Outcome (iii) Improved access to local and international markets for edible oil producers: the programme has made a significant contribution to the achievement of this outcome. The most important aspect of the programme’s success in this part of the value chain was not in relation to international markets, but rather in the development of vertical linkages within the value chain, which helped contribute to a better marketing framework for seed growers, cooperatives and processors. Far more work is needed within the value chain and in establishing significant market arrangements for domestic edible oils, but clear directions have been shown (Newkirk, 2013).

6. References

AfDB (2013). Support to Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises in Organic Clusters Project. Project Appraisal Report. African Development Bank. https://projectsportal.afdb.org/dataportal/VProject/show/G-EG-AAG-ZZZ-001

AfDB (2015). Egypt - Rural Income and Economic Enhancement Project (RIEEP). Project Evaluation Report. African Development Bank. https://projectsportal.afdb.org/dataportal/VProject/show/P-EG-IE0-003

AfDB (2020). Egypt - Rural Income and Economic Enhancement Project (RIEEP). Detailed Project Report. African Development Bank. https://projectsportal.afdb.org/dataportal/VProject/show/P-EG-IE0-003#home

AfDB (2020b). Support to Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises in Organic Clusters Project. Detailed Project Report. African Development Bank. https://projectsportal.afdb.org/dataportal/VProject/show/G-EG-AAG-ZZZ-001#home

Bacon, C. (2005). Confronting the coffee crisis: can fair trade, organic, and specialty coffees reduce small-scale farmer vulnerability in northern Nicaragua?, World Development, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 497-511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2004.10.002

Bamber, P., and C. Staritz. (2016). The Gender Dimensions of Global Value Chains. Geneva: International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development. https://ictsd.iisd.org/sites/default/files/research/the_gender_dimensions_of_global_value_chains.pdf

Coles, C., and J. Mitchell. (2011). Gender and Agricultural Value Chains: A Review of Current Knowledge and Practice and Their Policy Implications. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. http://www.fao.org/3/a-am310e.pdf

DFID (2008), The Operational Guide for the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) Approach, Department for International Development, London, http://www.value-chains.org/dyn/bds/docs/681/op%20guide%202008.pdf

DFID (2016). Trade and Global Value Chains (TGVC) Initiative (2013-15). Intervention Summary. Department for International Development. https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-203535/documents

DFID (2017). Trade and Global Value Chains Initiative. Project Completion Review. Department for International Development. https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-203535/documents

Donovan, J., Franzel, S., Cunha, M., Gyau, A., & Mithöfer, D. (2015). Guides for value chain development: a comparative review. Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies. https://doi.org/10.1108/JADEE-07-2013-0025

Ferrand, D., Gibson, A. and Scott, H. (2004). Making Markets Work for the Poor: An Objective and an Approach for Governments and Development Agencies, ComMark, Pretoria. https://beamexchange.org/uploads/filer_public/94/89/9489ca71-93d6-45ba-975b-0c8cc490b59e/making_markets_work_for_the_poor_2004.pdf

Harper, M., J. Belt, and R. Roy. (2015). Commercial and Inclusive Value Chains: Doing Good and Doing Well. Rugby: Practical Action. https://doi.org/10.3362/9781780448671

Hobbs, J., Cooney, A. and Fulton, M. (2000). Value Chains in the Agri-Food Sector: What are they? How do they work? Are They for Me?, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318878324_Value_Chain_Thinking_A_Trainer's_Manual

Humphrey, J. and Navas-Alemán, L. (2010). Value chains, donor interventions, and poverty reduction: a review of donor practice, Research Report No. 63, IDS Brighton. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2040-0217.2010.00063_2.x

ILO (2013). The Pro-poor horticulture value chain in Upper Egypt (SALASEL). Evaluation report. International Labour Organization. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_220651.pdf

ILO (2016). Women's Entrepreneurship Development Assessment: Egypt. International Labour Organization. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/---ifp_seed/documents/publication/wcms_551168.pdf

IMC (2020). Value Chain Development Programme (VCDP). Industrial Modernisation Centre. http://www.imc-egypt.org/index.php/imc/item/79-value-chain-development-programme

Ingram, V., J. Schure, J. C. Tieguhong, O. Ndoye, A. Awono, and D. M. Iponga. (2014). Gender Implications of Forest Product Value Chains in the Congo Basin. Forests, Trees and Livelihoods 23 (1–2): 67–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/14728028.2014.887610

Kaplinsky, R. (2016). Inclusive and Sustainable Growth: The SDG Value Chains Nexus. Geneva: International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development. https://www.tralac.org/images/docs/10543/inclusive-and-sustainable-growth-the-sdg-value-chains-nexus-ictsd-september-2016.pdf

Lundy, M., Gottret, M.V., Ostertag, C., Best, R. and Ferris, S. (2007). Participatory Market Chain Analysis for Smallholder Producers, Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical. https://www.crs.org/sites/default/files/tools-research/participatory-market-chain-analysis-for-smallholder-producers.pdf

Mayoux, L. and Mackie, G. (2008). Making the strongest links: a practical guide to mainstreaming gender analysis in value chain development", International Labour Office (ILO), Addis Ababa. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/documents/instructionalmaterial/wcms_106538.pdf

Nang'ole, E., Mithofer, D. and Franzel, S. (2011). Review of guidelines and manuals for value chain analysis for agricultural and forest products", Occasional Paper No. 17, World Agroforestry Centre. https://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/7718/OP11160.pdf?sequence=1

Newkirk, J. (2013) Edible Oil Value Chain Enhancement, Final Evaluation Report. United Nations Industrial Development Organization. https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/2013-10/ETH_FMETH10002-A02_Final_EvalRep_EdibleOilValueChainEnhancement__JUL13_0.pdf

OECD (2013). Analysis of Business Development Service Provision and Incubation for Women Entrepreneurs in the MENA Region. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. http://www.oecd.org/mena/competitiveness/BDS.pdf

Reardon, T., Timmer, C.P., Barrett, C.B. and Berdegue, J. (2003). The rise of supermarkets in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 85 No. 5, pp. 1140-1146. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0092-5853.2003.00520.x

Rubin D., and Manfre C. (2014) Promoting Gender-Equitable Agricultural Value Chains: Issues, Opportunities, and Next Steps. In: Quisumbing A., Meinzen-Dick R., Raney T., Croppenstedt A., Behrman J., Peterman A. (eds) Gender in Agriculture. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8616-4_12

Shackleton, S., F. Paumgarten, H. Kassa, M. Husselman, and M. Zida. (2011). Opportunities for Enhancing Poor Women's Socioeconomic Empowerment in the Value Chains of Three African Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs). International Forestry Review 13 (2): 136–151. https://doi.org/10.1505/146554811797406642

Staritz, C. (2012), Value Chains for Development: Potentials and Limitations of Global Value Chain Approaches in Donor Interventions, Austrian Research Foundation for International Development, Vienna. https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/98802/1/734851367.pdf

Stoian, D., Donovan, J., Elias, M., & Blare, T. (2018). Fit for purpose? A review of guides for gender-equitable value chain development. Development in Practice, 28(4), 494-509. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2018.1447550

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) (2008). A Synthesis of the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) Approach, SDC, Bern. http://www.value-chains.org/dyn/bds/docs/681/synthesis_2008.pdf

UNIDO (2011). Pro-Poor Value Chain Development: 25 guiding questions for designing and implementing agroindustry projects. United Nations Industrial Development Organization. https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/2011-12/Pro-poor_value_chain_development_2011_0.pdf

UNIDO (2014). UNIDO activities in Egypt. United Nations Industrial Development Organization. https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/2014-05/UNIDO_2014_Report_Egypt_updated_0.pdf

UNIDO (2016). Upgrading the Medicinal and Aromatic Plant Value Chain – Access to Export Markets (EMAP). Independent Terminal Evaluation. United Nations Industrial Development Organization. https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/2016-07/Final_evaluation_report_US_EGY_10005_EMAP_0.pdf

UNIDO (2017). Independent Evaluation: Green Trade Initiative (GTI). United Nations Industrial Development Organization. https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/files/2018-02/EGY-100089_GTI_EvalRep_IndepEval_2017.pdf

UNIDO (2019). UNIDO activities in Egypt 2017 – 2018. Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development. United Nations Industrial Development Organization. https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/files/2018-12/annual_2018_webexample_0.pdf

UNIDO (2019b). Independent Terminal Evaluation Indonesia SMART-Fish programme: Increasing trade capacities of selected value chains within the fisheries sector in Indonesia. United Nations Industrial Development Organization. https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/files/2020-01/120110_Indonesia_SMART%20Fish_Terminal%20evaluation.pdf

UNIDO (2020). SMART-Fish Indonesia; Traceable Seaweed. United Nations Industrial Development Organization. https://tii.unido.org/news/smart-fish-indonesia-traceable-seaweed

USAID (2016). Strengthening Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Development (SEED): Value Chain Assessment Study. United States Agency for International Development. http://www.seedegypt.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/D-CODE-USAID-SEED-Project-Value-Chain-Assesssment.September-2016.public.pdf

Webber, C.M. and Labaste, P. (2010). Building Competitiveness in Africa's Agriculture: A Guide to Value Chain Concepts and Applications, World Bank, Washington, DC. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/2401/524610PUB0AFR0101Official0Use0Only1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Weinberger, K. and Lumpkin, T. (2007). Diversification into horticulture and poverty reduction: a research agenda, World Development, Vol. 35 No. 8, pp. 1464-1480. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2007.05.002

Suggested citation

Megersa, K. (2020). *Programmes to Develop and Grow Value Chains: Evidences from Egypt and Other Developing Countries*. K4D Helpdesk Report 875. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

About this report

This report is based on six days of desk-based research. The K4D research helpdesk provides rapid syntheses of a selection of recent relevant literature and international expert thinking in response to specific questions relating to international development. For any enquiries, contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

K4D services are provided by a consortium of leading organisations working in international development, led by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), with Education Development Trust, Itad, University of Leeds Nuffield Centre for International Health and Development, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), University of Birmingham International Development Department (IDD) and the University of Manchester Humanitarian and Conflict Response Institute (HCRI).