

Nile Fresh Labs

CFP1-2026-001 | Startup | Agri-food | Cairo

Project stage: Pilot and testing stage

Evaluation snapshot

Recommendation: Borderline | Eligibility: Pass | Proposed score: 45 / 60

Requested grant: €42,000 | Co-financing: 22% | Documents processed: 4 / 4

Strong fit with the value-chain challenge and a credible pilot route, with some execution risk around commercial uptake and budget justification.

Reviewer moderation note: keep for now

Key strengths

- Clear value-chain bottleneck definition with customer validation
- Technically credible pilot design with measurable outputs
- Well-qualified team with relevant product and operations expertise

Main risks

- Partnership letters are still indicative rather than binding
- One budget line for external services remains weakly justified

Moderation status

Workflow status: Finalised | Reviewer: mb

Moderated recommendation band: Borderline

Finalised at: 17 Apr 2026

Structured summary

Project overview

Nile Fresh Labs proposes a lightweight post-harvest traceability and quality control solution for fruit and vegetable processors, aimed at reducing spoilage and improving export readiness.

Innovation and approach

The proposal combines low-cost sensor kits, batch tracking software, and advisory onboarding for processors that currently rely on manual records.

Budget and co-financing

The budget is concentrated on pilot hardware, software refinement, and field support. Co-financing is above the minimum threshold and appears broadly credible.

Impact and risks

Expected impact is plausible for pilot scale. The largest risk is whether processors convert from trial adoption to routine paid usage within the implementation window.

Eligibility view

Applicant is formally registered in Egypt

Status: Pass

Evidence: Commercial registration certificate and head office address are present.

Source: Supporting pack, registration certificate

100% Egyptian ownership

Status: Pass

Evidence: Shareholding declaration confirms Egyptian ownership structure.

Source: Application form, section 2

Project is in planning, pilot, or testing stage

Status: Pass

Evidence: Applicant describes current pilot deployment with two trial processors.

Source: Concept note, implementation section

Application is complete

Status: Manual check

Evidence: Core files are present, but one tax compliance annex is low quality.

Source: Supporting pack, tax certificate

Scoring matrix

Institutional capacity: Organisational experience and track record

Final score: 8 / 10 | AI draft: 8 / 10 | Confidence: Medium

Rationale: The team shows relevant delivery history and sector knowledge, though institutional scale is still limited.

Gap: Limited evidence of prior grant-managed delivery.

Moderation: Reviewer confirmed

Institutional capacity: Financial capacity

Final score: 7 / 10 | AI draft: 7 / 10 | Confidence: Low

Rationale: Basic financial stability is visible, but working capital resilience is not fully evidenced.

Gap: Financial statements need deeper reviewer validation.

Moderation: Reviewer confirmed

Relevance and innovation: Innovation and added value

Final score: 9 / 10 | AI draft: 9 / 10 | Confidence: High

Rationale: The product addresses a concrete bottleneck with a practical operational model and a clear user case.

Gap: No independent pilot benchmark beyond applicant testimony.

Moderation: Reviewer confirmed

Methodology and implementation: Feasibility and work plan

Final score: 7 / 10 | AI draft: 7 / 10 | Confidence: Medium

Rationale: The work plan is coherent and sequenced, but milestone dependency handling is light.

Gap: Customer onboarding assumptions could be more explicit.

Moderation: Reviewer confirmed

Financial plan and cost efficiency: Budget coherence and justification

Final score: 8 / 10 | AI draft: 8 / 10 | Confidence: Medium

Rationale: Most cost lines map well to activities and outputs.

Gap: External services line needs sharper justification.

Moderation: Reviewer confirmed

Impact, inclusiveness, and sustainability: Long-term sustainability

Final score: 6 / 10 | AI draft: 6 / 10 | Confidence: Medium

Rationale: The commercial logic is plausible but still early.

Gap: Recurring revenue assumptions need testing.

Moderation: Reviewer confirmed

Evidence trail

Eligibility: project stage | Concept note

Location: Page 6

Excerpt: The solution has been tested with two processors in a supervised pilot environment.

Scoring: innovation and added value | Concept note

Location: Page 8

Excerpt: The proposed system replaces paper-based traceability with low-cost digital batch logging.

Red flag: budget clarity | Budget

Location: External services tab

Excerpt: Technical advisory support line is not broken down by activity or unit assumption.

Red flag review

External services line lacks unit logic (Medium | Open)

One advisory services line is bundled and makes reviewer verification harder.

Partnership evidence is still provisional (Low | In review)

The proposal names processing partners, but only one letter of support appears signed.

Evaluation activity

Completed | Deterministic fallback | 15 Apr 2026

CfP1 fallback evaluation completed and prepared the first reviewer draft.

Deterministic | ruleset-cfp1-v1 | Prompt bundle v1 (fallback)

Document register

nile-fresh-application-form.docx | Application form

Status: Processed | Uploaded: 14 Apr 2026

Diagnostics: Seeded document placeholder.

nile-fresh-concept-note.pdf | Concept note

Status: Processed | Uploaded: 14 Apr 2026

Diagnostics: Seeded document placeholder.

nile-fresh-budget.xlsx | Budget

Status: Processed | Uploaded: 14 Apr 2026

Diagnostics: Seeded document placeholder.

nile-fresh-supporting-pack.pdf | Supporting documents

Status: Processed | Uploaded: 14 Apr 2026

Diagnostics: Seeded document placeholder.

Generated by GOPA Grant Studio for preparatory evaluation use. Final decisions remain with the selection committee.