

*Thematic Global Evaluation of European
Commission Support to agricultural
commodities in ACP countries*

Final Report

Volume 2: Annexes 1 to 3

April 2012

Evaluation for the European Commission





PARTICIP GmbH
Germany



Overseas Development
Institute,
United Kingdom

A consortium of
EGEVAL II (ADE-Particip)-DRN-
DIE-ECDPM-ODI
c/o ADE, leading company:

ADE s.a.
Rue de Clairvaux, 40, Bte 101
B - 1348 Louvain-La-Neuve /
Belgium
Phone: +32 10 45 45 10
Fax: +32 10 45 40 99
Email: ade@ade.be

EGEVAL II Headquarters
Merzhauser Str. 183
D - 79100 Freiburg / Germany
Phone: +49-761-79074-0
Fax: +49-761-79074-90
Email: info@egeval.org

nuary

Framework contract for
**Multi-country thematic and regional/country-level strategy
evaluation studies and synthesis in the area of external co-
operation**

**LOT 1:
Multi-Country Evaluation Studies of Economic
sectors/themes of EC External Cooperation**

**Ref.: EuropeAid/122888/C/SER/Multi
Request for Service: 2009/227410**

**Thematic global evaluation of European
Commission support to agricultural
commodities in ACP countries**

FINAL REPORT

VOLUME 2: ANNEXES 1 TO 3

April 2012

This evaluation was carried out by



This report has been prepared by the consortium led by EGEVAL II (ADE and Particip), with DRN, ECDPM, ODIE and DIE

The author accepts sole responsibility for this report drawn up on behalf of the Commission of the European Communities.

The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission.

Table of contents

VOLUME 1: MAIN REPORT

VOLUME 2: ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

ANNEX 2: EVALUATION QUESTIONS, JUDGEMENT CRITERIA AND INDICATORS

ANNEX 3: IDENTIFICATION FICHES OF THE 24 SELECTED INTERVENTIONS

ANNEX 4: COMPLETED DATA COLLECTION GRIDS

ANNEX 5: THE EIGHT PRODUCT FICHES

ANNEX 6: ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

ANNEX 7: FIELD MISSION DEBRIEFINGS

ANNEX 8: LIST OF PERSONS MET

ANNEX 9: BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annex 1 : Terms of Reference



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
EuropeAid Co-operation Office

Evaluation

**Thematic global evaluation of European Commission support
to agricultural commodities in ACP countries**

FINAL

TERMS OF REFERENCE

December 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. MANDATE AND OBJECTIVES	1
2. BACKGROUND.....	1
3. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION	3
4. METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH.....	7
4.1. Desk phase.....	8
4.2. Field phase.....	10
4.3. Final reports and seminar	11
4.4. Dissemination and follow-up	12
5. IDENTIFICATION OF THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS/ISSUES	12
6. MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISION OF THE EVALUATION.....	14
7. EVALUATION TEAM.....	15
8. TIMING.....	15
9. COST OF THE EVALUATION AND PAYMENT MODALITIES	16
ANNEX 1 NON EXHAUSTIVE LIST OF PRODUCTS FALLING WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION	16
ANNEX 1 – KEY DOCUMENTATION (NON-EXHAUSTIVE LIST)	17
ANNEX 2. OUTLINE STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT	17
ANNEX 3 - QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID.....	20

1. MANDATE AND OBJECTIVES

Systematic and timely evaluation of its expenditure programmes is an established priority for the European Commission, as a means of accounting for the management of allocated funds and as a way of promoting a lesson-learning culture throughout the organisation. The focus is on the **impact** (effects) of these programmes against a background of greater concentration of external co-operation and increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches**, particularly in the context of the programmes of the Relex Family of Directorates-General¹. In addition to evaluating impacts of programmes, the evaluations serve to assess the adequacy and impacts of policy decisions taken by the European Commission and the EU on the whole.

This evaluation is part of the 2009 evaluation programme as approved by the External Relations and Development Commissioners.

The main objectives of the evaluation are:

- to provide the relevant external co-operation services of the EC and the wider public with an overall independent assessment of the Commission's past and current cooperation support to agricultural commodities;
- To identify key lessons in order to improve the current and future strategies and programmes of the Commission;

The evaluation will focus on the EU Action Plan on Agricultural Commodities² and the EU Africa Partnership on Cotton adopted in 2004³, as endorsed by the Council on 27 April 2004.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. EC policy towards agricultural commodities

Agricultural commodity chains are vital in the economies of many developing countries. They are crucial to the employment and income for millions of people, and are a major source of revenue and foreign exchange of many developing states. For many sub-national regions within developing countries, commodities are the engine for economic development.

The producers involved in these commodity chains live an unpredictable existence because the **prices for a wide range of commodities are very volatile**. The prices of some important agricultural commodities (for example, sugar, cotton, coffee and cocoa) fell by 30 to 60% between 1970 and 2000 and have both risen and fallen since then.

For rural communities this is problematic as the sale of agricultural commodities often represents the main cash income of large sections of rural families. In **highly commodity dependent developing countries (CDDCs)**, this price pattern can also lead to macroeconomic imbalances: reduced export earnings, debt repayment capacity, credit availability, government revenue and ability to provide basic services such as health care and education.

¹ Directorates General of External Relations, (RELEX), Development (DEV) and the EuropeAid Co-operation Office (AIDCO).

² COM(2004) 89 final. Proposal for an EU Action Plan on Agricultural commodity chains, trade and poverty

³ COM(2004) 87 final. Proposal for an EU-Africa partnership in support of cotton sector development

Recognizing the development importance of agricultural commodities, the Commission had long extended support to the agricultural commodity sectors, not least via the so called **Stabex instrument**. However, in 2003, the Commission decided to review its approach to supporting the sectors. This decision was based on a series of changes at the international and national scene affecting the commodity sectors and the producers⁴.

Following a period of **analysis and consultations**, the Commission in February 2004 issued a proposal for an EU Action Plan on Agricultural commodity chains, trade and poverty⁵, as well as a specific proposal for an EU Africa partnership for cotton sector development⁶. Both communications were focused on ensuring **more and better EU actions in this area**, addressing six main challenges facing commodity dependent developing countries (CDDCs):

- treating commodity chains and dependence as priority issues in combating poverty;
- coping with the long-term decline in prices;
- managing commodity risks and providing access to finance;
- diversifying production around traditional commodities;
- promoting integration in the international trading system;
- encouraging the sustainable business and investment practices in the CDDCs.

It should be noted that the analysis was made on data available in 2003/2004, and that commodity prices have both risen and fallen since then. The key point embedded in the first challenge was that commodity sectors need to be a **strategic priority of governments**, so that various challenges can be effectively tackled. The second challenge sought to stress the fact that these sectors face **continued competition and long-term downward price pressures**, which need to be continuously addressed through investments in productivity, marketing, etc. The third challenge aimed at **differentiating this necessary long-term adaptation** from the shorter term fluctuations which also characterise the sectors, and which need a different type of response in the form of some kind of risk management efforts. Challenges four and five intended to make the link between **commodity specific support**, and wider efforts to promote **trade integration**. Finally, the last challenge sought to capitalise on **emerging trends in sustainability labelling** such as Fair trade, etc.

On 27 April 2004, the Council endorsed both these proposals, effectively committing to such enhanced joint action⁷. The Council identified the following key priority areas of work:

- supporting CDDCs in the **design and implementation of commodity chain strategies**,

⁴ The dramatic price falls experienced for several agricultural commodities at the turn of the century was one, but there were also others: In particular, there had been privatization and deregulation at both national and international markets; a move to a more retail-driven market with competition taking place not only at the basis of prices; emergence of various sustainability concerns; persistent commodity dependence in some countries; a shift in development cooperation approaches requiring governments to have clearer strategic approaches for mobilizing external financing of the sectors; and, not least, developments in international trade negotiations affecting the sectors, including cotton.

⁵ COM(2004) 89 final. Proposal for an EU Action Plan on Agricultural commodity chains, trade and poverty

⁶ COM(2004) 87 final. Proposal for an EU-Africa partnership in support of cotton sector development

⁷ "The Council endorses the objectives, orientations, policy priorities and measures of the proposed EU Action Plan; and agrees that the EU and its Member States should pursue these, including the issue of resources, in their bilateral and multilateral cooperation as well as in relevant international fora, and where appropriate, in their respective bilateral dialogue with CDDCs"

building on existing initiatives and in the context of national development strategies and in particular Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS);

- advancing efforts to **develop regional markets, policies and services in support of commodity sectors**. Advantage should in particular be taken of the opportunity presented by the negotiations on EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs);
 - supporting the CDDCs in their **effort towards diversification**, in particular by encouraging livelihood diversification for commodity producers, such support, where appropriate, should be provided in the context of the PRS of the particular country in accordance with the principle of ownership;
 - extending **access to market-based commodity risk instruments** at the micro level, and piloting these tools for the macro level;
 - developing **multi-donor cooperation on agricultural commodities** with international organisations (WB, FAO, UNCTAD, CFC), with a view to enhance expertise and development of innovative tools to support national commodity strategies;
- In addition, the Council recognised the important role of **International Commodity Bodies (ICBs)** as fora for co-operation between producer and consumer countries, both at government and private sector level; in particular, the participation of private sector should be encouraged. It invited the EC and Member States to undertake assessments, deepen the reflections and where appropriate make proposals with a view to ensuring the efficiency of these bodies and of their contribution to market functioning, sustainable development and other common interests of the sectors, and to commodity chain strategies in CDDCs.

Similar specific recommendations were issued for **cotton**. Later in 2004 these were followed up by an EU-Africa meeting in Paris, which adopted a joint Action Plan for collaboration regarding cotton⁸, and which should be seen as the main policy guidance for EU work in this area.

3. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation shall provide an overall assessment of EC support to agricultural commodities, in the context of the policies and approaches laid down in the EC Communication on "Agricultural commodity chains, dependence and poverty- a proposal for an EU action plan"⁹ and the EC Communication "Proposal for an EU-Africa partnership in support of cotton sector development"¹⁰ as endorsed by the Council conclusions of 27 April 2004¹¹. **The evaluation shall cover aid implementation over the period 2004-2009, the inventory will cover the period 2000-2009.** The **purpose** of the evaluation is to assess to what extent the Commission assistance has been relevant, efficient, effective and sustainable in providing the expected impacts in the agricultural commodities sector following the issue of the two Action plans. In particular, it should be assessed whether the policy line laid down have been pursued and whether it remains valid today or whether adjustments would be necessary in the future.

⁸ <http://www.cotton-forum.org/indexflash.html>

⁹ COM (2004) 89 final agricultural commodity chains, dependence and poverty- a proposal for an EU action plan

¹⁰ COM (2004) 87 final, Proposal for an EU-Africa partnership in support of cotton sector development

¹¹ Conclusions of 27 April 2004 8972/04

In short, the evaluation should assess progress achieved in terms of the EC assisting, in coordination and complementarity with EU MS, CDDCs in (i) **consolidating their commodity sectors** through clear strategies and enhanced competitiveness or (ii) in **diversifying** out of the so-called traditional sectors. Although information will be collected concerning different products¹², the assessment of the progresses achieved would take place at a general level. For each product there will be a fiche presenting the outcome of the desk study and of the field mission plus conclusions by product. Answers to Evaluation Questions, conclusions and recommendations will be provided at the general level and not at the level of the product from which information has been drawn.

Cotton had a special place in the EU commodities policy agreed in 2004, and will need a special focus in the evaluation. Whilst the policy recommendations are completely coherent with those embedded in the general communication, some specific efforts were set in motion focussed on supporting African cotton producing countries, and a special Steering group was set up to follow the work. It is not a question of providing a full fledged sector evaluation for cotton, but it is necessary to assess specifically the extent to which the policy recommendations laid down specifically for this product have been implemented, and appear relevant also for the future. This will be done through an overall assessment but not through specific answers to evaluation questions, conclusions and recommendations.

In view of the commodity policy outlined here being endorsed as a joint EU approach, it will be important to look into the consistency of initiatives taken by EC and MS¹³. The evaluation should pay particular attention to assessing the effective coordination and complementarity between EC and other EU donors and actors, as well as the coherence¹⁴ with other relevant EC/EU policies and the partner Governments' priorities and activities including international legal commitments to commodities. It has to be noted that this is an EC evaluation and only coordination, synergies and complementarity with Member States (MS) actions will be analysed and **not MS actions as such**. It should be assessed whether the adoption of the two Action Plans have led to some critical EU mass of support has been made available to ACP countries.

Whilst the main focus of the evaluation are programmes financed from the EDF, for the inventory all possible sources of EC finance should be covered, including general EC budget lines in favour of bananas, sugar etc. Instruments such as the **FLEX** should be covered, as well as programmes financed from **STABEX** resources after the formal ending of the programme, and also relevant "All ACP" programmes. Ensure that the final report contains, in addition to the detailed evaluation, an overview of ALL EU commodity support.

When discussing diversification, wider EU support to **Aid for Trade** should be taken into account, although a distinction should be made so to identify clearly programmes specifically targeting commodities sectors. The related database will form integral part of the inventory. The typology proposed by the consultants should be discussed in the inception report. All the aspects

¹² The list of products is in annex 1. Out of those 12 products, 8 will be dealt with extensively. This list can be modified by the RG but the total number of products dealt with extensively will not change.

¹³ The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partner's and donors' policies. The extent to which the intervention logic is not contradictory and does not contradict other interventions with similar objectives undertaken by MSs. The consultants would have to identify these initiatives and establish whether they are coherent with EC/EU initiatives.

¹⁴ Here coherence is intended as one of the three Cs (coordination, complementarity and coherence) and dealt with as a key issues

of **EC support to agricultural commodities** traded and marketed internationally in partner countries fall within the **scope of this evaluation** since these products are directly linked to poverty.

There are already some specific support programmes for bananas and sugar for example, and these programmes are having separate evaluations¹⁵. Therefore, it is not required to analyse this support in detail – however, the results of these evaluations, where relevant and useful, should be referred to in this evaluation and in the final report.

It is expected that the following main topics/issues will be addressed:

- (1) Overall profile of EC support to agricultural commodities: geographical focus (within the ACP Countries), types of support, poverty focus, continuity over time, etc.;
- (2) Alignment of EC support to agricultural commodities with national development priorities (PRSPs, etc.) and with national sector plans; but also the reverse – impacts of EU support on PRSPs; specific attention to be paid to the degree of **involvement of the private sector and small scale producers** in the design of strategies, (and programmes and projects)
- (3) Contribution of the EC support - in terms of impacts and sustainability; in particular the extent to which support actually strengthens **the position of producers** in the value chains;
- (4) Relevance of financing mechanisms and aid modalities (including sector and general budget support operations) and effectiveness of the linked sector policy dialogue;
- (5) Complementarity among various instruments (e.g. National Indicative programmes, Regional indicative programmes, thematic budget lines).

Specific further questions which should be addressed include (not exhaustive):

- The extent to which the **regional dimension** and in particular **regional integration** has been present in EU commodities support, and the scope for further efforts in this area. The generally increased attention to wider trade integration issues are changing the approach that the EC should take to commodity related support (e.g. the role of regional trade in food crops such as beans and maize). Some assessment on whether delays in implementing regional integration are affecting the recovery of the commodity sectors in ACP countries.

- Analysis of the relative success of **different approaches/instruments** – e.g. emphasis on micro-level solutions (productivity enhancement through GAP¹⁶, product enhancement etc) as opposed to more macro-level approaches such as success or otherwise of Commodity Exchanges/ Risk Management tools/MIS¹⁷/ WRS¹⁸ etc. and look into why they have taken off (or why not);

- State of play regarding the **access to commodity risk management tools**;

¹⁵ "Impact Evaluation of the Special Framework of Assistance for Traditional ACP Suppliers of Bananas" Global report, Project No. 2008/159263 - Version 1, the sugar evaluation is still ongoing and will be finalized by the end of the year.

¹⁶ Good Agricultural Practice: http://www.globalgap.org/cms/front_content.php?idcat=9

¹⁷ MIS: Marker information systems

¹⁸ WRS - Warehouse receipts systems

- Whether coordination with **relevant international organisations** (FAO, UNCTAD, ITC, World Bank, Common Fund for Commodities and ICBs) has increased following adoption of the Action Plans; and whether there is good coherence and complementarity between the activities of these bodies and those of the EC/EU. As for the ICBs, comments should be made in light of the recommendation of the Council to "undertake assessments, deepen the reflections and where appropriate make proposals with a view to ensuring the efficiency of these bodies and of their contribution to market functioning, sustainable development and other common interests of the sectors, and to commodity chain strategies in CDDCs".

- Whether the **Integrated Framework and its Diagnostic Trade Integration Studies** has played a constructive role in support of the commodity sector dialogue in concerned countries

The evaluation should come to a **general overall judgement** of the extent to which Commission policies, strategies and sector programmes, including Sector Budget Support and General Budget Support, have contributed to the achievement of the objectives and intended impacts, based on the answers to the agreed **evaluation questions**.

The evaluation should cover activities that fall within the relevant sub-sectors, financed from thematic and geographical budget lines/instruments, EDF and other financial instruments. The evaluation shall lead to **conclusions** based on objective, credible, reliable and valid findings and provide the EC with a set of operational and useful **recommendations**. The answers to the evaluation questions, conclusions and recommendations will be formulated at the level of the General Communication and not at the level of the specific products. However, each thematic fiche for the products concerned will also provide an overall assessment for each of these products. This overall assessment will be done in the light of the requirements of the overall Communication.

The evaluation shall be forward looking and take into account the most recent policy and programming decisions, providing lessons and recommendations for the continued support to the basic products sector within the present context and relevant political commitments (such as the European consensus, the Paris Declaration, all regional instruments) as well as taking into account the current processes within the Commission until 2009.

To provide relevant and forward looking recommendations, the **10th EDF programming** should be comprehensively analysed, so that all its implications in ACP countries are examined.

The evaluation should serve policy decision-making and project management purposes. The main users of the evaluation will be DG DEV, the EUROPEAID Co-operation Office and the EC Delegations. Other EC services (e.g. DG RELEX, DG AGRI and DG TRADE) may also benefit from the results of this evaluation. The evaluation should also generate results of interest to a broader audience, including governments of partner countries, Member States, civil society and others.

The evaluation will include a comprehensive desk phase followed by **country case studies by product** to be carried out in **8-10 different representative countries** (considering geographical criteria as well as various types of co-operation). The case studies shall be selected in consultation with the Reference Group (RG), taking into account different experiences in the area of support to basic products sector as well as different country/regional contexts.

Annex 1 provides a list of the products concerned by the evaluation, but it should be noted that programmes to be considered need not be commodity specific but can also be thematic or cross-cutting in nature, aimed at supporting the functioning of commodity markets in a wider sense.

4. METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

The overall methodology guidance is available on the web page of the Evaluation Unit under the following address:

<http://ec.europa.eu/comm/europeaid/evaluation/methodology2/index> .

Within 14 days after the reception of the ToRs, the Consultants will present a **launch note** which should contain:

- their understanding of the ToRs;
- a methodological note including the implementation of the quality control;
- the provisional composition of the evaluation team with CVs¹⁹;
- a proposed budget²⁰.

Following the launch note, the main key deliverables are:

- The kick-off meeting;
- The inception meeting;
- The inception report;
- The desk report;
- The final report;
- The dissemination seminar in Brussels.

All the relevant documentation, which is available on AIDCO Intranet address, will be made available by the Evaluation Unit.

The consultants are invited to use all the available literature/studies/results (partial or completed, official or unofficial) done so far on the subject if they consider it can be useful for the drafting of the report.

The evaluation approach should encompass the following fundamental tasks

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">i. identify, explain and prioritise the Commission's <u>objectives</u> in the field of agricultural commodities, their logic and consistency, their relevance both to EU objectives and to the needs of recipient countries, the intended impact²¹ corresponding to each objective, and finally how these intended impacts fit within broader and changing contexts (sociological, cultural, economic, political);ii. The coherence of the Commission's cooperation strategies (all instruments included) for the period; |
|---|

¹⁹ All birthday dates must be written in the following Format: dd/mm/yyyy

²⁰ In the frame of a "framework contract"

²¹ Please note the ordering of the five criteria. In the context of the programmes of the External Relations Directorates-General, the increased focus on *impact* is of particular importance given the current emphasis on results-based management as well as on partner Governments to focus their policies more on poverty alleviation, good governance, democracy, and sound macroeconomic management.

- iii. identify all recorded **impacts** including unintended impacts or deadweight/substitution effects (and compare them to intended impacts); assess **effectiveness** in terms of how far the intended results were achieved and also - to the extent that the interventions were effective - their **efficiency** in terms of how far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time and other resource considerations contributed to, or hindered the achievement of results;
- iv. consider the **sustainability** of activities supporting agricultural commodity sectors, that is an assessment of whether key results, taking account in particular of the institutional capacity required to maintain consistent levels of access and service delivery;
- v. assess what is the **EC added value** of the actions, not only as concerns financing, but also regarding policy dialogue and other aspects. Co-ordination, complementarity and synergies with EU member states and other donors are also to be examined. In this respect, the evaluation should build on Paris declaration principles.

The evaluation basic approach consists of **5 phases**, subdivided in **subsequent methodological stages** (phases for which consultant contribution is requested are marked in grey).

<i>Five Main Phases of Development:</i>	<i>Methodological Stages:</i>
1. Preparation Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reference Group (RG) constitution ▪ ToR drafting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Launch Note
2. Desk Phase 3. Field Phase 4. Synthesis phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Structuring of the evaluation ▪ Data Collection, verification of hypotheses ▪ Analysis ▪ Judgements on findings
5. Feedback and Dissemination	Dissemination Seminar in Brussels
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality Grid ▪ Summaries ▪ Evinfo (summary for OECD and Commission databases) ▪ <i>Fiche contradictoire</i> (a statement of key recommendations followed by the Commission's response)

4.1. Desk phase

Following the approval of the *Launch Note* by the Evaluation Unit, the evaluation team will meet the reference group during the *kick-off meeting* in order to present the experts and the approach they intend to follow for the inventory.

4.1.1 The inception meeting

During the inception meeting the consultants will present the results of the inventory (see below) and will propose the first ideas for the evaluation questions following the results of the inventory.

4.1.2 Inception report

The *Inception report* will be divided into two parts. **The first part** (inventory) will contain the complete overview of EC financial contributions and if necessary non financial activities made in support of agricultural commodity sectors, and **in particular the producers**, in the period 2000-2009. This should indicate contracted amounts and disbursement, and be presented in a typology which helps to analyse whether the support strategies changed following the adoption of the Commodities and Cotton Action Plans. Clear information to be provided regarding level of support to different sectors; type of countries; and type of activities. This overview will also include all relevant **Budget Support operations** (both General budget support and Sector budget support). **The second part** of the inception report will consist of the analysis of all relevant key documents, including the relevant policy, programming documents and agreements. The report should also provide an overview of existing relevant evaluations.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluators will:

- (1) **Reconstruct the intervention logic** of the EC aid to partner countries within the agricultural commodities sector, by producing policy impact diagrams relevant for the evaluated period and geographic sub-areas;
- (2) Present a **preliminary set of evaluation questions (EQ)** together with judgement criteria for each EQ and provisional indicators for each of the proposed judgement criteria;
- (3) Propose, on the basis of clearly defined criteria, the final products and a selection of 8-10 countries that will be retained for the desk phase. At this stage, the consultants will also propose a draft structure for reporting by product to take into account the findings encountered in the desk and in the field missions following hypothesis tested in the different Countries.
- (4) Specify the **methodological tools** that will be used;
- (5) Present the approach to ensure **quality assurance** throughout the different phases of the evaluation;
- (6) Present a detailed **workplan**, specifying the organisation and time schedule for the evaluation process;

The Contractor will present the *Inception Report* which shall be formally approved by the Evaluation Unit. The Reference Group will comment on the *Inception Report* and validate the Evaluation Questions and the proposed Country Case Studies.

4.1.3 Desk phase report

Upon approval of the *Inception Report*, the team of consultants will proceed to the Desk Phase of the evaluation. The Desk Phase shall be the moment when relevant information in Headquarters is gathered and analysed.

The desk report takes up the points dealt with in the inception report and goes into as much detail as necessary. In this stage, consultants are asked to present:

- (1) a final set of **evaluation questions** along with appropriate **judgement criteria** and relevant quantitative and qualitative **indicators**;

- (2) the methodology for **data and information collection and validation**, both for the Desk phase and for the forthcoming field phase;
- (3) the **methods of analysis** of the information and data collected in order to draw findings that would enable to draw general conclusions; due to the difficulty of this exercise any limitation should be made explicit;
- (4) the way to come to **judgements** that directly relate to the Judgement criteria, though adaptable should the field findings require doing so;
- (5) the **preliminary findings responding to the evaluation questions** and the **first hypotheses to be tested** in the field based on the specific methods identified in the *Inception Report*;
- (6) **reporting notes**, one for each of the product retained including already the findings from the desk phase and indicating data collection missing and hypothesis to be tested in the field. The interventions to be analysed will be selected among those reviewed in the desk phase;

At the completion of this work, the evaluation team will present a *Desk Phase Report* setting out the results of this first phase of the evaluation including all the above listed tasks²² (the core part of the *Inception Report* will be annexed to the *Desk Phase Report*). The RG will comment on *Desk Phase Report* based on which the necessary amendments will be specified. Formal approval of this report is to be made by the Evaluation Unit.

4.2. Field phase

Following satisfactory completion of the Desk Phase, the evaluation team will proceed to the field missions²³. The fieldwork shall be undertaken on the basis set out in the Final Desk Phase Report. Planned field mission will be agreed **by the RG and by the EC Delegations** of countries proposed for visits. If during the course of the fieldwork any significant deviations from the agreed methodology and/or schedule are perceived necessary, the Consultants must receive the approval of the Evaluation Unit before they can be applied.

Prior completion of each country visit the Evaluation team shall prepare for the EC Delegation concerned a **debriefing of the field mission**, seeking to validate the data and the information gathered.

Following the completion of the field mission, the team will proceed to prepare informative notes for each product to be submitted to the Evaluation Unit within 4 weeks after returning from the field. In these notes there will be for each product the findings encountered at the level of the desk phase and following the country missions. These notes will be annexed to the *Final Report*. When all field missions are conducted, and before the start of the Final report phase, the Evaluation team shall present results of the field phase in a form of a powerpoint presentation to the Reference Group.

²² All the databases produced for this aim will be integral part of the document.

²³ Nevertheless, if considered necessary for the adequate preparation of the field phase, the contractor might undertake pilot mission in parallel to the Desk Phase (subject to approval of the Evaluation Unit).

4.3. Final reports and seminar

4.3.1. The Draft Final Report

The Consultants will submit the draft final report in conformity with the structure set out in annex 3. Comments received during de-briefing meetings with the Delegation and the Reference Group must be taken into consideration.

The Consultants may either accept or reject the comments but in case of rejection they must justify (in writing) the reasons for rejection (the comments and the Consultants' responses are annexed to the report). If the Consultants don't want to take them in the report, they must explain in a separate document the reasons why.

If the evaluation manager considers the report to be of sufficient quality (cf. annex 3), he/she will circulate it for comments to the reference group. The reference group will convene to discuss it in the presence of the evaluation team.

A presentation (ppt) presenting for every question 4-5 slides on:

- The theory of action (part of the intervention logic concerned) with the localisation of the EQ;
- One table with Judgement criteria and indicators;
- Findings (related to JC and Indicators) and their limits;
- Conclusions and recommendations.

4.3.2. The Final Report

The Consultants will prepare the final report based on of further comments from the reference group, the Delegations and/or the evaluation manager. The final report will be in **English**, the executive summary (5 pages) will be translated into French and Spanish.

60 copies of the **Final Main Report** (including the executive summary in the three linguistic versions) must be sent to the Evaluation Unit with an additional 10 reports with all printed annexes. A CD-Rom with the Final Main Report and annexes has to be added to each printed report. The evaluators have to hand over on an appropriate support (electronic or paper) all relevant data gathered during the evaluation.

The contractor shall submit a **methodological note** explaining how the quality control and the capitalisation of lessons learned have been addressed.

The Evaluation Unit makes a formal judgement on the quality of the evaluation (cf. annex 4).

The report should reflect a rigorous, methodical and thoughtful approach. The evaluation shall lead to **conclusions** based on objective, credible, reliable and valid findings and provide the EC with a set of operational and useful **recommendations**. It should cover all the points listed under chapter 3 above.

The evaluation shall be forward looking and take into account the most recent policy and programming decisions, providing lessons and recommendations for the continued support to agricultural commodities within the present context and relevant political commitments (such as the European consensus and the Paris Declaration²⁴) as well as taking into account the current processes within the Commission.

²⁴ OECD 2 March 2005

Recommendations must be:

- Linked to the conclusions;
- Clustered, prioritised and targeted at specific addressees;
- Useful and operational;
- If possible, presented as options associated with benefits and risks.

The final version of the *Final Report* shall be presented in a way that enables publication without any further editing.

4.3.3 The Seminar

The final report will be presented at a seminar in Brussels. The purpose of the seminar is to present the results, the conclusions and the recommendations of the evaluation to all main stakeholders concerned (EC services, Member States, Members of the European Parliament, representatives of the partner countries and civil society organisations and other donors).

The Consultants shall prepare a presentation (*Power point*) for the seminar. This presentation shall be considered as a product of the evaluation in the same way as the reports and the data basis. For the **seminar** 120 copies of the report (including the executive summary in the three linguistic versions) and 30 reports with full printed annexes (see annex 2 of the ToR) have to be produced.

The Final **presentation** will include slides for:

- Context of the evaluation;
- Intervention logic and focus of questions;
- Answers to the evaluation questions (1);
- Conclusions and;
- Recommendations.

4.4. Dissemination and follow-up

Following the approval of the final report, the evaluation manager will proceed to dissemination of the results (conclusions and recommendations) of the evaluation: (i) make a formal judgement on the evaluation using a standard quality assessment grid (see Annex 4); (ii) prepare an Evaluation Summary following the standard DAC format (EvInfo); (iii) prepare and circulate a three-column *Fiche Contradictoire* (FC). The FC is prepared by the Evaluation Unit in order to ensure feedback from the evaluation and an active response from the Commission services. All three documents will be published on the Web alongside with the *Final Report*.

The Evaluators will be required to assist in dissemination and follow-up activities. In coordination with the Evaluation Unit, they shall present the conclusions and recommendations during a seminar in Brussels. Limited number of other brief presentations might also be required.

5. IDENTIFICATION OF THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS/ISSUES

The evaluation will be based on a set of key evaluation questions which are intended to give a more precise and accessible form to the evaluation criteria and to articulate the key areas of interest of EC services, thus optimising the focus and utility of the evaluation.

The evaluation will be based on the seven evaluation criteria: relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence and the EC value added. The first five correspond to the traditional practice of evaluation of development aid and have been formalised by the OECD (DAC). The following two apply to all EC policies. The criteria will be given different weightings based on the priority accorded to the evaluation questions.

In general, questions (to a maximum of 10) will refer to the following main evaluation criteria and topics:

- **Relevance** of the strategy/programme: this includes both relevance to the general objectives of the EC and relevance to commitments on an international level the EC has itself committed to.
- **Design and consistency**²⁵ of the intervention strategy/programme: this mainly concerns the extent to which the resources foreseen were adequate in relation to the objectives set out in the programming documents.
- **Consistency** of the implementation in relation to the strategy: the Consultants shall verify the extent to which the work plan, schedule and implementation of the activities (all types of interventions, geographical and sectoral distribution, instruments, and aid delivery channels included) were consistent with the strategy set out in the Action plans. They shall demonstrate who were the real beneficiaries, direct or indirect, of the intervention and compare them to the target population(s) in the Action plans.

The Consultants will also verify the extent to which the intervention modalities (instruments, aid delivery channels, etc.) were appropriate to the objectives.

- **Achievement of main impacts/effects:** the Consultants shall identify all recorded results and impacts, including any unintended ones, and compare these to the intended results and/or impacts. The Consultants will also identify the changes, which occurred in the areas in which EC programmes were supposed to produce an impact. A specific producer focus should be ensured.
- **Efficiency of the implementation:** for the activities which were effective, it will be necessary to question to what extent funding, human resources, regulatory and/or administrative resources contributed to, or hindered the achievement of the objectives and results.
- **Sustainability of the effects:** an analysis of the extent to which the results and impacts are being, or are likely to be maintained over time.

²⁵ The notion of consistency should be understood here as follows: (i) correspondence between the different objectives of a strategy, implying that there is a hierarchy of objectives (with lower level objectives logically contributing to the higher level ones); (ii) extent to which the resources foreseen are adequate in relation to the objectives set out in the strategy

- **Key cross-cutting issues:** for example gender, environment and climate change, human rights, etc. Verification should be undertaken, on the one hand, of the extent to which account has been taken of these priorities in the programming documents and, on the other hand, to what extent these issues have been reflected in the implementation modalities and in the effects of the intervention.
- **The 3Cs (co-ordination, complementarity and coherence):** co-ordination / complementarity with EU Members States and other donors, in particular FAO, WB, CFC and ICBs, UNCTAD and ITC, (; coherence with EU policies (including the Member States' own policies and eventual interventions of the EIB)
- **Value added of the EC interventions:** The criterion is closely related to the principle of subsidiarity and relates to the extra-benefit the activity/operation generates due to the fact that it was financed/implemented through the EC.

There may be three practical elements to illustrate possible aspects of the criterion:

- 1) The EC has a particular capacity for example experience in regional integration, above those of the Member States;
- 2) The EC has a particular mandate in the framework of the '3Cs' and can draw member states to a greater effort together;
- 3) EC cooperation is guided by a common political agenda embracing all Member States.

The evaluation questions should also reflect particular interests from EC services represented in the Reference Group.

6. MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISION OF THE EVALUATION

The responsibility for the management and supervision of the evaluation will rest with the Evaluation Unit of the EuropeAid Co-operation Office. The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by the Reference Group (RG) consisting of members of EC services concerned.

The RG will act as the main interface between the Evaluation Team and the Commission Services. **The principal function of the Reference Group** is to follow the evaluation process and more specifically:

- to advise on the scope and focus of the evaluation and the elaboration of the Terms of Reference;
- to act as the interface between the consultants and the Commission services;
- to advise on the quality of the work of the consultants;
- to facilitate access to information and documentation;
- to facilitate and assist in feedback of the findings and recommendations from the evaluation.

Several Reference Group meetings (about 4/5) will take place during the process of the evaluation, as indicated below in a time schedule.

7. EVALUATION TEAM

This evaluation is to be carried out by a team with advanced knowledge and experience in **development co-operation** in general terms and in various aid implementation modalities (including the SBS and GBS).

Special expertise is required concerning support to **agricultural commodities sectors, in particular in ACP countries**. Previous experience of conducting big evaluations for international organisations will be considered as an asset. Experience in evaluating Budget support operations with link to agriculture sector indicators will be also considered an advantage.

The team leader must have a proved experience in EC evaluation methodology and shall have considerable experience in managing evaluations of a similar size and character.

Consultants should possess an appropriate training and documented experience in the management of evaluations as well as evaluation methods in field situations. The team should comprise a reasonable mix of consultants familiar with the different ACP regions. The team must be prepared to work in **English**, and possess excellent drafting skills. Knowledge of **French** and **Spanish** in particular for the field phase, is required.

The Evaluation Unit recommends strongly that **consultants from beneficiary countries** will be employed (particularly, but not only, during the Field Phase). The agreed Team composition may be subsequently adjusted if necessary in the light of the final Evaluation Questions once they have been validated by the Reference Group.

The evaluation team should possess a sound knowledge and experience in:

- in all fields pertaining to the topic of the evaluation : agricultural commodities, trade of ACP countries (in agriculture and wider), value chain approaches, commodity risk management, diversification, aid for trade, ACP regional integration, International commodities bodies (ICBs), European partnership agreements negotiations;
- Evaluation methodology.

Consultants must be strictly neutral. Conflicts of interests must be avoided. A declaration of absence of conflict of interest should be signed by each consultant and annexed to the launch note.

8. TIMING

The evaluation shall start in December 2009, the completion of the *final report* is scheduled for March 2011.

The following is the *indicative* schedule²⁶:

<i>Evaluation Phases and Stages</i>	<i>Notes and Reports</i>	<i>Dates</i>	<i>Meetings</i>
Terms of Reference		November 2009	

²⁶ The dates mentioned in the above table may only be changed in view of optimising the evaluation performance, and with the agreement of all concerned.

Starting Stage	Launch Note	December 2009	
Desk Phase			
Structuring Stage	Inception Report	May 2009	RG meeting
Desk Study	Draft Desk Report	September 2010	RG meeting
	Final Desk Report	October 2010	
Field Phase	November- December 2010		
	Presentation for the RG (including final notes on case studies)	January 2010	RG meeting
Final Report-Writing Phase			
	Draft Final Report	February 2011	RG meeting
	Final Report	March 2011	
Dissemination Seminar		April 2011	

9. COST OF THE EVALUATION AND PAYMENT MODALITIES

The overall cost includes:

- The **evaluation** as such:

The total of these must not exceed **€600 000**.

According to the service contract, payments modalities shall be as follow:

30% at the acceptance of the *Inception Note*, plus 2.5% of the agreed budget to be used for quality control;

50% at acceptance of *Draft Final Report*;

20% at acceptance of *Final Report*.

The invoices shall be sent to the Commission only after the Evaluation Unit confirms in writing the acceptance of the reports.

Seminar related costs are to be invoiced and paid separately.

ANNEX 1 NON EXHAUSTIVE LIST OF PRODUCTS FALLING WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Again, it should be noted that this list is illustrative of the most important products concerned. All EU support to ACP agricultural trade, and diversification out of traditional commodities, should be covered. However, as there are already some specific support programmes for bananas and sugar for example, and these programmes are having separate evaluations, it is not required to analyse this support in detail.

Priority products

1. Bananas
2. Cocoa
3. Coffee
4. Cotton
5. Rice
6. Rubber
7. Sugar
8. Tea
9. Vanilla
10. Spices
11. Jute
12. Rum

ANNEX 2 – KEY DOCUMENTATION (non-exhaustive list)

EC Policy documents:

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL AND THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT Agricultural Commodity Chains, Dependence and Poverty - A proposal for an EU Action Plan Brussels, 12.02.2004 COM (2004)89 final

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL AND THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT Proposal for an EU-Africa partnership in support of cotton sector development Brussels, COM (2004)

New EU Action Plan on Agricultural Commodities, Dependence and Poverty and a specific action for cotton EUROPEAN COMMISSION DE 122 MAY 2004

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING PAPER Agricultural Commodity Trade, Dependence and Poverty An Analysis of Challenges facing Developing Countries

Programming and monitoring tools:

Programming guidelines for Country Strategy Papers

Indicators for monitoring progress

Methodology to assess partner countries' performance

Toolkit on mainstreaming gender equality in EC development cooperation

http://www.cc.cec/EUROPEAID/ThematicNetworks/qsg/Networks/newGender/documents/tk_section2_priority_areas.pdf

On programming, the EC interservice quality support group intranet web page is to be used (accessible within EC computer network only):
<http://www.cc.cec/home/dgserv/dev/newsite/index.cfm?objectid=95E08920-E0CF-8351-805A6B642803AD28>

ROM (Results oriented monitoring) reports, available in CRIS database, including ex-post ROM reports, produced since January 2007

Mid-Term Review of the "All ACP Agricultural Commodities Programme", including cotton and another assessment of the banana sector support "SFA" (2008)]

Reference Web sites:

Doha Development Agenda: Negotiations, implementation and development:
http://www.wto.org:80/english/tratop_e/dda_e/dda_e.htm

The overall methodology guidance for evaluations:

<http://ec.europa.eu/comm/europeaid/evaluation/methodology2/index> .

Millennium Development Goals - www.un.org/millenniumgoals/

UN Millennium Development Goal Indicators Database
http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mi/mi_goals.asp

Other key documents:

Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, OECD (2 March 2005)

Relevant evaluation reports related to the basic products and agricultural commodities sector, for details see:

Evaluation reports commissioned by the Evaluation Unit
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/intro_pages/reports.htm

European evaluation inventory
http://ec.europa.eu/comm/dg/aidco/ms_ec_evaluations_inventory/evaluationslist.cfm?start=101

Alliance 2015 report: The EU's contribution to the Millennium Development Goals - Halfway to 2015:Mid-term Review, June 2007

Relevant reports issued by WB, UNDP and other multilateral institutions, reports from MS and other donors

Publication and sources on Budget Support:

Guidelines on the Programming, Design & Management of General Budget Support, EC, 2007

The Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support 1994–2004, Burkina Faso, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Uganda, Vietnam, Evaluation of General Budget Support: Synthesis Report IDD and Associates, May 2006 (available on http://ec.europa.eu/comm/europeaid/evaluation/document_index/2006/705_docs.htm)

Note on Approach and Methods for the Evaluation of General Budget Support, IDD and Associates, January 2007

European Court of Auditors. Information note by the European Court of Auditors on Special Report No 2/2005 concerning EDF budget aid to ACP countries: the Commission's management of the public finance reform aspect. (September 13, 2005) European Court of Auditors: Luxembourg.

Revue du Programme d'Appui Budgétaire Conjoint pour la Réduction de la Pauvreté (2004-2006) de la Commission Européenne au Bénin, Novembre 2006, ADE s.a.

All other recent evaluations of Budget Support should be extensively used.

ANNEX 3. OUTLINE STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Length: The overall length of the final evaluation report should not be greater than 60 pages (including the executive summary). Additional information on overall context, programme or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to annexes (which however should be restricted to the important information).

1. Executive Summary

Length: 5 pages maximum

This executive summary must produce the following information:

- 1.1 – Purpose of the evaluation;
- 1.2 – Background to the evaluation;
- 1.3 – Methodology;
- 1.4 – Analysis and main findings for each Evaluative Question; short overall assessment;
- 1.5 – Main conclusions;*
- 1.6 – Main recommendations.*

** Conclusions and recommendations must be ranked and prioritised according to their relevance to the evaluation and their importance, and they should also be cross-referenced back to the key findings. Length-wise, the parts dedicated to the conclusions and recommendations should represent about 40 % of the executive summary*

2. Introduction

Length: 5 pages

- 2.1. Synthesis of the Commission's Strategy and Programmes: their objectives, how they are prioritised and ordered, their logic both *internally* (ie. the existence – or not – of a logical link between the EC policies and instruments and expected impacts) and *externally* (ie. Within the context of the needs of the country, government policies, and the programmes of other donors); the implicit assumptions and risk factors; the intended impacts of the Commission's interventions.*
- 2.2. Context: brief analysis of the political, economic, social and cultural dimensions, as well as the needs, potential for and main constraints.*
- 2.3. Purpose of the Evaluation: presentation of the evaluative questions

** Only the main points of these sections should be developed within the report. More detailed treatment should be confined to annexes*

3. Methodology

Length: 10 pages

In order to answer the evaluative questions a number of methodological instruments must be presented by the consultants:

- 3.1. Judgement Criteria: which should have been selected (for each Evaluation Question)

and agreed upon by the steering group;

- 3.2. Indicators: attached to each judgement criterion. This in turn will determine the scope and methods of data collection;
- 3.3. Data and Information Collection: can consist of literature review, interviews, questionnaires, case studies, etc. The consultants will indicate any limitations and will describe how the data should be cross-checked to validate the analysis.
- 3.4. Methods of Analysis: of the data and information obtained for each Evaluation Question (again indicating any eventual limitations);
- 3.5. Methods of Judgement

4. Main Findings and Analysis

Length: 20 to 30 pages

- 4.1. Answers to each Evaluative Question, indicating findings and conclusions for each;
- 4.2. Overall assessment of the EC Strategy. This assessment should cover:
 - Relevance to needs and overall context, including development priorities and co-ordination with other donors;
 - Actual Impacts: established, compared to intended impacts, as well as unforeseen impacts or deadweight/substitution effects;
 - Effectiveness in terms of how far the intended results were achieved;
 - Efficiency: in terms of how far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time and other resource considerations contributed or hindered the achievement of results;
 - Sustainability: whether the results can be maintained over time.
 - EC value added

5. A Full Set of Conclusions and Recommendations

Length: 10 pages

A Full set of Conclusions* and Recommendations* (i) for each evaluation question; (ii) as an overall judgement. (As an introduction to this chapter a short mention of the main objectives of the country programmes and whether they have been achieved)

**All conclusions should be cross-referenced back by paragraph to the appropriate findings. Recommendations must be ranked and prioritised according to their relevance and importance to the purpose of the evaluation (also they shall be cross-referenced back by paragraph to the appropriate conclusions).*

Annexes should include logical diagrams of EC strategies; judgement criteria forms; list of the projects and programmes specifically considered; project assessment fiches; list of people met; list of documentation; Terms of Reference; any other info (also in the form of tables) which contains factual basis used in the evaluation; etc.

- Power point presentation with 4 slides for each evaluation questions illustrating in a

synthetic and schematic way the evaluation process: 1st slide) logical diagram with the evaluation question, 2nd slide) judgment criteria, indicators and target level, 3rd slide) findings compared with success criteria, and 4th slide) interventions of the EC plus limits of the evaluation.

ANNEX 4 - QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

Concerning these criteria, the evaluation report is:	Unacceptable	Poor	Good	Very good	Excellent
1. Meeting needs: Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs of the commissioning body and fit the terms of reference?					
2. Relevant scope: Is the rationale of the policy examined and its set of outputs, results and outcomes/impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?					
3. Defensible design: Is the evaluation design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the full set of findings, along with methodological limitations, is made accessible for answering the main evaluation questions?					
4. Reliable data: To what extent are the primary and secondary data selected adequate? Are they sufficiently reliable for their intended use?					
5. Sound analysis: Is quantitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?					
6. Credible findings: Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?					
7. Validity of the conclusions: Does the report provide clear conclusions? Are conclusions based on credible results?					
8. Usefulness of the recommendations: Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personnel or shareholders' views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?					
9. Clearly reported: Does the report clearly describe the policy being evaluated, including its context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the evaluation, so that information provided can easily be understood?					
Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the overall quality rating of the report is considered.					

(for details on how criteria are rated refer to:
http://ec.europa.eu/comm/europeaid/evaluation/methodology/guidelines/gui_qual_flr_trg_en.htm)

Annex 2: Evaluation Questions, Judgment Criteria and Indicators

The Evaluation Questions and their coverage are illustrated in the first table hereunder. The detailed list of Judgment Criteria and Indicators is listed below.

Coverage of Evaluation criteria and Key issues by EQ

Evaluation Question	Relevance	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability	Efficiency	Coherence	Commission's added value	Cross-cutting issues	Coordination and Complementarity
EQ1 on the contextual background to the Commission's Communication relative to agricultural commodities	x							x	
EQ2 on the Commission's support in terms of agricultural commodity strategy development		x	x	x			x	x	x
EQ3 on the Commission's coordination with international organisations including ICBs		x				x	x		x
EQ4 on the Commission's support in terms of competitiveness of agricultural commodity chains in CDDCs		x	x	x			x	x	x
EQ5 on the Commission's support to risk management		x	x	x					x
EQ6 on the Commission's support in terms of diversification		x	x	x			x		x
EQ7 on the Commission's support in the wider context of EC policies						x		x	x
EQ8 on the use made of different financing instruments in support of agricultural commodities	x	x			x	x			x
EQ9 concluding on the relevance of the two Communications and the EU Action Plan for cotton	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

EQ1 In what ways has the Commission reacted to the long term agricultural commodities price decline and volatility when supporting Commodity Dependent Developing Countries?		Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with			Case studies			
Sources of information	Commission officials				Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche	
	J.1.1 Commodity dependence characterises a majority of ACP countries										
I.1.1.1	Some concepts, possible definitions and measures of commodity dependence	EC documents Existing studies		x							
I.1.1.2	The evolution of the degree of commodity dependence of ACPs over time (15 years)	EC documents Existing studies		x							
I.1.1.3	Main agricultural commodities exported by ACPs (falling under the criterion of commodity dependence) over the last 10 years	Export statistics		x					x	x	
J.1.2 Prices of agricultural commodities exported by ACPs have demonstrated a long-term declining trend and high volatility											
I.1.2.1	Overall price trend of agricultural commodities over the last 50 years	Statistics Existing studies		x							x
I.1.2.2	Price trend of CDDCs main agricultural commodities over the last 50 years	Statistics Existing studies		x							x
I.1.2.3	Product specific issues having affected individual products' prices over the last 10 years	Existing studies		x							x
J.1.3 The Commission has adapted its support to CDDCs to the constraints revealed by long term price decline and short term price volatility											
I.1.3.1	Evidence (reports, publications, internal notes) that the Commission has monitored agricultural commodities price and market developments and analysed their impact upon CDDCs	EC documents Existing studies Interviews		x	x						
I.1.3.2	Setting up by the Commission of specific instruments to tackle constraints identified in CDDCs (STABEX, FLEX, BAM, AMSP, etc.)	EC documents Existing studies Interviews		x	x						x

	Information collection approach	Sources of information	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies			
					Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche	
I.1.3.3	Periodic evaluations of the Commission's aid effectiveness relating to support to CDDCs' agricultural commodities sectors and re-orientation of the financing instruments used (STABEX, FLEX, SAF, BAM)	EC documents Existing studies Interviews		x	x							x
I.1.3.4	Launching by the Commission of specific projects to tackle the constraints faced by CDDCs due to price decline and variability	EC documents Inventory Interviews	x	x	x							x
I.1.3.5	Elaboration of an agricultural commodities strategy to support CDDCs	EC documents Interviews		x								
J.1.4	<i>The Commission has adapted its interventions supporting agricultural commodities to the constraints revealed by long term price decline and short term price volatility</i>											
I.1.4.1	The Commission has supported interventions dealing with the long term price decline and/or price volatility by channelling funds to the six priority areas identified in the COM(2004)89. Data broken down by priority will be presented as follows: a. static view in 2009, and b. dynamic view 2000-2004 and 2005-2009	Inventory	x	x								x
I.1.4.2	The Commission has introduced new financing instruments to tackle the challenges represented by long term price decline and short term price instability	Inventory EC documents	x	x	x							x
I.1.4.3	After 2004, in CDDCs selected for country visits, mid-term reviews and country strategy papers show increased support to the agricultural commodities sectors	Inventory Mid term reviews, CSP	x	x	x						x	

EQ2 To what extent has the Commission’s support enabled the design of agricultural commodity strategies in commodity dependent ACP countries and regions?										
	Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies		
				Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche
	Sources of information									
J.2.1 The Commission has promoted commodity chains and addressing dependence as a priority in national strategies										
I.2.1.1	Evidence that the CDDC-EU policy dialogue has included the competitiveness or diversification of commodity sectors	Interviews File notes			x	x		x		x
I.2.1.2	Evidence that the Commission support encouraged the analysis of the sustainability, poverty implications and needs of commodity sectors as part of strategy development	NIP/CSP/NAS Inventory	x	x	x	x				x
I.2.1.3	Evidence that Commission support contributed to enhance human and institutional capacity needed to design and ensure flexible and effective strategies	Interviews M&E reports			x	x		x		
I.2.1.4	Evidence that the Commission promoted the participation of stakeholders, including representatives of producer/ farmer organisations, in the strategy design process and their effective engagement in the dialogue	Inventory Interviews			x	x	x	x		x
I.2.1.5	Evidence that the Commission’s initiatives were coordinated with MS and complementary to their interventions	Interviews Minutes of meetings		x	x			x		x
I.2.1.6	National development strategies have integrated a strong consideration of the problems and issues surrounding agricultural commodity dependence and these problems and issues have been addressed in a cross-sectoral manner	NIP/CSP/NAS		x	x	x	x		x	x

J.2.2										
<i>The Commission's support has stimulated the design of commodity strategies by CDDCs and their incorporation into national and regional development strategies</i>										
I.2.2.1	Evidence that the Commission ensured the availability of diagnostics of the competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains (Domestic Resource Cost studies)	CSP/NIP, NAS, Fas, DRC		x						x
I.2.2.2	Evidence that the Commission promoted the design of commodity chain strategies addressing needs and challenges identified in diagnostics and taking account of important transversal and cross-sectoral issues (environment, gender, corporate responsibility including child labour and other social rights)	Case studies Existing studies NIP/CSP/NAS		x						x
I.2.2.3	Evidence that the Commission's support led countries to embed their national commodity strategies into their national development strategy and to include them at a regional level into regional strategies	CSP/ NIP/NAS RSP/RIP		x						x
I.2.2.4	Evidence that the Commission initiatives in promoting national commodity chain strategies were coordinated with and complementary to Member States' initiatives and coordinated with other donors and international organisations	Interviews		x	x				x	x
I.2.2.5	Evidence that the integration of national commodity chain strategies in national and regional strategies was sustained beyond the period of support from the Commission	CSP/ NIP/NAS RSP/RIP Interviews		x		x			x	x
I.2.2.6	Views of beneficiary governments on the effectiveness of Commission support to the sustained development of national and regional strategies	Interviews			x			x		x
I.2.2.7	Producer/ farmer organisations and producers views on the effectiveness of Commission support to the sustained development of national and regional strategies	Interviews			x	x		x		x
J.2.3										
<i>The Commission's attention paid to commodity chain strategies in CDDCs has had more results than could have been attained by MS alone</i>										
I.2.3.1	Evidence that the Commission and EU MS have a common political agenda in the area of commodity chain strategies	Interviews			x				x	x
I.2.3.2	Programming documents refer to a comparative advantage of the Commission in this area	Programming documents		x					x	x
I.2.3.3	Evidence of a long standing proven positive experience of the Commission in the partner country and in the commodity sector	Interviews Existing studies		x	x	x				x
I.2.3.4	Evidence that Commission initiatives were complementary to and created synergies with the initiatives of MS	Interviews			x				x	x

EQ3 To what extent has the Commission encouraged other international organisations including ICBs to adopt the Communications' approach to agricultural commodity chains?		Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with			Case studies		
Sources of information	Commission officials				Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche
	J.3.1 <i>Coordination with relevant international organisations has increased following adoption of the Action Plans</i>									
I.3.1.1	Evidence that the adoption of the Actions Plans triggered coordination initiatives led by the EC/EU	Interviews		X	X			X		
I.3.1.2	After 2004 general and product specific meetings have been held at international level between the EC/EU and other international organisations to discuss the coordination of strategies and interventions in agricultural commodities sectors	Interviews		X	X			X		
I.3.1.3	After 2004 discussion fora (such as thematic working groups) were set up at country level to discuss general and product specific issues between representatives of the Commission and other donors/organisations active in the field of agricultural commodities	Interviews Minutes of meetings		X	X			X		
I.3.1.4	After 2004, the level of coordination between donors concerning activities in the field of agricultural commodities was stepped up	Interviews Project formulation documents		X	X			X		X
I.3.1.5	Evidence of Commission leadership in the promotion of cooperation and the search for complementarities on agricultural commodities interventions	CSP/Fas Interviews		X	X			X		X

J.3.2 The Commission's interventions have been complementary to those of other donors in the field of agricultural commodities											
I.3.2.1	Synergies have been noted between interventions supported by the Commission with those supported by other donors	Interviews M&E reports		x	x				x	x	x
I.3.2.2	In country, no conflicts, cases of overlap or duplication were noted between the interventions supported by the Commission and those of other donors	Interviews M&E reports		x	x				x	x	x
I.3.2.3	After 2004, the Commission co-financed multi-donor funds in favour of agricultural commodities support in CDDCs	Inventory Interviews	x	x	x				x		x
J.3.3 The Commission's support to ICBs has enabled them to adopt and spread to other international organisation a commodity chain perspective											
I.3.3.1	The Commission has undertaken assessments and promoted the reform of the ICBs objectives and functions towards improved integration of environmental and socio-economic sustainability principles into their current focus on market functioning, improved responsiveness to stakeholders in both producing and consuming countries and to the commodity market challenges	Existing studies on ICBs (2007) Interviews		x	x				x		x
I.3.3.2	The Commission has undertaken assessments and promoted the reform of the ICBs with regard to their justification and membership by re-evaluating its membership in ICBs, considering withdrawing from ICBs with low relevance, continuous poor performance or very small size and proposing to merge ICBs covering related commodities	Existing studies on ICBs (2007) Interviews		x	x				x		x
I.3.3.3	The reforms promoted by the Commission of the ICBs objectives and functions, justification and membership, governance and ICBs secretariats have been implemented, as well as their effectiveness and the ICBs work have been monitored by the Commission	Existing studies on ICBs (2007) Interviews		x	x				x		x
I.3.3.4	The ICBs individual commodity strategies have been strengthened as a result of the reforms adopted	Existing studies on ICBs (2007) Interviews		x	x				x		x
I.3.3.5	The strengthened ICBs have drawn on and influenced other international actors working on cross-cutting commodity chain initiatives so that they incorporate a commodity chain perspective in their strategies	Existing studies on ICBs (2007) Interviews		x	x				x		x

EQ4 To what extent has the Commission's support helped to improve the competitiveness of agricultural commodity chains in commodity dependent recipient countries?		Information collection approach		Interviews with				Case studies			
Sources of information				Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries
		J.4.1 <i>The Commission's cooperation programme has stimulated the creation of an environment conducive to increased competitiveness of agricultural commodity chains</i>									
I.4.1.1	Evidence that the Government-Commission policy dialogue included specific measures in favour of agricultural business development and agricultural commodity exports based on identified needs and challenges	Interviews File notes			x	x				x	
I.4.1.2	Evidence that essential related areas (private sector development, fiscal/tax policies, competition policy, land titling/ownership policies, judicial system, etc.) were supported by the Commission in complementarity to Government or other donors support	CSP/NIP, NAS, country studies		x						x	
I.4.1.3	Evidence that EPA and WTO negotiations related to agricultural commodities have progressed and that results have been obtained for commodity dependent ACP countries	Existing studies Interviews		x	x	x				x	
I.4.1.4	The helpdesk launched by the Commission has facilitated CDDCs access to data on tariffs, rules of origin and trade statistics	EC documents Existing studies Interviews		x	x					x	
I.4.1.5	Evidence that the Commission supported CDDCs' efforts to comply with existing tariff and non-tariff barriers (such as sanitary and phyto-sanitary) applicable to agricultural commodity imports into the EU	Inventory Interviews	x	x	x					x	
I.4.1.6	Evidence that the Commission's support was coordinated with MS and other donors	Interviews File notes		x	x			x		x	

	Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies		
				Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche
	Sources of information									
J.4.2 Commission support has contributed to increase agricultural commodity production and lower the average cost of production and processing										
I.4.2.1	Commission support contributed to stimulate research (in the field of production factors and producer access to them, and labour productivity) and the dissemination of research results to producers/producer organisations	Project M&E reports Interviews	x			x		x	x	x
I.4.2.2	Commission support contributed to improve production factors and farmers access to them (e.g. extension services/agricultural techniques, water, fertilizers, seeds, energy)	Project M&E reports Interviews	x			x		x	x	x
I.4.2.3	Commission support contributed to increase agricultural commodities crop yields, crop quality and quantity	Project M&E reports Interviews	x			x		x	x	x
I.4.2.4	Commission support contributed to improve infrastructures (e.g. feeder roads) related to agricultural commodity production, collection and processing	Project M&E reports Interviews	x			x		x	x	x
I.4.2.5	Commission support contributed to improve the collection and processing of agricultural commodities	Project M&E reports Interviews	x			x		x	x	x

	Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies		
				Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche
	Sources of information									
J.4.3 Commission support has contributed to improve the capacity of producers to respond to commodity										
I.4.3.1	Commission support contributed to improve availability and use of market information and advisory services to producer organisations/producers (e.g. agricultural commodity prices, quality standards, packaging, timely delivery, etc.) at national and regional level	Project M&E reports Interviews	x			x		x		x
I.4.3.2	Commission supported interventions contributed to an increased number of producers/ producer organisations having direct contracts with supermarket chains and/or are certified with a label	Existing studies Interviews	x			x		x		x
I.4.3.3	Commission supported interventions contributed to an increased number of producers/ producer organisations being coordinated at national and regional levels	Existing studies Interviews	x			x		x		x
I.4.3.4	Commission support contributed to increased foreign direct investments in the commodity chains, including public-private partnerships, and promotion of sustainable development through social and environmental codes of conduct	Project M&E reports Interviews	x		x	x			x	
I.4.3.5	Evidence that Commission supported activities towards improved competitiveness were coordinated with and complementary to the activities of other donors in the same areas	Project M&E reports Interviews	x	x	x	x			x	
I.4.3.6	Evidence that obtained results in terms of increased agricultural production and producers' capacity to respond to commodity market requirements outlast Commission support	Project M&E reports Interviews	x			x		x	x	

	Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies			
				Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche	
	Sources of information										
J.4.4 Incomes of producers, sector and countries have improved as a result of Commission's support to the implementation of commodity chain strategies											
I.4.4.1	Evidence of increased exports (volume and value) of agricultural commodities to regional and international markets, of which in particular the EU	Statistics Existing studies		x					x	x	
I.4.4.2	Evidence that foreign exchange earnings at country level have stabilised and increased due to improved performance of agricultural commodity related products in regional and international markets	Statistics Existing studies		x					x	x	
I.4.4.3	Evidence that income levels at producer level and within the agricultural sector as a whole have stabilised and increased through: - The increased competitiveness of the agricultural commodity production - A diversification of the sources of income of the agricultural sector through expansion of agricultural commodity value added - Higher export earnings	Statistics Existing studies		x					x	x	
I.4.4.4	Producer/ farmer organisations and producers views on the effectiveness of increased competitiveness as an income increasing and stabilising tool and on the benefits from improved access to regional and international markets	Existing documents Interviews						x	x	x	x

EQ5 To what extent has the Commission's support contributed to protect agricultural commodity producers from income variability through risk management and/or social safety nets?		Information collection approach		Statistical work on inventory			Deskwork			Interviews with				Case studies		
Sources of information										Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche
		J.5.1 Commission support has contributed to the development and implementation of risk management and compensatory tools														
I.5.1.1	Evidence that the Commission supported the development of and access to shock management tools at macro-economic level	Inventory Existing studies Interviews	x	x	x	x				x						
I.5.1.2	Evidence that the Commission developed and eased the access to compensatory tools (such as Stabex, FLEX)	Commission papers, Inventory	x	x	x					x	x					
I.5.1.3	Evidence that the shock management and/or compensatory tools developed by the Commission added value compared to already existing tools	Existing studies Interviews		x	x	x				x						
I.5.1.4	Evidence that agricultural commodity strategies supported by Commission interventions addressed risk management	CSP/NIP/NAS		x						x	x					
I.5.1.5	Evidence that the Commission supported interventions with a view to improving producers' access to finance (credit)	Case studies Existing studies Interviews	x	x			x		x		x					
I.5.1.6	Evidence that the Commission supported interventions related to risk management at micro-level in order to better cope with agricultural commodity price variability	Case studies Existing studies Interviews	x	x			x		x		x					
I.5.1.7	Evidence that the Commission's support was undertaken in coordination with that of other donors	Interviews, Country studies, FA			x	x	x	x	x	x	x					
I.5.1.8	Evidence that the tools developed remain used and that their financial sustainability is ensured without further Commission support	M&E reports, interviews		x	x	x	x		x		x					

J.5.2 Commission's support to agricultural commodities in CDDCs has included safety net issues in complement to commodity chain issues										
I.5.2.1	Evidence in strategy and programming documents that the support to specific agricultural commodities aimed at alleviating poverty	CSPs and NIPs		x					x	
I.5.2.2	Existence of interventions designed to bring a safety net for vulnerable segments of a population depending upon a specific product	Intervention formulation docs, interviews		x	x	x	x		x	
I.5.2.3	Evidence that these interventions offered a better living/created a safety net to the segments of the population targeted	M&E reports		x					x	
I.5.2.4	Views of stakeholders on : (i) the appropriateness of the support with respect to the creation of safety nets (ii) the results of the support with respect to the creation of safety nets	Intervention formulation docs, interviews		x	x	x	x		x	
J.5.3 Income variability and vulnerability to price fluctuations of producers, sector and countries has declined as a result of improved risk management										
I.5.3.1	Evidence that the producer can better manage potential agricultural commodity price variability	Existing studies Country case studies		x					x	x
I.5.3.2	Year-to-year and in-year variations of income levels within the agricultural sector as a whole have been reduced through the use of risk management and compensatory tools	Existing studies Country case studies		x					x	
I.5.3.3	Year-to-year and in-year variations in producers' revenues have been reduced through the implementation of safety nets for commodity producers	Existing studies Country case studies Interviews		x			x		x	
I.5.3.4	Year-to-year variations of income levels at country level have been reduced	Existing studies Country case studies		x					x	

EQ6 To what extent has Commission support helped producers, the agricultural sector and commodity dependent ACP countries to successfully diversify around traditional products?		Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies		
Sources of information	Commission officials				Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche	
	J.6.1 <i>The Commission's support has facilitated the analysis of Government's policy choices aiming for diversification and growth</i>										
I.6.1.1	Evidence that Technical Assistance has been provided to the Government in the area of policy analysis relating to diversification and growth where necessary and in complementarity with that provided by other donors	Inventory	x						x	x	
I.6.1.2	Evidence that specific tools have been developed and continue to be used for supporting strategic choices (e.g. competitiveness evaluations of specific commodity chains)	Country case studies									
I.6.1.3	Evidence that a policy dialogue has been encouraged and supported by the Commission on diversification policies, strategies and measures and has involved potential diversifiers (producers, exporters, foreign investors)	Commission guidelines				x				x	
I.6.1.4	Evidence that a policy dialogue has been encouraged and supported by the Commission on diversification policies, strategies and measures and has involved potential diversifiers (producers, exporters, foreign investors)	Interviews and file notes				x	x	x	x	x	
I.6.1.4	Stakeholders' views on the value added of the Commission's approach to diversification and of the Technical Assistance provided by the Commission	Interviews				x	x	x	x	x	
J.6.2 <i>The Commission has encouraged the diversification of sources of livelihoods of traditional agricultural commodity producers through the adoption and implementation of rural growth strategies</i>											
I.6.2.1	The Commission has encouraged the inclusion of productive sector development strategies in the PRSPs and their discussion with relevant parties (Government, investors, donors)	Country case studies								x	
I.6.2.2	The Commission's rural development strategies and interventions have included considerations for diversification of producers' livelihoods and have addressed international marketing issues	Country case studies	x							x	x
		interviews									

	Information collection approach	Sources of information	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies			
					Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche	
I.6.2.3	The Commission has commissioned studies of causes of low food production and their possible remedies for Governments to implement enabling environments	Reports Interviews		x	x	x				x		
I.6.2.4	Evidence that support to diversification has been provided in coordination with other donors efforts in this area	Country case studies, Interviews			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
I.6.2.5	Stakeholders' views on implication of the Commission in diversification and growth initiatives	Country case studies, interviews			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
J.6.3	<i>The Commission has facilitated knowledge of and access to support instruments for private sector development</i>											
I.6.3.1	Evidence of Commission support to private sector development in CDDCs, including via its participation in PSD policy discussion groups	Country case studies									x	
I.6.3.2	Existence of EIB operations in the CDDCs	Country case studies									x	
I.6.3.3	Stakeholders views on Commission efforts to communicate the possibilities of funding of private sector development initiatives through EIB and other direct access horizontal instruments of the Commission and EU MS	Interviews				x	x	x				
I.6.3.4	Stakeholders views on Commission efforts to involve the EIB and other direct access horizontal instruments in developing the private sector in country	Interviews				x	x	x				
I.6.3.5	Stakeholders views on value added of Commission efforts in developing the private sector in CDDCs	Interviews				x	x	x			x	
I.6.3.6	Evidence that achievements in terms of facilitation of support instruments for private sector development outlast Commission support	M&E reports, interviews		x	x	x	x		x			

	Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies			
				Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche	
	Sources of information										
J.6.4 <i>The income vulnerability of producers, sector and countries has declined as a result of the implementation of diversification strategies</i>											
I.6.4.1	CDDCs economies have diversified around traditional commodities (GDP, employment, investment)	Existing studies and national accounts	x							x	
I.6.4.2	Evidence that income levels of producers have stabilised and increased in geographical zones where diversification strategies have been implemented	Existing studies Country case studies	x							x	
I.6.4.3	Evidence that income levels within the agricultural sector as a whole have stabilised and increased through the implementation of vertical and horizontal diversification	Existing studies Country case studies	x							x	
I.6.4.4	Evidence that income levels at country level have stabilised and increased with the reduction of dependency upon traditional agricultural commodities	Existing studies Country case studies	x							x	
I.6.4.5	Producers views on the effectiveness of diversification as an income stabilising and improvement tool	Interviews					x				

EQ7 To what extent did the implementation of other relevant European Community policies strengthen or weaken the pursuit of the COM's objectives?										
	Sources of information	Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies	
					Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries
J.7.1 European Community policies in fields potentially relevant to cooperation in the area of agricultural commodities in CDDCs (such as trade or agriculture) have been designed and implemented taking account of their potential impact upon agricultural commodities										
I.7.1.1	The implications of trade and domestic agricultural support policies upon CDDCs export performance have been monitored on a regular basis	Reports and publications Interviews		x	x					x
I.7.1.2	There has been no occurrence of positive or negative effects of the implementation of other European Community policies in the countries and sub-sectors (products) benefiting from Commission agricultural commodities support	Country case studies; interviews		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
I.7.1.3	Specific measures have been taken by the Commission to mitigate any potential negative consequences upon agricultural commodities in CDDCs of other policies in related areas (trade, agriculture, environment ...)	Interviews; studies and reports		x	x	x	x	x		x
J.7.2 Commission' support in other areas has achieved synergies with Commission support to agricultural commodities										
I.7.2.1	Specific initiatives have been launched by the European Community in other related policy areas to support the objectives of the Communication related to agricultural commodities in CDDCs	Interviews; studies and reports		x	x	x	x	x		
I.7.2.2	Evidence of initiatives in other policy areas that reinforced the success of agricultural commodity support interventions	Project documents and interviews; studies and reports				x	x	x	x	x

	Information collection approach	Sources of information	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies		
					Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche
I.7.2.3	Evidence that the Commission has alleviated negative impacts of changes in international trade rules (such as rules of origin)	Interviews; studies and reports			x	x		x		x	x
I.7.2.4	Stakeholders' views on the Commission support given in the area of capacity building for trade negotiation	Interviews				x	x			x	
J.7.3 <i>Commission' support to agricultural commodities has taken into account Commission transversal policies regarding gender, environment, protection of human rights, corporate responsibility (including child labour and other social rights) and HIV/AIDS in CDDCs</i>											
I.7.3.1	Evidence of reference to these cross-cutting issues in strategy and programming documents	Strategy and programming documents		x						x	x
I.7.3.2	Evidence of inclusion of specific measures targeting these cross-cutting issues in interventions supporting agricultural commodities	Intervention formulation documents		x				x			x
I.7.3.3	Evidence that commodity chain strategies have integrated corporate responsibility issues, including child labour and other social rights	Case studies Existing studies		x				x	x	x	x
I.7.3.4	Evidence that the Commission has promoted the inclusion of these transversal issues in the strategies and interventions of MS and other international organisations active in the same areas	CSP/NIP, Fas Interviews		x	x			x		x	

EQ8 To what extent were different financing instruments and implementation modalities used in a cost effective and timely manner in order to facilitate attainment of the COM's objectives?		Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies		
Sources of information	Commission officials				Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche	
	J.8.1 <i>The use of different financing instruments facilitated the development of synergies and complementarities between different interventions so as to facilitate achievement of the COM's objectives</i>										
I.8.1.1	Evidence that a mix of different financing instruments (EDF, budget lines and emergency financing mechanisms) has been used in support of agricultural commodities in order to facilitate attainment of the COM's objectives	CSPs and NIPs Inventory		x						x	
I.8.1.2	Evidence that interventions at bilateral level in a given country are designed and implemented in the full knowledge of and in complementarity with regional interventions and vice versa	MoU/FA, identification reports, M&E reports		x					x		
I.8.1.3	Evidence that interventions financed under non programmable funds in a given country have reinforced the achievements of interventions financed under programmable funds	M&E reports		x					x		
I.8.1.4	Stakeholders' views on complementarities between interventions of a given country financed under: (i) bilateral and regional funds (ii) programmable and non programmable funds	Interviews			x	x	x	x	x		
I.8.1.5	Stakeholders' views on the appropriateness of the mix of instruments with regard to the COM objectives in a given country	Interviews			x	x	x		x	x	

	Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies		
				Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche
	Sources of information									
J.8.2 At country level, the support to agricultural commodities used a mix of financing modalities and implementation mechanisms that offered timely and cost-effective responses to the challenges identified										
I.8.2.1	Evidence of justification in the programming documents of the choice of financing modalities and implementation mechanisms, including in terms of timeliness of implementation and cost-effectiveness of interventions	CSP/NIP MoU/FA, Identification fiches		x						
I.8.2.2	Ex post evidence that this choice was justified in terms of effectiveness and efficiency with regard to the outputs produced and the results obtained within the allocated budget and the planned schedule: - extent to which outputs were produced according to plan - extent to which results were achieved according to expectations - nature of any factors having influenced cost overruns, implementation delays, or shortfalls with regard to results achieved	Monitoring and evaluation reports, project documents		x				x		
I.8.2.3	Views of Commission staff on the appropriateness of financing modalities and implementation mechanisms used for the different financing instruments	Interviews		x	x					
I.8.2.4	Views of the stakeholders on appropriateness of the financing modalities and implementation mechanisms used with regard to their cost effectiveness and timeliness vis-à-vis the objectives pursued	Interviews			x	x	x	x		

	Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with				Case studies			
				Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche	
	Sources of information										
J.8.3 <i>At sector level, the interventions used financing modalities and implementation mechanisms that were adapted to the absorption and implementation capacities of implementation agencies, regional organisations and producer organisations</i>											
I.8.3.1	Intervention formulation documents included a diagnostic of the institutional capacity of the implementing agency to undertake the required tasks	MoU/FA							x		x
I.8.3.2	Evidence of mix of different financing modalities used within a sector and within programmes (MoU/FA) to adapt to needs and absorption capacities	CSP/NIP, MoU/FA, inventory	x	x					x	x	x
I.8.3.3	Evidence of mix of different implementation mechanisms used within a sector and within programmes (MoU/FA) to adapt to implementation capacities	CSP/NIP, MoU/FA, inventory	x	x					x	x	x
I.8.3.4	Mitigating actions and measures were contained in sector interventions to compensate for identified institutional capacity weaknesses	MoU/FA							x		x
I.8.3.5	Views of the stakeholders on appropriateness of implementation mechanisms with regard to the management of the project implementation, the organisational and managerial strength of the beneficiary agency and the objectives pursued	interviews					x	x	x		x

EQ9 To what extent has the Commission’s support to agricultural commodities been: (i) responsive to the needs, problems and issues of commodity dependent ACP countries, (ii) aligned to and supportive of the policy objectives and priorities of recipient commodity dependent ACP countries and regions, and (iii) consistent with and supportive of the objectives of the two communications COM(2004)89 and COM(2004)87 ¹ ?		Information collection approach	Statistical work on inventory	Deskwork	Interviews with			Case studies			
					Commission officials	Government Officials	Beneficiaries	Other	Selected interventions	Selected countries	Product-fiche
		Sources of information									
J.9.1 <i>The interventions supported by the Commission in the field of agricultural commodities have been designed as a response to the country’s needs, problems and issues</i>											
I.9.1.1	Country programming and project documents include an analysis of needs and challenges of the agricultural commodity sector or are based on existing diagnostics of the competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains (Domestic Resource Cost studies)	CSP/NIP, NAS, FAs		X						X	X
I.9.1.2	Programming and formulation documents explicitly show which needs are intended to be responded to and how the proposed interventions will address these needs at macro-economic and commodity sector level	CSP/NIP NAS, Fas		X						X	X
I.9.1.3	Explicit reference in programming documents of Commission interventions to measures ensuring sustainability such as the participation of key stakeholders when designing programmes and projects	M&E reports, interviews		X	X	X	X		X		
I.9.1.4	Views of stakeholders on appropriateness of needs identified and on the priorities chosen with respect to the needs identified as well as on their ownership of Commission-funded activities	Interviews			X	X	X				
I.9.1.5	Views of Commission and other donors on the stakeholders' ownership	Interviews			X			X			

J.9.2 The choice of interventions is aligned with the policy objectives and priorities of the beneficiary country's national strategy										
I.9.2.1	Existence in the programming documents of explicit reference to the country's national and commodity sector policy objectives and priorities	CSP/NIP		X					X	
I.9.2.2	Programming documents explicitly show how the Commission's priorities are aligned on the national and sectoral objectives	CSP/NIP		X					X	
I.9.2.3	Existence in the intervention formulation documents of explicit reference to the policy objectives and priorities of the commodity sector in which interventions are proposed to take place and of explicit links to these objectives	MoU/FA		X				X		X
I.9.2.4	Views of stakeholders on appropriateness of Commission's interventions with respect to national and country priorities	Interviews			X	X	X			
J.9.3 Over the period 2004-2009, the choice of interventions supported in the field of agricultural commodities is aligned to the objectives of the two Communications and has helped their achievement										
I.9.3.1	EC stakeholders know the COM (2004) 89 and the COM (2004) 87 and have designed interventions taking into account the strategy defined in the COMs	CSP/NIPs, project formulation documents Interviews		X	X				X	
I.9.3.2	Evidence in country and regional programming documents that the intermediary objectives of the COM are explicitly stated	CSPs/NIPs RSPs/RIPs		X						X
I.9.3.3	Evidence in country and regional programming documents of the strategic contribution of interventions in the field of agricultural commodities to one or several intended results of the COM	CSPs/NIPs RSPs/RIPs		X						X
I.9.3.4	Explanation in intervention formulation documents of the link between the proposed intervention and its strategic contribution to one or several of the COM's intended results	MOUs/FAs		X					X	
I.9.3.5	Evidence in project monitoring and evaluation reports that the interventions have contributed to the achievement of one or several of the COM's intended results	M&E reports							X	
I.9.3.6	Views of stakeholders about the alignment of Commission support in the field of agricultural commodities to the COM's objectives	Interviews			X	X	X			

Annex 3: Identification Fiches of the 24 selected interventions

The 24 analysed interventions are summarised below in terms of countries, regions, COM priorities, products, status and budgets. Each project is then detailed in an individual intervention Identification Fiche.

Nb.	Decision ref / contract ref	Name of intervention	Country	Region	Priority	Category	Product	Status	Contracted amount (in €)
1	FED/2006/018-543	All ACP Agricultural Commodities Programme	ACP COUNTRIES	All ACP	Multi	Multi	N/A*	On-going	44.283.845
2	FED/2007/020-850	Global index insurance facility project for ACP countries(GIIF-ACP)	ACP COUNTRIES	All ACP	3	Risk management	N/A*	On-going	24.500.000
3	FED/2008/020-237	Integration to the Multilateral Trading System and support to the Integrated Framework	ACP COUNTRIES	All ACP	5	Trade	N/A*	On-going	5.529.806
4	FED/2001/015-497	Programme "PIP Quality and conformity Fruit & Vegetables" (previously Initiative Pesticides)	ACP COUNTRIES	All ACP	5	Trade	N/A*	On-going	33.787.701
5	DCI-NSAPVD/2007/019-615 / contract n°149561	Appui à la valorisation des ressources agricoles locales : filières anacarde et sésame	BURKINA FASO	West Africa	2	Support to producer	Cashew nut	On-going	586.207
6	FED/2008/019-754	PAFFIC - Programme d'Appui Financier à la Filière Coton	BURKINA FASO	West Africa	Multi	Multi	Cotton	On-going	10.000.000
7	FED/2007/018-833	Programme d'appui et de soutien à l'accord de partenariat économique (PASAPE)	CAMEROUN	Central Africa	2	EPA	N/A*	On-going	3.733.220
8	ONG-PVD/2005/017-215 / contract n°118626	Renforcement de l'autonomie et de l'auto-promotion des organisations paysannes pour le développement socioéconomique des communes de Garoua Rurale et de Gashiga - Cameroun	CAMEROUN	Central Africa	2	Farmer organisation	N/A*	On-going	320.000
9	FED/2001/015-561	Integrated Development Programme For Caribbean Rum Industry	CARIBBEAN REGION	Caribbean	2; 6	Support to producer; Environment/social	Rum	On-going	66.936.652

Nb.	Decision ref / contract ref	Name of intervention	Country	Region	Priority	Category	Product	Status	Contracted amount (in €)
10	FED/2003/016-291	Support to the competitiveness of the rice sector in the Caribbean	CARIBBEAN REGION	Caribbean	2	Support to producer; Farmer organisation; Infrastructure/Equipment	Rice	On-going	22.048.190
11	FED/2001/015-643	Coffee Improvement Programme IV (CIP IV)	ETHIOPIA	Eastern Africa	2	Support to producer; Infrastructure/Equipment; Institutional and regulatory support	Coffee	On-going	12.805.880
12	FED/2007/019-650	Ghana Cocoa Sector Support Programme - Phase II	GHANA	West Africa	2	Support to producer	Cocoa	On-going	4.493.534
13	FED/2008/020-255	Réhabilitation agricole en zone élaéicoles et cotonnières de Côte d'Ivoire	CÔTE D'IVOIRE	West Africa	2	Support to producer; Institutional and regulatory support	Cotton	On-going	7.793.907
14	ONG-PVD/2003/004-562 / contract n°64188	Structuration professionnelle de la filière anacarde : une contribution durable pour la paix - Côte d'Ivoire	CÔTE D'IVOIRE	West Africa	2	Value Chain	Cashew nut	Closed	738.216
15	FED/2006/020-739	PAN-SPSO: participation of African nations in sanitary and phytosanitary standards-setting organisation	KENYA	Eastern Africa	5	Trade	N/A*	On-going	1.775.895
16	FOOD/2005/017-812 & FOOD/2006/018-309	Programme d'appui au secteur agricole à Madagascar 1 & 2	MADAGASCAR	Eastern Africa	2; Multi	Support to producer; Institutional and regulatory support; Multi	N/A*	On-going	14.342.967
17	FED/2006/020-723	Programme d'appui à la Réforme de la Filière Coton	MALI	West Africa	2; 4; 6; Multi	Infrastructure / Equipment; Support to diversification; Fair trade; Multi	Cotton	On-going	14.198.922
18	FED/2007/020-777	Facilitating Agricultural Commodity Trade (FACT)	PACIFIC REGION	Pacific	5	Trade	N/A*	On-going	3.905.000

Nb.	Decision ref / contract ref	Name of intervention	Country	Region	Priority	Category	Product	Status	Contracted amount (in €)
19	ONG-PVD/2006/018-227	Insertion favorable des organisations paysannes professionnelles de la région de Kolda sur des marchés porteurs des filières sésame et noix de cajou	SENEGAL	West Africa	2	Farmer organisation	Cashew nut and sesame seeds	On-going	696.185
20	FED/2003/016-361	Implementation and coordination of agricultural research and training in the SADC region	SOUTHERN AFRICA REGION	Southern Africa	2	Research / Study	N/A*	On-going	8.983.653
21	ONG-PVD/2004/006-239 / contract n°96162	Support project to strengthen commercial capacities of agricultural producers in Tanzania	TANZANIA	Eastern Africa	2	Support to producer	N/A*	On-going	734.319
22	ONG-PVD/2004/006-239	Establishing an export market for certified responsible coffee with smallholder producer groups in Uganda	UGANDA	Eastern Africa	6	Fair trade	Coffee	On-going	690.370
23	FED/2004/017-036	Sector Budget Support to the Programme for Modernisation of Agriculture	UGANDA	Eastern Africa	Multi	Multi	N/A*	On-going	17.500.000
24	FED/2002/015-896	Producers organisation project II (POP 2)	VANUATU	Pacific	2	Support to producer	N/A*	On-going	1.664.157

Source: ADE on the basis of the list of Commissions' interventions supporting agricultural commodities from the inception report and the inventory as presented in the inception report (October 2010); "" means that no specific product was indicated in the CRIS database*

Intervention Title	All ACP Agricultural Commodities Programme (AAACP programme) ACP-ACP
Country / Region	ACP countries
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2006/018-543 ▪ Accounting Number: 9 ACP RPR 064 ▪ Identification number: RPR/010/06 ▪ Contract numbers: 10 contracts 196500 to 196508 and 221813
EC aid modality	<p>2 Projects and contributions to Common Funds and Trust Funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3 contribution agreements to the Common Fund for Commodities ▪ 2 projects (one open call for tender: Service contract to Cardno Emerging Markets coordinating Unit- and one framework contract for the mid-term review of the AAACP) ▪ 1 contribution agreement to the International Trade Centre ▪ 1 contribution agreement to the FAO ▪ 1 contribution agreement to the UNCTAD (Regional solutions to commodity market problems information and financing) ▪ 2 administrative agreements to Trust Funds managed by the World Bank
Intervention Start date & End date	<p>Start: December 2006 (signature of the Financial Agreement), September 2007 (operational launch of the AAACP programme)</p> <p>End (planned and likely):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 31 December 2010 (operational phase) and 31 December 2012 (initial deadline) ▪ 31 December 2011 (operational phase) and 31 December 2012 (execution phase),
Budget	<p>Planned: € 45 M (including one third for the cotton sector)</p> <p>Committed: € 45 M</p> <p>Contracted: € 44.28 M (as of January 2010)</p> <p>Disbursed: € 25,8 M (as of December 2010)</p>
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission ▪ Implementing agencies: Five international organizations, known in the field of support to commodity chains, implement the programme. They are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Common Fund for Commodities (CFC); - the International Trade Center (ITC); - the Food Agriculture Organization (FAO); - the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD); - the World Bank (WB). ▪ Direct beneficiaries: ACP countries ▪ Final beneficiaries: Actors of ACP countries, which will be engaged in participatory value chain based strategy development for agricultural products¹ <p>In addition to the five implementing agencies, it is interesting to note that a Steering Committee (SC) chaired by one of the ACP representatives shall meet the Programme's specific needs of guidance. It met as required (about twice a year, and more intensely in the start-up phase of the programme) to follow the programme's conduct, providing stimulus, advice and strategic guidance. Supported by the Coordination Unit, which is the focal point of the programme (based in Brussels), the Steering Committee will in particular draft yearly work plans of the programme</p>

¹ Priority will be given to countries that are highly dependent on a small number of agricultural products (such as cotton, coffee, cocoa, cashew, groundnuts, tea, etc.); and whose dependence affect a large number of poor people (i.e. smallholders rather than large plantations). Commodities that already receive support from other EC sources (such as bananas and sugar) will not be targeted by this support.

	<p>and suggest any adjustments needed to ensure that programme activities are in line with stated objectives. It will also decide on the allocation of unallocated funds as well as reallocations.</p> <p>The Steering Committee includes 7 executive members representing ACP Secretariat (3), EC (3) and COS Coton (1). In addition, each IO is expected to designate a contact person for the programme who will represent his (her) Organisation in the SC meetings as implementers of the programme as required (ie as observers without voting power). EU Member States, the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA) and the Centre for Development of Enterprise (CDE) are also invited as observers. The SC also maintains consultative contacts with other key actors and stakeholders, including from commodity chains: producers, processing industry, exporters, financial institutions and NGOs. Specialist contributors may be invited on an ad hoc basis when necessary, drawn from the international organisations implementing the programme, from ACP regional organisations, EU Member States.</p> <p>The role of the CU is to facilitate its day-to-day successful implementation, including the regular Interagency Coordination.</p>
Intervention Description	<p>The “All ACP Agricultural Commodities Programme” (AAACP programme) was launched in September 2007 as an initiative of the European Commission and the ACP Secretariat. This programme fully acknowledges the link between production, value addition and trade in agricultural commodities and poverty reduction (DAC Code: 31162).</p>
Programme Background & History	<p>The proposed programme takes place in the context of the EU Action Plan on Agricultural Commodities, Dependence and Poverty (COM (2004) 89) as well as the EU-Africa Partnership for Cotton Sector Development of 2004 (COM (2004) 87).</p> <p>Important issues to face related to: liberalisation and deregulation in producing countries; quality and traceability requirements from retailers and consumers; concentration and vertical coordination and integration on the side of buyers. In addition, there had been changes in the approaches to development cooperation with moves away from project type activities to broader sector approaches closely related to national strategic development frameworks such as PRSPs.</p> <p>The Communication from the Commission outlined the various challenges that commodity dependent developing countries (CDDCs) were facing. It suggested actions by the EU to assist them cope with these challenges, with the objective of increasing producer incomes, and reducing income vulnerability at both producer and macro levels. The challenges addressed referred to long term price decline; price fluctuations, difficulties to diversify, international trade rules, and sustainable corporate practices.</p> <p>In April 2004, the Council recommended that as a first step the following actions should be pursued: i) supporting CDDCs in the design and implementation of commodity chain strategies; (ii) advancing efforts to develop regional markets, policies and services in support of commodity sectors; (iii) supporting CDDCs in their effort towards diversification; (iv) extending access to market-based commodity risk instruments; (v) maximise opportunities for commodity dependent developing countries in the multilateral trading system; and (vi), encourage sustainable corporate practices and investments for sustainable commodity production. The Council also</p>

	<p>recommended developing multi-donor cooperation on agricultural commodities with international organisations (such as FAO, UNCTAD, World Bank, CFC), with a view to enhance expertise and development of innovative tools to support national commodity strategies.</p> <p>The proposed programme is a key aspect of implementing the two Action Plans on Commodities and Cotton. It addresses most of the key recommendations made by the Council and the EU-Africa Cotton Forum, including the one concerning cooperation with international organisations.</p>
Overall objectives	The overall objective of the AAACP programme is to improve incomes for producers from traditional or other agricultural commodities and reduce income vulnerability at both producer and macro level
Specific objectives	The AAACP programme purpose is to strengthen the capacity to develop and implement sustainable commodity strategies that improve farmers' productivity and their rural livelihoods and reduce income vulnerability.
Expected results	<p>The main expected results are four</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Result 1: Commodity strategies and implementation plans ▪ Result 2: Access and use of markets, production factors and services ▪ Result 3: Market-based risk management instruments ▪ Result 4: Complementary aspects of and synergies between the international organisations, the EU and the ACP actors
Main Activities	<p>The programme will essentially <u>make available a pool of key services and tools to ACP commodity chain actors</u>. The <u>key activity areas</u> are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Participatory strategy development</u>: at the core of the programme lies support to the development of commodity strategies in the most commodity dependent ACP countries. ▪ <u>Follow-up on key priorities emerging from the strategy development</u>; and specific all-ACP actions to improve access to relevant markets, production factors and services ▪ <u>Commodity Risk Management</u>: The programme will support further work on country-and commodity-specific development and application of market-based instruments (use of hedging, forward contracting, insurance etc.), raise awareness and build capacity among potential users of these instruments (producer organisations, inter-professional associations, traders, processors, financiers and governments). Moreover, the programme will support the strengthening of supportive <i>infrastructure</i>, both <i>soft</i> (e.g. organisations and legislation) and <i>hard</i> infrastructure (e.g. weather stations) that forms a prerequisite for the application of the instruments. ▪ <u>Capitalising on complementarities and synergies</u> of ACP, EU and concerned International Organisations (IOs) in the area of agricultural commodities; and sharing of experiences at the All-ACP level.
Main achievements	<p>Main achievements of the programme by result are as follows (as of December 2010):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Result 1</u>: out of the 33 activities implemented by IOs, 21 were completed 17 commodity strategies (prepared with AAACP funding) were completed (just one being finalised). Note that, out of the 17 commodity strategies, 3 are cotton regional strategies (WAEMU, ECCAS, COMESA). ▪ <u>Result 2</u>: 50 out of the 125 activities implemented by IOs, 49 were completed (mainly regional workshops to strengthen producer organizations, contributions to value chain analysis and commodity strategies (implementation of action plans), identification of business models as well as specific activities like control

	<p>of fruit fly).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Result 3: 6 of the 23 activities were completed. These activities, which have been implemented in the form of studies, training, technical assistance and advisory services, could not have an effect unless they are accompanied by the establishment or strengthening of both 'soft' infrastructure (e.g. organisation, legislation, regulation, finance, insurance, judiciary) and 'hard' infrastructure (e.g. weather stations, laboratories, warehouses, rural roads, electricity) that forms the prerequisite for the application of the instruments. ▪ Result 4: on the one hand, there is a real coordination at IO headquarters level through the Inter Agencies Mechanism (IAM) meetings, on the other hand, the field phase (May-July 2011) found no evidence to confirm this at the level of the EU Delegations and offices of IOs. <p><i>Source: Activity Status (as at 31/12/2010), AAACP Coordination Unit, Mid-term Review of the AAACP Programme, Final report, April 2009, page 69 & 70; AACP Coordination Unit, November 8th 2011, field mission (May-July 2011)</i></p>
Main difficulties	<p>The Mid-term Review of the AAACP Programme, final report (April 2009) listed the following difficulties (in p 69 and in the executive summary):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lengthy planning and incomplete kick-off workshop ▪ Baseline information screening not available ▪ Insufficient strategic guidance at the outset of the programme ▪ Poor coordination between the five International Organisations and the Coordination Unit ▪ Poor communication from the Coordination Unit in the ACP countries <p>Following this evaluation, some actions were undertaken, for instance the appointment of regional focal points or the recruitment of a communication expert for the coordination unit.</p> <p><i>Source: Mid-term Review of the AAACP Programme, Final report, April 2009, page 69 and executive summary</i></p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification Fiche (Proposal for Formulation) AIDCO/C3/2006/D/12596, 2 June 2006 ▪ Financing Proposal n° 9 ACP RPR 64, 24 July 2006 ▪ Financing Agreement between the European Commission and the ACP States, All ACP Agricultural Commodities Programme (RPR/010/06), EDF IX ▪ Global Workplan for the period October 2007 to December 2011, November 2009 ▪ Consultancy project to Support the Creation of an Intra-ACP thematic programme for the Implementation of the Plan of Action on Agricultural Commodities and the Plan of Action for the EU-Africa Cotton partnership, Final report, May-June 2009 ▪ Mid-term review of the All ACP Agricultural Commodities Programme, Final Report, January-April 2009 ▪ Addendum No 1 to Financing Agreement N°9571/REG, Extension of time limit for implementation and execution, 6 July 2009 (Ref.: RPR/010/06 9.ACP.RPR.64 2006/18-543) ▪ Draft notes of PSC Meeting (Version 2), 22 July 2009 ▪ Programme Steering Committee Meeting Note, 23 February 2010, progress report (period July to December 2009)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Draft notes of the 6th meeting of the Steering Committee, 23 February 2010, ACP House, Brussels▪ Progress report on cotton-relates interventions under the AAACP, Situation as at 31 march 2010, 14th COS meeting, 18 May 2010▪ Doc 52c: Follow Up to main MTR recommendations, 20 September 2010▪ Meeting notes reference number MN 934 and MN 641▪ Activity Status (as at 31/12/2010), AAACP Coordination Unit▪ Field Phase
--	--

Intervention Title	Global index insurance facility project for ACP countries GIIF-ACP
Country / Region	ACP region
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2007/020-850 ▪ Contract number(s): 197750
EC aid modality	Contribution agreement (<i>GIIF ADMIN. AGRT WITH IFC - TF071038</i>) Use of Trust Fund. The Netherlands and Japan put in €20 million too. Joint Management with the World Bank Group
Intervention Start date & End date	14/11/2008 signature of contract with IFC Operations over 5 years to 31 December 2013 (with end date of execution at 31 December 2015)
Budget	Planned: € 25 million Committed: € 25 million (as of January 2010) Contracted: € 24,5 million (as of January 2010) through the Trust fund with about 50% planned for TA and 50% for premium subsidisation Disbursed: € 12,25 million (as of January 2010) Planned for M&E (not through the Trust Fund): €0.5 million
Main stakeholders as per project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission using a Trust Fund Agreement open to other donors ▪ Implementing agencies: International Finance Corporation ▪ Direct beneficiaries: Producers and 10 to 15 ACP governments (that will take up the insurance) and the primary insurers that will intermediate the insurance ▪ Indirect beneficiaries: financial sector in ACPs (banks, micro-finance institutions) as loans and credits are expected to increase when producers improve their risk coverage ▪ Final beneficiaries: wider population at risk that will be covered (ie food insecure population, growers of specific products).
Intervention Description as per project design	<p>The project supports the enhanced use of index insurance² in ACPs using a PPP mechanism. It addresses the challenge of reducing ACPs vulnerability, especially of agricultural producers w/r to catastrophic weather situations thus minimising macroeconomic disruption and induce higher investment levels.</p> <p>The idea is to strengthen the private insurance industry in ACP countries by supporting the improvement in the general knowledge and appreciation of benefits of index insurance and the legal, regulatory and institutional environment.</p>
Programme Background & History	<p>The idea has been developed since 2005 by the International Task Force on Commodity Risk Management (ITF-CRM) in which the WB and the Commission play a prominent role. The project applies concepts and techniques piloted before.</p> <p>The IF (dated May 2007) specifies that the formulation of the project commenced with a feasibility study of the GIIF (market analysis in ACPs providing recommendations on concept and feasibility and identifying areas of assistance). Discussion with stakeholders (WB, IFC) on the management of GIIF and the premium subsidies. Work was expected to be completed by mid-May 2007 but delays occurred (see below programme achievements).</p>

² Index insurance (as opposed to traditional indemnity-based insurance) is explained as insurance not related to a specific 'property' (=crop) but related to an event which is measurable (drought, wind etc.). Index insurance avoids the moral hazard problem (taking more risks because of the incentive arrangement; in fact here there is no incentive for insured persons to create additional damage or to neglect operations; rather the contrary, it provides an incentive for disaster preparedness and mitigation, as insured persons will receive the insurance payment in addition to their income from their crops) and is less subject to fraud and can lead to fast payouts. It is also less expensive in terms of underwriting and claims handling costs (since there is no individual persons' underwriting and no damage assessments for individual claims). The main requirements for index insurance seem to be a reliable data base (to construct the index) and the legal set-up in-country.

	The FED Committee approved on 25 October 2007.
Overall objectives	Reduce the vulnerability of ACP population to external (weather induced) shocks /natural disasters by using ex-ante risk reduction options
Specific objectives	To expand the use of index insurance as a risk management tool in ACPs; to be used in a range of applications, including disaster risk reduction, food security and agriculture.
Expected results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Higher levels of awareness and use of index insurance³ ▪ An improved legal framework and strengthened regulatory capacities in a number of ACPs⁴ ▪ An improved commercial capacity to develop and market index insurance ▪ An increase in the successful conclusion of index insurance transactions in ACPs through financial support in the form of premium subsidies
Main Activities foreseen as per project design	<p>The option that has been retained for this project is rather than scaling up successful pilot initiatives, address the structural capacity constraints (awareness, legal and regulatory issues) of local insurance industry and use a market extension approach (enter into support arrangements with a public-private re-insurance company preferably operating on index re-insurance for emerging markets (Index Re).</p> <p>Main activities include: Capacity building:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promotion and public awareness of index insurance ▪ Strengthening of legal, regulatory and supervisory systems related to index insurance in ACP countries, as well as at an umbrella level (eg African Centre for Catastrophe Risk, ACCR) ▪ Improving data availability, data cleaning, catastrophe risk modelling, including using satellite data ▪ Product development, including design, rating and the development of delivery mechanisms ▪ Premium subsidy provision to specific index insurance agreements
Main achievements	<p>The project has been delayed in its starting phase. The main investor in Index Re withdrew in June 2009 and so the approach was revised from reliance on one single reinsurance company (Index Re) to a more proactive role for the Trust Fund with a plurality of partners to avoid dependence upon a single provider for technical support. This has delayed the programme's effective start.</p> <p>A Programme manager commenced work in July 2009 and the programme was officially launched in December 2009. At the same time some requests had already started coming in for risk transfer projects (3), local capacity building (1), premium subsidy support (1) and regulatory and policy reforms (2).</p> <p>As of December 2010 it seems there are 3 projects that have taken off (one for cattle farmers in Northern Kenya, one for crops in Kenya and one in India). Since Kenya was not included in the countries visited by the evaluator, no further information was collected in the field on the two projects in Kenya.</p>
Main difficulties	The main difficulty this project appears to have had to cope with are the delays in launching the project. The Commission's funding decision was taken in October 2007 but the project was officially launched only in December 2009 due to the withdrawal of the main reinsurance agent. At end 2010 there were thus no activities to be evaluated in the field. In the seven countries visited the project was not known by any of the interviewed

³ Awareness of the instrument is poor and affects the chance of insurance products being sold and requires additional work in awareness raising (feasible, but demanding in terms of time and efforts).

⁴ Insurance regulation in many developing countries is fully "indemnity based" and does not cover parametric insurance. Changes in regulations and in laws may be needed in the medium-term, while often temporary creative solutions will need to be found in the shorter term.

	<p>parties but discussions revealed that crop insurance was thought to be mostly attractive to well-off farmers as smaller farmers cannot afford to buy crop/income insurance and have other ways to reduce risks on-farm.</p> <p>The (theoretical) difficulties of the project cited by the Project Identification Fiche include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capacity problems in understanding index insurance principles, ▪ Developing and marketing suitable products ▪ Developing a regulatory framework <p>All require substantial donor support to obtain an initial insurance product. Challenge will be to scale up the number of insurance applications in the local insurance industry to increase (invoke) demand for insurance and reduce the costs of the product.</p> <p>A risk includes the not attractive subsidy as other donors offer full premium coverage; insufficient capital being attracted by the IFC for this Index-Re; private sector capacity building might be slower than expected thus affecting sustainability of the project.</p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financing Agreement No 9865/REG, signed December 2007 ▪ Identification Fiche, May 2007 ▪ Commission Decision C(2007)5916 of 30th November 2007 ▪ http://www.ifc.org/ifcext/gfm.nsf/Content/Insurance-GIIF ▪ Brief for the European Commission and ACP Secretariat on the Global Index Insurance Facility – GIIF status as at 31st December 2009 ▪ http://www.ifap.org/issues/risk-management/en/ ▪ MN 934 and MN912 ▪ Discussions held in the seven visited countries with EUDs, donors and sector stakeholders. ▪ Other interesting documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Potential for Scale and Sustainability in Weather Index Insurance for Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods, IFAD, 2010 - New solutions for managing the food crisis: private-public partnership programme for agriculture investment and risk management, Commonwealth Business Council and Swiss Reinsurance Company Ltd, March 2009 - Sustainable development Innovation Briefs, Issue 2, March 2007 ‘Developing Index-based Insurance for Agriculture in Developing Countries’ (includes discussion of the Malawi/groundnut case) - Index insurance and climate risk: Prospects for development and disaster management, Climate and Society No 2 (includes the case studies of Malawi, Ethiopia and many others)

Intervention Title	Integration to the multilateral trading system and support to the Integrated framework for All ACP countries ACP-IF
Country / Region	All ACP countries
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2008/020-237 ▪ Contract number(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 255973 (2010): Enhanced IF - 216751 (2009): Programme Estimate 1 (01/07/2009-12/12/2010)
EC aid modality	<i>(e.g. project approach, Sector Budget Support, Pool funding / Trust funds)</i> Regional funds (9ACP RPR 140)
Intervention Start date & End date	Start: signing date of FA: December 2007 and February 2008 End date: 31 December 2015 (deadline for entering into contracts: 12 December 2010)
Budget	Planned: €16 million of which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support to enhanced IF: € 6 million ▪ Integrating ACP states into the MTS of WTO: € 9.68 million ▪ Rest: audits, evaluation etc. Committed: € 16,000,000 (as of January 2010) Contracted: € 5,529,086 (as of January 2010) Disbursed: € 2,161,863 (as of January 2010)
Main stakeholders	Donor(s): European Commission, other donors (support to the IF comes from UNDP and WTO and is managed by the UNOPS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementing agencies: ACP secretariat through a PMU & steering committee (which includes DEV, EuropAid and TRADE) ▪ The contribution to the enhanced IF will be implemented in joint management with an international organisation (UNOPS) through a Contribution Agreement ▪ Direct beneficiaries: first beneficiaries are ambassadors of ACPs in Geneva, then the ACP country representatives (Ministries of Trade mostly) ▪ Final beneficiaries:
Intervention Description	Demand driven programme operating through 2 complementary components: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1/ one focused on the WTO trade negotiations and implementation agreements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1a/ effective participation in MT negotiations ▪ 1b/ support for the implementation of MT agreements 2/ one focused on assisting ACP LDCs through a contribution through the enhanced IF in order to⁵: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2a/ mainstream trade into LDC national development plans ▪ 2b/ assist in the coordinated delivery of TRTA in response to need identified by LDCs ▪ 2c/ develop the capacity of LDCs to trade, incl. Through capacity building and addressing supply constraints.
Programme Background & History	Successor to the all-ACP capacity building programme for the WTO (implemented 2002-2006). Programme context notes the deteriorating share of ACP share in world trade and EU's share of trade with ACP has been declining despite tariff preferences (Cotonou). For most

⁵ IF Trust Fund provides resources for two sets of activities, namely Window 1 (Diagnostic Trade Integration Studies (DTIS) and strengthening in-country structures) and Window 2 (some small capacity-building projects as identified in the DTIS Action Matrices). The enhanced IF enabled LDCs to work with the six Agencies and other development partners to ensure that national trade policies are integrated into their respective development strategies. The IF facilitates a coordinated response by the various agencies and development partners to the trade-related assistance and capacity-building needs identified by each of the LDC governments and other national stakeholders.

	<p>ACP, Eu is the main trading partner. ACP exports remain concentrated in a few primary products which represent mainly commodities.</p> <p>Considerable heterogeneity amongst ACP countries but common features such as supply constraints – weak infrastructure and high transport costs – and weak capacity of trade administrations and limited trade support services.</p>
Overall objectives	To contribute to an effective Aid-for-Trade for ACP countries
Specific objectives	To enable ACP countries integration into the Multilateral Trading System (MTS), to mainstream trade into their national development strategies and to translate trade needs into PRSPs
Expected results	<p>MTS component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhanced participation of ACPs in MTN and protection of their interest and concerns in WTO negotiations through: Contribute to inter-ACP meetings and participation to WTO meetings, prepare regional positions and analytical and legal work. Focal points and promoting ACP expertise through the use of a pool of ACP experts in trade related matters, assist ACP candidates to WTO membership in their accession process. ▪ Better compliance of ACPs to their WTO commitments and stronger national and regional capacities to implement such commitments. <p>Enhanced IF component: Generate a broad based trade development agenda within ACP countries overall macroeconomic and development strategy and to prioritise capacity building needs to which bilateral and multilateral donors respond. Three broad stages (not further defined).</p> <p>The above subdivision of activities is not all that clear from the FA where activities under the MTS component are the provision of legal TA in WTO disputes, inventory of legislation for compliance with WTO agreements and training of public and private sector officials in understanding implementation implications of the agreements.</p>
Main Activities	<p>MTS component: provision of legal TA in WTO disputes, inventory of legislation for compliance with the WTO agreements and training of public and private sector officials in understanding implementation implications of the agreements.</p> <p>Examples of activities undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Payment for ACP participation in the all ACP trade ministers Meeting in preparation for the 7th WTO Ministerial Conference” (11 to 13 November 2009) and the 7th WTO Ministerial Conference (30 November to 02 December 2009) ▪ Projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “001-09 Ad hoc support to ACP Delegations on DDA Negotiations: teams of experts to assist the Group directly in its DDA-related work” - Ouagadougou workshop on cotton (17-22 June 2010) - Mauritius for the “Assistance to review the existing legislations regarding the services sector, to identify new areas where new domestic regulations need to be developed, with a particular emphasis on professional, health and educational services - Ad hoc support to ACP Delegations on DDA Negotiations - St Vincent and the Grenadines aimed at raising awareness amongst the stakeholders on the progressive liberalisation on Trade in services, its implications, and support more effective participation in the implementation and negotiations in the WTO - COMESA on “Enhancing the participation of COMESA members in the ongoing WTO negotiations, and promote and defend their commercial interests in the WTO

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Federated States of Micronesia: Legal Support and capacity Building in Trade-Related Laws and Regulations - Kenya on Technical assistance to develop effective trade remedy regime, including the establishment of an investigation authority - Dominican Republic: build capacity in the negotiations on trade in Agriculture - Vanuatu on accelerating the accession of Vanuatu's membership to the WTO and - ACP Group on study to produce empirical evidence for the extension of additional protection for Geographical Indications (GIs) to other economically significant African products other than wines and spirits. - Seychelles: Laws and Regulations dealing with SPS measures are brought in conformity with international standards and the regulatory bodies dealing with SPS strengthened - COMESA: public health/regional scope - Sudan: enhance the process of accession of Sudan to join the WTO, so as to promote and safeguard its commercial interests in the WTO - PMU also participated in WTO conferences thus using opportunity to meet ACP countries and explain access to the assistance of the programme. <p>Enhanced IF component:</p> <p>1/ preparatory activities: technical review of request to participate in IF, establish IF steering committee, identify lead donor</p> <p>2/ diagnostic phase: elaboration of a DTIS (examines the country's trade policy, assesses the competitiveness of the economy and examines sectors engaged in international trade or those with the potential to do so. On this bases, TA needs are identified.</p> <p>3/ Follow up activities: transform DTIS in action plan with stakeholders spelling out priority TA required (used by the WTO programme for funding identification)</p>
Main achievements	<p>Achievements are not really measured as such: the PMU monitoring provides an account of what funding requests have been accepted and are being implemented so there is a measure of activities (or outputs) but not of achievements in terms of actual contributions to the outcome.</p> <p>From the evaluators' field visits, interviewed government officials from several countries underlined that they had received assistance for the negotiation of trading agreements but it wasn't always clear whether this came from the MTS-IF or from other sources. The views on the usefulness were mixed (positive in Ghana, negative in Vanuatu and mixed in Tanzania and Cameroun).</p>
Main difficulties	<p>No difficulties were mentioned.</p> <p>One aspect which may be flagged is the fact that the project, because of its nature, does not address the issue of sustainability: it provides assistance in negotiations and MTS but it doesn't build capacities in ACPs to deal themselves with these issues. (this point was raised by the mid-term evaluation and by the final evaluation of trade.com: are ACP countries better able now to enter and successfully complete trade negotiations?)</p> <p>Another issue which arises from the mid-term evaluation report of the previous MTS project (2002-2006) is that there it was recommended that the project's €10 million was far too little for the activities pursued; with the current project we have just under this amount for MTS. How does that work out in practice?</p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FA + Rider FA ▪ 4th Quarterly report (Dec 2009-Feb 2010-11-14 5th Quarterly Report (March-May 2010) ▪ List of projects

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The programme's website : http://acp-mts-programme.org▪ http://www.integratedframework.org/▪ MN 986, MN938, MN1011, MN134, MN601.▪ Mid-term review, ACP Trade related Assistance EDF Project, Support to the integration of ACP States into the WTO MTS (7 ACP RPR 753), Final Report, Danish Management A/S, 14th September 2004.▪ Final evaluation of the Trade.com Facility, 8th November 2010, ACE.▪ UNDP Commodity Development Strategies in the Integrated Framework, July 2009.
--	--

Intervention Title	Pesticides Initiative Programme for All ACP countries ACP-PIP
Country / Region	All ACP countries
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: AFS/2003/006-043 ▪ Decision number(s): PIP1: FED/2001/015-497 (PIP tr (transitoire): 2007/020-894 & PIP 2 : FED/2009/021-473)
EC aid modality	Aid was given in the form of a grant to the COLEACP (Comité de Liaison Europe-Afrique-Caraïbes-Pacifique), a professional horticulture organisation that took charge of implementing the programme.
Intervention Start date & End date	Start: 12 th of July 2001 End (planned): 30 th of June 2008 (PIP tr between 2008 and 2009) (PIP2: from October 2009 to 2014)
Budget	<p>For the PIP1: Planned: € 34 million Committed: € 34,120,000 (as of January 2010) Contracted: € 33,787,701(as of January 2010) Disbursed: € 33,787,701(as of January 2010)</p> <p>PIPtr: Committed: € 5,000,000 (as of January 2010) Contracted: € 5,000,000 (as of January 2010) Disbursed: € 4,446,917(as of January 2010))</p> <p>PIP2: € 32,500,000 (contract 219304) Disbursed: € 6,548,945 (as of January 2010)</p>
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission (the EC is the only donor, but financing was also brought by end beneficiary companies as a cost-sharing arrangement) ▪ Implementing agencies: COLEACP ▪ Direct beneficiaries: The fruit and vegetables sector of ACP countries ▪ Final beneficiaries: The fruit and vegetables sector of ACP countries
Intervention Description	Initially, the PIP intended to help ACP countries comply with Maximum Residue Limits of pesticides to help them maintain and increase their market share in EU imports. At the end of PIP1 and then in PIPtr, the scope was extended to other issues: food security and safety, private standards and rural poverty
Programme Background & History	<p>In the 1990s, due to increasing demands in terms of food safety by EU consumers, the EC reformulated its pesticides legislation regarding their authorization and the fixing of Maximum Residue Limits.</p> <p>ACP countries risked losing substantial EU market shares due to lack of compliance with EU regulation. Indeed, MRLs of the main tropical crops risked being fixed at the limit of detection because pesticide manufacturers were not interested in preparing files to support requests for import tolerances, and this would have resulted in their elimination from the European market.</p> <p>Therefore, a large-scale, general and coordinated programme was initiated to ensure ACP compliance with new EU regulations. This process was particularly necessary given that the horticultural export sector represented a significant portion of the GDP of producing countries, and had a strategic importance for rural development given the income it distributes and its influence on other crops.</p> <p>After the end of the PIP1, a transitory PIP took place for one year. In 2009, the PIP2 was then launched, pursuing and broadening the objectives and activities of the programme</p>

	(see details below)
Overall objectives	<p>PIP1: Reinforcing sustainable (and fair regarding small and medium producers) competitiveness of the private sector horticulture in ACP countries. The programme aims at least to maintain ACP market shares in EU imports.</p> <p>PIP2: Increasing the contribution of the trade of agricultural products to poverty reduction and food security improvement in ACP countries</p>
Specific objectives	<p>PIP1: Improving the sanitary quality of ACP fruit and vegetable products exported to the EU markets.</p> <p>PIP2: (i) Adequacy of ACP agricultural products to legal and trade-related requirements, (ii) sustainable improvement of capacities of all stakeholders in ACP value chains to adapt to the evolution of legal requirements and markets.</p>
Expected results	<p>PIP1: The PIP counted 7 expected results regrouped into 4 categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information/Communication category <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. ACP producers and exporters are informed when necessary of regulations in importing countries, and in particular of those regarding MRLs and temporary import tolerances. Importers are equally informed of ACP efforts to comply with the regulations. 2. Regulation category <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. EU regulation and MRLs are determined for 200 couples of “active substance * crop” that are important for ACP countries. In the short term, 200 temporary import tolerances are distributed. b. The phytosanitary regulation of at least 20 ACP countries is adapted and implemented. 3. Good Company Practices (GCPs) category <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 50 references of GCPs for tropical fruit & vegetables are established and 10 ACP countries have implemented a quality control system that is recognized by EU public and private controls. ACP consumers are also aware of these references. b. In at least 10 ACP countries, vulgarisation systems of the GCPs are adapted so as to maintain access to EU markets for small and medium sized producers. 4. Capacity building category <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ACP members of the horticultural value chain lead at least 10 national Task Forces which work as coordination platforms with the public institutions involved, and the capacities of the service providers and organisations in charge of controlling the pesticides are built up, so that they can take on the role of the PIP at the end of the project. b. The ACP members of the horticultural value chain and their professional organisations have set up a European network of technical relays <p>PIP2: results were divided in two groups:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support to ACP fruit & vegetables value chains <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Improvement of market access for ACP operators and smallholders b. ACP operators of fruit & vegetable exports are able to comply with legal requirements and market demand c. Reinforcement of sector support capacity and environment d. Availability for producers of the information and products of the PIP2 e. Sustainability of the institutional framework of the programme

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Contribution to the Standard and Trade Development Facility <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Effective coordination for SPS among technical assistants, donors and ACP countries according to the Paris Declaration b. Reinforcement of analysis and implementation capacities of public and private ACP stakeholders for SPS measures.
Main Activities	<p>PIP1: The activities can be separated in the programme's 4 main components as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information/Communication category <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Raising awareness of ACP operators on the issues dealt with by the PIP b. Facilitating knowledge and know-how transfer from the PIP to the operators by putting into place communication tools and informing the market about the upgrading efforts made by ACP operators 2. Regulation category <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Carrying out field surveys in the main countries concerned b. Selecting authorized active substances in and developing technical itineraries for the pesticides c. Carrying out field experiments to test efficiency and verify compliance with regulations d. In cases where compliance wasn't possible, putting together requests for import tolerances 3. Good Company Practices (GCPs) category <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Analysis of company requests b. Signing of protocols c. Audit-needs assessment of the company food safety systems d. Participation of the staff in collective training e. Support to establish the system accompanied by specific in-company training f. Assistance with the process of pre-auditing and certification 4. Capacity building category <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Providing high-quality training to 167 expert service providers, out of which half were used afterwards by the PIP as local experts b. Assisting laboratories in the accreditation process c. Support to organizing professional associations d. Helping task forces to start discussion activities between public and private sectors in the field of food safety. e. Support to bodies responsible for pesticides regulation to enable them to play their role in the process of registration and control of pesticides <p>PIP2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support to ACP fruit & vegetables value chains <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reinforced support to smallholders and their organisations b. Enlargement of the scope of the intervention to trade requirements and to environmental, social and fairness standards (organic production, fair trade, etc.). c. Enlargement of the scope of products to include processed fruits & vegetables and bananas d. Reinforced contribution to the improvement of the quality of products on regional and local markets 2. Contribution to the Standard and Trade Development Facility <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Coordination and dissemination activities on SPS standards and

	<p>measures</p> <p>b. Preparation and implementation of projects in ACP countries</p>
Main achievements	<p>The final evaluation report of PIP1 states that overall, the PIP has achieved the objectives assigned to it at the beginning, to the satisfaction of all concerned.</p> <p><i>(Achievements of PIP2 were not included in the evaluation scope)</i></p>
Main difficulties	<p>PIP Problems appeared for <i>“beneficiaries in the public and associative sectors, which did not yet meet the requirements for an effective support and which needed, at least some of them, a closer and more significant support, and less demanding as to the share of costs. A more selective approach, and also a more intensive one for those beneficiaries who looked really motivated, would have been more effective and finally more efficient.”</i></p> <p><i>(Difficulties of PIP2 were not included in the evaluation scope)</i></p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PIP1 Final Evaluation Report ▪ PIP1 Financing Agreement ▪ PIP2 Financing Agreement ▪ PIP2 Note for Commission Members ▪ MN 958

Intervention Title	Appui à la valorisation des ressources agricoles locales : filières anacarde et sésame au Burkina Faso BF-ANSE
Country / Region	Burkina Faso
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: DCI-NSAPVD/2007/019-615 ▪ Contract number(s): n°149561
EC aid modality	Project approach
Intervention Start date & End date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Date de démarrage: 01/01/2009 ▪ Date finale prévue: 01/01/2013 ▪ Date final probable: 01/01/2013
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engagement primaire (financement CE) : 586.207 € (27/09/2010) ▪ Autres fonds (gouvernement ou autres donateurs): 195.232 € (27/09/2010) ▪ Budget total de l'opération : 781.439 € (27/09/2010) ▪
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contribution financière du demandeur 78.161 € (10%) ▪ Contribution requise de la Commission dans cette demande : 586.207 € (75%) ▪ Contributions d'autres organisations : MISEREOR / KZE Allemagne : 117.241€ (15%) ▪ Total des contributions : 781.610 € ▪ Mise en œuvre: RONGEAD (ONG) en partenariat avec INADES-Formation /Burkina Faso
Intervention Description	<p>L'action proposée vise le renforcement des capacités techniques et économiques des organisations de producteurs de sésame et d'anacarde. Il vise également l'appui aux initiatives privées de valorisation des ressources agricoles (transformation primaire, conditionnement) et de micro-entreprises de formation et conseil en milieu rural.</p> <p>L'appui aux processus durables de développement social, humain, environnemental et économique vise l'intégration économique et l'autonomie des groupements cibles. Le renforcement des capacités de gestion des organisations de producteurs par des sessions de formation et de suivi des projets permettront une meilleure valorisation des ressources locales. L'appui à la gestion d'une activité économique vise l'intégration des groupements de producteurs et des micro-entreprises dans des marchés internationaux spécifiques (promotion du Commerce Equitable, de l'Agriculture Biologique et d'autres modes de production certifiés par des standards internationaux). La promotion de pratiques culturales agrobiologiques est un moyen de promouvoir des activités économiques durables.</p> <p>L'appui à la structuration de la filière nationale est fait en tenant compte des enjeux sous-régionaux et internationaux. Trop souvent, les politiques de soutien aux filières s'élaborent sur la base d'enjeux nationaux sans prendre suffisamment en compte les contraintes et opportunités internationales. Le projet vise donc à favoriser la concertation entre l'Administration, les opérateurs privés, les investisseurs potentiels et les groupements de producteurs pour l'organisation et la régulation des filières sésame et anacarde afin de relever le défi de la compétitivité d'une transformation nationale des ressources agricoles.</p>
Programme Background & History	<p>Les populations rurales des zones sahéennes Burkinabè sont confrontées à des problèmes économiques et écologiques. Les difficultés écologiques sont liées au climat sahéen, à la déforestation et à la fragilité des sols. Les difficultés économiques sont principalement liées à la crise du coton et aux difficultés alimentaires.</p> <p>Les populations rurales des régions productrices de coton, qui pratiquent également l'agriculture vivrière, sont à la recherche d'activités alternatives génératrices de revenus. Le développement de l'arboriculture paysanne et des cultures annuelles de rente (en pures ou</p>

	<p>en associations) sont des stratégies de diversification envisageables. Le Burkina Faso possède des zones agro-écologiques favorables à la production de l'anacarde et du sésame, sources de revenus complémentaires pour les populations vulnérables des zones rurales.</p> <p>Ces deux filières font face à des problèmes technico-commerciaux semblables : manque de maîtrise de la qualité, difficulté de commercialisation sur le marché international, manque de services adaptés à des filières peu encadrées, difficulté d'accès aux informations technico-économiques sur le marché.</p> <p>Le sésame présente un potentiel de développement important au Burkina Faso, s'agissant d'une plante peu exigeante, s'intégrant facilement dans les calendriers agricoles et valorisable à l'export. La demande du marché international est en croissance et certains contrats d'achat au Burkina Faso ne sont pas remplis. Toutefois, la méconnaissance des bonnes pratiques agricoles et le manque d'accès aux informations techniques et économiques pénalisent les organisations paysannes productrices de sésame (voir par exemple les contaminations du sésame biologique à la salmonelle en 2005 et les conséquences dramatiques pour la filière burkinabè).</p> <p>L'anacarde (noix de cajou) présente également un potentiel de diversification des revenus intéressant, bien que la production actuelle du Burkina Faso reste faible et peu structurée. Des plantations existent dans les régions cibles de l'action mais les exigences du marché international ne sont pas maîtrisées par les producteurs. L'anacardier est un arbre rustique valorisable économiquement, c'est pourquoi il est considéré comme un arbre adapté au développement économique de zones défavorisées et a été introduit dans les zones de savanes arborées de plusieurs pays d'Afrique de l'Ouest.</p> <p>Notons que le choix des zones d'intervention a été conditionné par les zones où l'INADES était déjà présente (recherche d'une concentration/complémentarité des appuis).</p>
Overall objectives	<p>Les objectifs globaux que l'action contribue à atteindre sont :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Réduire la pauvreté en milieu rural pour améliorer les conditions de vie de populations défavorisées (2) Promouvoir la représentation des femmes dans les filières agricoles nationales et l'autonomisation économique des femmes (3) Favoriser la création locale de valeur ajoutée par la promotion de la qualité et des traitements post-récolte (4) Faciliter l'intégration de populations vulnérables à l'économie mondiale (5) Favoriser la préservation des ressources naturelles par la promotion de pratiques culturelles agrobiologiques et la démonstration d'une reforestation rentable économiquement pour les populations
Specific objectives	<p>L'objectif spécifique de l'action est de favoriser l'amélioration, la diversification et la sécurisation du revenu de populations rurales défavorisées du Burkina Faso par la création de valeur ajoutée dans les filières sésame et noix de cajou dans un environnement protégé.</p>
Expected results	<p>(R1) Des opérateurs paysans professionnels ayant augmenté leur revenu grâce à une amélioration de la qualité de leur production et à une meilleure capacité de négociation lors de la commercialisation</p> <p>(R11) Des OP professionnelles, des producteurs formés</p> <p>(R12) Une commercialisation maîtrisée par les OP, des partenariats OP/privés satisfaisants et durables</p> <p>(R2) Des opérateurs investis dans la transformation agro-alimentaire, capables de gérer des unités artisanales de transformation et d'intégrer les caractéristiques technico-économiques du marché international.</p> <p>(R21) Une maîtrise technique renforcée des acteurs de la transformation agro-</p>

	<p>alimentaire primaire</p> <p>(R22) Des volumes de produits agricoles semi-transformés commercialisés en augmentation améliorent l'économie rurale (débouchés locaux et internationaux)</p> <p>(R221) Insérer des producteurs défavorisés sur des marchés d'export rémunérateurs</p> <p>(R222) Une meilleure exploitation des potentialités du marché local et sous régional</p> <p>(R3) Des micro-entreprises de conseil agricole pour dynamiser les filières anacarde et sésame</p> <p>(R31) Des agents de conseil spécialisés sur les filières anacarde et sésame</p> <p>(R32) Un conseil orienté vers les besoins des paysans et financé par les OP</p> <p>(R4) Une politique régionale de valorisation de l'anacarde et du sésame, en collaboration avec des partenaires internationaux est définie</p>
Main Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Activité 1 : Appuyer la structuration professionnelle et favoriser l'amélioration de la qualité. ▪ Activité 2 : Appuyer les opérateurs locaux investis dans la transformation agro-alimentaire ▪ Activité 3 : Favoriser l'émergence d'un conseil agricole répondant aux besoins des producteurs et axé sur les résultats, complémentaire des services techniques de l'Etat pour dynamiser les filières anacarde et sésame ▪ Activité 4 : Favoriser une concertation multi-acteurs : Organisations Paysannes, groupes de femmes transformatrices, micro-entreprises rurales, investisseurs privés, commerçants, Conseils Régionaux, agents techniques de l'Etat
Main achievements	<p>1. <u>Formations des producteurs et des leaders paysans</u></p> <p>1.1. Conception, fabrication et diffusion des outils pédagogiques</p> <p>Filière Anacarde : Cette activité a été réalisée en partenariat avec le PDA/GTZ afin d'harmoniser les outils de formation à l'échelle nationale. La phase de conception a été réalisée par l'équipe du projet : conception de deux kits de formation (niveau 'basique' et niveau 'avancé'). Les kits sont composés d'une boîte à image pour le formateur et de jeux d'affiches pour les paysans ciblés. Ils sont également composés de pinces pour le contrôle qualité (achetées en Inde). La conception a également intégré la traduction en langue locale des outils (dioula). L'impression n'est à l'heure actuelle qu'à l'état de draft et suit un test de validation par les bénéficiaires, elle sera réalisée en 2010. La diffusion aura lieu courant 2010.</p> <p>Filière sésame : une première analyse de l'existant a été faite. Il existe un grand nombre d'outils au Burkina (réalisés par la GTZ, Olam...). Le projet doit intégrer ces acquis pour proposer des outils ayant une réelle valeur ajoutée, la réflexion est en cours.</p> <p>1.2. Organisation des ateliers de formation</p> <p>3 Ateliers Paysans « Anacarde »</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organisation de 3 ateliers paysans sur la qualité de l'anacarde : 3 ateliers de 2 jours rassemblant environ 40 producteurs à chaque fois, organisés en avril 2009 à Toussiana, Péné, Kourignion. ▪ Organisation de session de restitution des formations au sein des OP (sessions organisées en juin 2009 et en novembre 2009).

1 Atelier Leaders Régional « Anacarde »

- Organisation d'un atelier de concertation régionale en septembre 2009, sous la responsabilité du Conseil Régional des Hauts Bassins. Le rapport de l'atelier a été diffusé aux participants. Il est disponible sur demande à Inades et Rongead.

1 Atelier Conseillers « Anacarde »

- Organisation d'un atelier de 3 jours à Bobo Dioulasso de 24 relais formateurs sur les techniques de productions de l'anacarde, en collaboration avec ICA et GTZ. En matière de transformation, la formation porte sur les normes de standards de qualité à rencontrer pour l'exportation.
- Formation semence « sésame » : 12 producteurs-semenciers formés au sein de l'UPPSEM (province du Mouhoun). Cette formation sera donnée aux autres OP ciblées en 2010.
- Formation technique de production « sésame » : 25 producteurs relais formés au sein de l'UPPSEM.

Remarque : concernant les formations techniques de production sésame, réalisées en partenariat avec les DRA, le projet a connu un retard par rapport aux prévisions. Seule 1 OP sur les 4 ciblées a reçu l'appui technique. Les raisons de ce retard sont diverses : phase de diagnostic/ identification plus longue que prévu, difficulté à identifier les bons partenaires, décalage par rapport à la phase de production du sésame. Ces activités sont en train d'être rattrapées.

2. Appui à la commercialisation des OP

L'identification des opérateurs de l'aval et un diagnostic des atouts/contraintes des systèmes de contractualisations proposés a été réalisé. Dans la filière anacarde, les principaux partenaires identifiés sont : ANA Trans, Sotria B, Gebana Afrique, Olam. Un partenariat est en cours de définition avec Gebana Afrique pour appuyer la commercialisation des OP sur les marchés Bio et Commerce Equitable.

Concernant la filière sésame, un travail d'analyse de l'aval de la filière et des exigences/contraintes des exportateurs a été réalisé sous forme de mémoire de fin d'étude d'une étudiante de l'Ecole Supérieure d'Agriculture d'Angers. Rapport disponible sur demande.

2.1. Formation à la maîtrise technique de la transformation agro-alimentaire

Remarque : En année 1 du projet, cette activité ne concerne que la filière anacarde. 3 Groupements de femmes ciblés par cette activité. Réalisation d'une formation in situ sur l'hygiène et la qualité lors de la transformation agroalimentaire (avril 2009). Diagnostic des besoins de formation des leaders en matière de gestion technico-commerciale.

2.2 Appui à la commercialisation

Recherche de débouchés, participation à des salons en Europe pour prospection (Nat Expo - Paris, Salon Européen du Commerce Equitable - Lyon). Identification des différents référentiels disponibles : ESR- Ecocert, Agriculture Bio, Commerce Equitable (FLO , BioEquitable).

	<p>3. Formations des conseillers agricoles</p> <p>Cf. 1.1.2. : Un atelier de formation des formateurs organisé. Programme de restitution : 1 formateurs organise 4 séances de restitution afin de toucher les 1000 ménages agricoles ciblés par le projet (1000 hommes, 1000 femmes). Cette activité est planifiée sur janvier/février 2010. Pour la filière sésame, l'activité est prévue en année 2, toutefois, des systèmes de conseil endogène financé par la filière au pu être identifié, ainsi que leurs besoins de formation.</p> <p>4. Favoriser une concertation multi-acteurs</p> <p>Filière Anacarde : Cf. 1.1.2. : Organisation d'un Atelier Régional les 4 et 5 Septembre 2009 à Bobo Dioulasso. Cet atelier a permis la mise en place d'un Comité Ad Hoc de la filière régionale piloté par la Chambre Régionale D'Agriculture en relation avec Conseil Régional. Le projet accompagne la mise en place du Comité. Le projet a également permis de représenter les acteurs de la filière des Hauts Bassins au niveau des instances de décisions nationales et des initiatives sous-régionales d'autres projets :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ participations aux concertations de l'ACA, ICA B/F (Initiative du Cajou Africain, Burkina Faso) : réunions à Ouaga, Banfora, Bobo ... ▪ participation à la conférence internationale de l'ACA (Septembre, Abidjan). ▪ Accord de partenariat avec FMS/ICDE sur l'accompagnement des producteurs des Hauts Bassins aux Bonnes Pratiques de Gestion. ▪ Accord de partenariat avec PDA/GTZ sur l'accompagnement de paysans formateurs sur la maîtrise de la qualité et l'amélioration de la productivité des vergers. ▪ Accord de partenariat avec INERA Banfora sur l'identification des techniques de greffage visant l'amélioration du matériel végétal. <p>Filière sésame : Un cadre de concertation national existant déjà, la problématique n'est pas la même pour la filière sésame. Le projet vise donc à renforcer la place des OP dans le processus et informer les producteurs à la base des discussions qui ont lieu dans ce cadre.</p>
<p>Main difficulties</p>	<p>Efficacité à ce jour</p> <p>Dans un contexte très favorable pour ces filières, des résultats ont été atteints notamment une amélioration des connaissances techniques des producteurs et des transformateurs. Le travail sur la commercialisation n'a pas encore débuté sur la filière sésame et les producteurs s'en plaignent car ils n'ont pas compris la logique de l'ensemble du projet. La qualité des services est bonne. L'encadrement existe surtout pour la filière anacarde mais sera développé dans la filière sésame. Les résultats dans la première filière ont bénéficié de fortes synergies avec l'Initiative pour le Cajou Africain. Dans la deuxième, des changements sur les techniques de semence sont observées sur le terrain. Dans le Nord, le projet semble moins avancé, mais il a choisit de focaliser ses efforts sur les zones les plus porteuses au démarrage et le sésame a souffert de parasites en 2009.</p> <p>Par ailleurs, les unités de transformation artisanales ont fonctionné à très faible capacité, car les producteurs ont préféré vendre à des acheteurs allochtones, avec de plus fortes capacités de financement. Les cibles de l'OS sont très axées sur l'augmentation des revenus locaux, qui peu ne pas être due à celle des rendements ou de la qualité. Accepter que les femmes soient reléguées au rôle de transformatrices et de travailleuses sur des cultures essentiellement vivrières empêche ce groupe de bénéficier suffisamment des résultats. Le projet s'adapte à des conditions très changeantes. Pour le cajou, il y a un véritable « boum », un moment opportun, avec l'arrivée dans la région des Hauts Bassins d'une initiative semi-privée qui a entraîné la construction d'une unité de transformation de 5000t.</p>

	<p>La question des débouchés est considérée, surtout pour les transformateurs artisanaux, performants mais ayant une faible capacité de financement. La bonne compréhension de la filière et des enjeux à déjouer devrait garantir la réalisation de l'OS. Des effets négatifs dus au projet ne sont pas attendus.</p> <p>Viabilité potentielle</p> <p>Un dispositif de suivi des résultats a été mis en place, prenant notamment en compte l'augmentation de revenus des producteurs et transformateurs liée à l'intervention. Les résultats ne sont pas encore disponibles. Pour le sésame, le développement d'une activité semencière et de ventes groupées semblent porteuses en termes d'amélioration des revenus.</p> <p>L'appui à l'organisation des producteurs (constitution d'unions locales et bientôt régionales) est un appui structurant.. Pour l'anacarde, il s'agit également de constituer à terme une interprofession (processus en cours). Elle pourrait alors mieux défendre les intérêts de l'anacarde du Burkina Faso, notamment au niveau du cadre de concertation de l'anacarde pour l'Afrique (Alliance Cajou Africain).</p> <p>Un impact économique est déjà perceptible au niveau des OG. Les bénéficiaires sont satisfaits d'avoir pu changer leur manière de cultiver – ces changements devraient donc s'avérer durables. Ils font part d'une augmentation significative de leur production (l'OP de Passakongo fait part d'un passage de 2 à 3 ou 4 sacs sur une même parcelle). Dans la transformation, la difficulté d'accès aux intrants rend les impacts moins évidents, même si les transformatrices rencontrées ont maintenant des notions qui leur permettent de savoir si la récolte leur permettra d'être rentables. L'accès au crédit par les transformateurs leur permettrait d'acheter la matière première et ainsi conserver la plus grande partie de la valeur ajoutée sur le territoire burkinabé. Ainsi, des facteurs externes comme la forte augmentation des prix internationaux peuvent compromettre l'impact du projet, si une solution n'est pas trouvée rapidement. C'est d'autant plus grave que la transformation concerne prioritairement les femmes.</p> <p>Pour le sésame, un nombre important de producteurs semble estimer qu'il constitue une alternative intéressante à la culture du coton. Un système de warrantage du sésame est en train d'être testé.</p> <p>Les impacts sociaux sont pour l'instant peu évidents.</p> <p>Les impacts environnementaux sont recherchés à travers la réduction de l'utilisation de pesticides chimiques et l'utilisation de fumure organique.</p> <p>La question du genre a été insuffisamment considérée. Il existe certes des contraintes liées à la structure foncière au Burkina, mais le projet contribue à renforcer ces inégalités, en donnant prioritairement accès aux hommes aux formations. Les responsables rencontrés sur place ont cependant fait part que des appuis sont apportés pour permettre une meilleure prise en compte du genre. Ex. Pour l'Anacarde, les paysans formateurs incluent des femmes (conseillères agricoles) dispensant des formations aux femmes, surtout en matière de transformation où elles sont fort impliquées ; pour le sésame, la production appartient à la femme et environ 45% des bénéficiaires des appuis sont des femmes.</p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget ▪ Contrat ▪ RONGEAD Annexe I - Description de l'action ▪ RONGEAD Annexe I - Cadre logique ▪ RONGEAD Annexe I - Plan de visibilité ▪ Annexe VI "Rapport narratif intermédiaire" (Interreport_1_fr_Rongead_DCINSA PVD_2008_149-561) ▪ MR-136069.01 ▪ PS-136069.01 ▪ Réponse DCE Ouaga_26.01.10

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Intégration des filières dans la mitigation au changement climatique, Analyse carbone sur la filière anacarde au Burkina Faso, Application de l'outil EX-ACT (Filière Anacarde et CC rapport GTZ FAO)▪ MN 551 |
|--|--|

Intervention Title	Programme d'Appui Financier à la Filière Coton (PAFFIC) au Burkina Faso BF-COT
Country / Region	Burkina Faso
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2008/19754 (CRIS); ▪ Contract number(s): FED/2008/019-754.
EC aid modality	Appui budgétaire sectoriel (ABS)
Intervention Start date & End date	Début : 06/11/2007; Fin: 2010
Budget	Engagé: 10.000.000 €. Modalité ABS avec 2 tranches fixes (tranche 1 : 8M€ ; tranche 2 : 2M€). Contracté: 10 000 000 € Déboursé: Tranche 1, décembre 2008 ; tranche 2 : avril 2009€
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): CE (et indirectement l'AFD pour le Fonds de Lissage lié à la stratégie de sortie de crise de la filière coton). ▪ Implementing agencies: Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances (MEF), Ordonnateur National du FED (et indirectement l'AFD pour le Fonds de Lissage lié à la stratégie de sortie de crise de la filière coton). ▪ Direct beneficiaries: Union Nationale des Producteurs de Coton (UNPCB) ▪ Final beneficiaries: Association Interprofessionnelle du Coton Burkinabé (AICB), Sociétés cotonnières privatisées, Producteurs de coton
Intervention Description	<p>De manière à assurer le financement de la campagne 2007-2008 et permettre l'achat et le paiement rapide de l'ensemble du coton graine produit, la définition et la mise en œuvre d'une stratégie ad hoc de renforcement de la filière se sont révélées d'une extrême urgence.</p> <p>Le PAFFIC vise à contribuer à la lutte contre la pauvreté en appuyant la filière coton, important vecteur de croissance économique en milieu rural. Il permet de financer la participation des producteurs à la recapitalisation des sociétés cotonnières. Il contribue à la stratégie de sortie de crise, adoptée par le Gouvernement et l'AICB, qui veut redresser financièrement les sociétés cotonnières et ramener la confiance du système bancaire national et international, prévoyant notamment la recapitalisation des sociétés cotonnières accompagnée de la mise en place de mécanismes de gestion du risque prix, comme le Fonds de lissage (FdL).</p> <p>La modalité financière du PAFFIC est un ABS de 10M€ réparti en deux tranches fixes.</p> <p>Le décaissement de la 1ère tranche fixe (8M€) fixe est soumis :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Au respect des conditions générales relatives à tout appui budgétaire, en accord avec l'accord de partenariat de Cotonou6 - Au respect de conditions spécifiques : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>L'adoption par le Gouvernement et par l'AICB de la stratégie de sortie de crise</i> 2. <i>L'inscription dans le budget de l'Etat (2007 ou loi rectificative) d'une contribution financière à la résolution de la crise financière de la filière</i> 3. <i>La décision des CA des sociétés cotonnières sur la recapitalisation de leur société avec une quote-part dans ces recapitalisations de l'UNPCB à hauteur d'au moins 10 millions euros</i> 4. <i>La publication du rapport annuel 2006 reprenant les données consolidées de la filière</i>

⁶ Plus particulièrement : (i) à la mise en œuvre d'un mécanisme de suivi du cadre macroéconomique par le FMI (cadre macroéconomique), (ii) à la poursuite satisfaisante de la mise en œuvre du CSLP et de son processus de suivi (stratégie de réduction de la pauvreté), et (iii) à l'appréciation satisfaisante de la dynamique de réformes et d'amélioration des finances publiques par la Commission et les partenaires du CGAB-CSLP (gestion des finances publiques).

	<p>Le décaissement de la 2ème tranche fixe (2M€) fixe est soumis à 2 conditions spécifiques:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Le versement par l'Etat Burkinabé en 2007 pour le compte de l'UNPCB, sous forme de don, d'au moins 10 millions d'euros au titre de la participation des producteurs de coton à la recapitalisation des sociétés cotonnières</i> 2. <i>La répartition de la totalité de ce financement entre les sociétés cotonnières qui auront décidé, au 31 décembre 2007, de procéder à leur recapitalisation. Cette répartition se fera au prorata de la moyenne du volume de coton graine réceptionné par chacune de ces sociétés cotonnières des 3 dernières campagnes</i>
<p>Programme Background & History</p>	<p>Le secteur coton burkinabé a connu un développement très important depuis 1994. Il concerne plus de 300.000 producteurs, touche directement plus de 3 millions de personnes, et contribue à hauteur de 60 à 70 % aux recettes d'exportation selon les années et à environ 5 % du PIB (15 % du PIB agricole). Il faut noter qu'en raison des difficultés qu'a connues la filière cotonnière, les exportations du coton (qui représentaient jusqu'en fin 2006 en moyenne 60% des exportations totales) ont baissé en 2007 de 18% en valeur, soit 1.5 point de PIB. De ce fait, les exportations du coton ne représentaient plus que 56.4% des exportations totales en 2007.</p> <p>Depuis 1999, le Gouvernement burkinabé a engagé un processus de privatisation de la filière, en cédant dans un premier temps aux producteurs 30% des actions qu'il détenait dans la société cotonnière d'Etat, la SOFITEX, et en cédant dans un second temps en 2004 les zones Centre et Est à 2 nouvelles sociétés cotonnières, FASOCOTON et la SOCOMA.</p> <p>Par le passé, la CE a largement participé au développement de la filière coton dans le cadre du mécanisme de stabilisation des exportations "STABEX", à travers des appuis directs à la SOFITEX et à l'UNPCB ainsi qu'aux groupements de producteurs de coton. La construction d'infrastructures villageoises et la réhabilitation des routes nationales RN1 et RN4 utilisées pour le transport du coton, en sont des exemples.</p> <p>Depuis la campagne 2004-2005, la filière coton est cependant confrontée à une crise financière sans précédent, due notamment à la forte dépréciation du dollar US par rapport à l'euro, à la baisse des prix du coton fibre sur les marchés internationaux et à la baisse de la compétitivité de la filière. Cette crise financière s'est d'abord traduite par un retard dans les achats et le paiement du coton graine de la campagne 2006-2007, ensuite par la difficulté de mobiliser les financements pour l'acquisition des intrants de la campagne 2007-2008. De manière à assurer le financement de la campagne 2007-2008 et permettre l'achat et le paiement rapide de l'ensemble du coton graine produit, la définition et la mise en œuvre d'une stratégie ad hoc de renforcement de la filière se sont révélées d'une extrême urgence.</p> <p>Le PAFFIC vise à contribuer à la lutte contre la pauvreté en appuyant la filière coton, important vecteur de croissance économique en milieu rural. Il permet de financer la participation des producteurs à la recapitalisation des sociétés cotonnières. Il contribue à la stratégie de sortie de crise, adoptée par le Gouvernement et l'AICB, qui veut redresser financièrement les sociétés cotonnières et ramener la confiance du système bancaire national et international, prévoyant notamment la recapitalisation des sociétés cotonnières accompagnée de la mise en place de mécanismes de gestion du risque prix, comme le Fonds de lissage (FdL).</p>
<p>Overall objectives</p>	<p>« Contribuer à la lutte contre la pauvreté en appuyant la filière coton, important vecteur de croissance économique en milieu rural » (NB. Pas de cadre logique fourni, <i>source : PAFFIC, rapport de mise en œuvre</i>)</p>

Specific objectives	« Appuyer la stratégie de sortie de crise de la filière cotonnière en finançant la participation des producteurs à la recapitalisation des sociétés cotonnières » (NB. Pas de cadre logique fourni, OS déduit des documents consultés).
Expected results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stratégie de sortie de crise adoptée par le Gouvernement et l'AICB impliquant la mise en place de mécanisme de gestion du risque prix du coton graine à travers un Fonds de Lissage (FdL) ▪ Recapitalisation des sociétés cotonnières avec une quote-part de l'UNPCB à hauteur de 10 millions € (NB. Pas de cadre logique fourni, résultats déduits des documents consultés)
Main Activities	NB. Pas de cadre logique fourni
Main achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stratégie de sortie de crise adoptée par le Gouvernement et l'AICB, mise en place du FdL ▪ Sociétés cotonnières recapitalisées y compris avec la quote-part de l'UNPCB de 10 millions € (via la subvention PAFFIC) ▪ Selon les responsables actuels de la DUE, le PAFFIC a été un appui ponctuel pour faire face à un problème de grave crise financière de la filière coton. Cet appui ponctuel a pris la forme d'un appui budgétaire sectoriel. Le coton était alors en première position dans les produits d'exportation, avant l'or. Le PAFFIC était lié à une sortie de crise du secteur cotonnier (stratégie de sortie de crise).
Main difficulties	Pas de difficultés particulières relevées dans les documents consultés, mis à part quelques retards dans le timing des résultats à atteindre.
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allocution du chargé d'affaires A.I. de la DCE au Burkina Faso, à la cérémonie officielle de signature des conventions de financement des programmes d'appui financier à la filière coton (PAFFIC) et d'appui à l'Ordonnateur National, 6 novembre 2007 (fichier « Discours_signature_CF_ON_PAFFIC_condense »). ▪ Aide mémoire conjoint MEF/PTFS de suivi du plan d'actions sectoriel triennal 2007 et perspectives 2008-2010 (N°1). Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances. Mai 2008 (fichier « Aide mémoire SRFP2 »). ▪ Note de dossier - Convention de financement – PAFFIC : décaissement de la 1^{ère} tranche fixe. Examen des conditions générales et spécifiques. DCE au Burkina Faso. Octobre 2008. (fichier « PAFFIC-note de dossier décaissement 1^{ère} tranche »). ▪ Note de dossier - Convention de financement – PAFFIC : décaissement de la tranche fixe 2007. Projet n°9ACPBK12 (CF n°9361/BK). DCE au Burkina Faso. Décembre 2008. (fichier « PAFFIC-accord siège 1^e tranche »). ▪ Appui Financier à la Filière Coton (PAFFIC) : décaissement de la deuxième tranche. Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances. Mars 2009. (fichier « N01365 – Appui financier à la filière coton PAFFIC-décaissement de la 2^{ème} tranche »). ▪ Rapport de mise en œuvre PAFFIC, DCE au Burkina Faso (fichier « PAFFIC Rapport de mise en œuvre CRIS 090630 maj avril 2010 »). ▪ Note de dossier - Convention de financement – PAFFIC : décaissement de la 2^{ème} tranche fixe. Examen des conditions spécifiques. DCE au Burkina Faso. Avril 2009. (fichier « PAFFIC-note de dossier décaissement 2^e tranche 090409 »). ▪ Sixième revue du Programme FRPC 2007-2010, 1^{er} janvier au 31 mars 2010 (fichier « Remis en séance du 30/03/2010 ((fichier « FRPC 6 AICB avril 2010 »)). ▪ Meeting note reference numbers: MN 567

Intervention Title	Programme d'Appui et de Soutien à l'Accord de Partenariat Economique (PASAPE) au Cameroun CM-PAS
Country / Region	Cameroun
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2007/018-833 (9 ACP CM 018) ▪ Contract numbers: 197199, 223319, 197200, 207713, 197201, 197202, 197198
EC aid modality	<i>Project approach</i>
Intervention Start date & End date	<p>Start date : 11/10/2007 (planned) ; 25/06/2008 (actual)</p> <p>End date :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mise en œuvre : 31/12/2011 – Avenant (2010) : 31/10/2012 ▪ Exécution : - Avenant (2010) : 31/10/2014
Budget	<p>Planned: €3.733.220 (CRIS extraction)</p> <p>Committed: € 5.500.00 (CRIS extraction) – Avenant (2010) : € 6.500.000</p> <p>Contracted: € 3.615.292 (CRIS extraction)</p> <p>Disbursed: € 1.503.502 (CRIS extraction)</p>
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bailleur: Commission européenne ▪ Maître d'œuvre: Comité National de Suivi et de Coordination des Négociations de l'APE (CNCSN APE) ▪ Bénéficiaires directs: Ministère de l'économie, de la planification et de l'aménagement du territoire (MINEPAT) (et administrations publiques impliquées dans le processus de négociation de l'APE) ▪ Bénéficiaires finaux: secteurs public et privé camerounais (en particulier les entreprises de production exportatrices et de prestations de services liés à l'industrie), le CNCSN APE, le comité de compétitivité et les organisations intermédiaires entre le gouvernement et le secteur privé. <p>NB : le projet comporte 3 composantes : la composante 1 et une partie de la composante 2 sont gérées par la Commission (procédures FED), tandis que la mise en œuvre d'une part importante de la composante 2 et de la totalité de la composante 3 est entièrement déléguée à l'Organisation des Nations Unies pour le Développement Industriel (ONUDI) (propres procédures) du fait de son expérience en matière de développement et de mise à niveau d'entreprises et de support au contrôle qualité de biens manufacturés ou de produits agro-industriels en pays MEDA et en Afrique de l'Ouest.</p>
Programme Background & History	<p>Ce projet s'inscrit dans une volonté de renforcement de l'économie camerounaise et de facilitation de son insertion dans l'économie régionale et mondiale, à travers la mise en œuvre viable de l'Accord de Partenariat Economique Union Européenne-Afrique Centrale (APE UE-AC). Il répond à une volonté du gouvernement camerounais et de la Commission européenne d'amplifier les efforts concernant la préparation de l'économie nationale à l'arrivée de l'APE. Les négociations de l'APE avec l'Afrique Centrale ont été officiellement lancées à Brazzaville le 4 Octobre 2003. Il a fait l'objet d'une étude de faisabilité (<i>étude dont les évaluateurs ne disposent pas</i>).</p> <p>Il s'inscrit dans le Document de Stratégie de Réduction de la Pauvreté (DSRP) dont deux axes majeurs concernent « le renforcement de la croissance par la diversification économique » et « la dynamisation du secteur privé comme moteur de la croissance » et dans le Programme National de Gouvernance 2005-2010 et en particulier son volet sur l'amélioration du climat des affaires.</p>
Overall objectives	« Contribuer au renforcement de la compétitivité de l'économie camerounaise et faciliter son insertion dans l'économie régionale et mondiale à travers la mise en œuvre viable de l'APE UE-CE. »
Specific objectives	« Soutenir le processus national de négociation, contribuer au suivi de l'APE et améliorer la compétitivité de l'économie camerounaise par un appui aux capacités de production, à la mise à niveau des entreprises et

	<i>au renforcement du système qualité. »</i>
Expected results	« 1. Les capacités nationales de négociation et de suivi de l'APE sont améliorées 2. la compétitivité, l'environnement des affaires et la mise à niveau des entreprises sont renforcées. 3. Les systèmes de normalisation et de qualité sont renforcés. »
Main Activities	<p>Le projet comporte 54 (sous)-activités, non répertoriées ci-dessous de façon exhaustive. Les sous-résultats visés et principales activités sont les suivants :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Renforcement des capacités de négociation du CNSCN APE au niveau régional et avec l'UE via des appuis en AT internationale au CNSCN, des formations (sur AT courte durée) des membres du CNSCN dans les domaines liés à l'APE, la réalisation d'études d'analyses complémentaires et d'outils techniques de négociation (AT court ou long terme), etc. 1.2 Formulation et mise en œuvre de stratégies pour le développement du commerce via appui sous forme d'AT au ministère du Commerce pour appuyer dans l'élaboration de la politique commerciale nationale et des appuis sous forme d'études et d'organisation d'ateliers. 1.3 Appui au suivi de l'APE amélioré : appui à la mise en place de l'organe de suivi de l'APE, appui à la mise en œuvre d'une stratégie de communication sur l'APE, etc. 2.1 Le cadre stratégique de soutien à la compétitivité et au développement du secteur privé est amélioré : études complémentaires et analyses pour la formulation d'une stratégie nationale de compétitivité, organisation d'ateliers, etc. 2.2 La compétitivité est renforcée par la mise à niveau des entreprises pilotes (mise en œuvre ONUDI) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.1 Les capacités institutionnelles nationales de mise à niveau sont renforcées 2.2.2 Les mécanismes de financement de la mise à niveau sont mis en place 2.2.3 Les capacités des centres techniques sont renforcées (diagnostic et appui pour le renforcement des centres techniques agro-alimentaires) 2.2.4 Le programme pilote d'appui pour la mise à niveau des entreprises des secteurs prioritaires est élaboré et mis en œuvre (pour 15 entreprises) 2.3 Les services aux entreprises sont améliorés (mise en œuvre ONUDI pour une part) 2.4 L'environnement des affaires est amélioré par le renforcement du dialogue public-privé et la mise en place du dialogue entre opérateurs économiques camerounais et européens présents au Cameroun. 3.1 Les opérateurs économiques et les consommateurs sont sensibilisés et l'information mise à leur disposition (séminaires de sensibilisation et diffusion de supports médiatiques) 3.2 Les entreprises camerounaises sont accompagnées à la certification (formations, séminaires, appui à la mise en place de système de management et de la qualité pour 13 entreprises) 3.3 Les systèmes de normalisation, la réglementation et la métrologie légale sont développés 3.4 Accompagnement des laboratoires à l'accréditation
Main achievements	<p>Il est important de noter que pour les composantes 2 et 3, principalement mises en œuvre par l'ONUDI, il n'existe pas de rapportage. L'évaluation à mi-parcours a notamment collecté des éléments sur la composante 1 (mise en œuvre par la Commission). Cela contraint l'analyse sur l'ensemble du programme.</p> <p>L'évaluation à mi-parcours note que le programme souffre globalement d'un faible taux d'exécution des activités (voir ci-dessous). Aucun résultat escompté n'est atteint au</p>

	<p>moment de l'évaluation à mi-parcours.</p> <p>Quelques activités ont été réalisées dans le cadre du devis-programme 1 :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organisation d'un séminaire de formation ▪ Conduite d'une étude locale sur le diagnostic de la compétitivité nationale ▪ Conduite d'une étude d'appui à l'élaboration de la stratégie nationale de compétitivité ▪ Amélioration du site web du CNSCN-APE
Main difficultés	<p>Il est important de noter que pour les composantes 2 et 3, principalement mises en œuvre par l'ONUDI, il n'existe pas de rapportage au niveau de l'UE. L'évaluation à mi-parcours a notamment collecté des éléments sur la composante 1 (mise en œuvre par la Commission). Cela contraint l'analyse sur l'ensemble du programme.</p> <p>L'évaluation à mi-parcours note les difficultés suivantes:</p> <p><u>Conception du programme:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Association dans un même programme d'objectifs et de résultats de natures très différentes (négociations APE / mise à niveau et normalisation) en introduisant une mixité du mode opératoire (CE/ONUDI) qui elle-même comporte des risques qui n'ont pas été maîtrisés ; ▪ Ampleur des résultats escomptés, des activités du programme et des acteurs a instauré des attentes trop élevées et nécessite des moyens de coordination importants non disponibles ; ▪ Le nombre d'entreprises visées par le programme est réducteur de son ambition ; ▪ Ambiguïté dans le rôle de l'AT long terme : recrutement envisagé pour appuyer le CNSCN-APE dans les négociations du commerce international vs rôle de coordination du PASAPE et de suivi de l'avancement des activités. <p><u>Organisation et exécution du projet :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Un comité de pilotage (présidé par le MINEPAT) est venu se superposer au CNSCN-APE chargé de la maîtrise d'ouvrage + instauration d'un sous-comité technique en 2009 sur base des recommandations de l'ONUDI. Cela implique qu'environ 80 personnes sont mobilisées autour du PASAPE. Cela conduit à une dispersion de l'information ▪ La mixité du mode opératoire : (i) volet FED pour la composante 1 et quelques autres activités de la composante 2, (ii) volet ONUDI pour les composantes 2 et 3 : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Double rapportage sans consolidation par la maîtrise d'œuvre et en l'absence de ressources humaines dédiées. ▪ Faiblesse opérationnelle des rapports d'activités : rapportage sur la composante 1 mais pas de rapportage ONUDI ▪ Absence d'un dispositif de suivi des indicateurs de résultats ▪ Niveau d'exécution opérationnelle du programme est très faible en raison des nombreux retards dans la mobilisation des ressources humaines et logistiques : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Décaissement CE en faveur de l'ONUDI forfaitaire ; justification comptable qui intervient en fin de projet ; - Décaissements effectués en faveur de la régie correspondent à des coûts de fonctionnement/d'investissement ; - Absence d'AT long-terme : procédures infructueuses et faisant l'objet de controverses entre la CE et les autorités camerounaises ; 3^{ème} tentative de recrutement en cours. ▪ Absence d'une stratégie de communication du PASAPE (en cours de formulation au moment de l'évaluation à mi-parcours) ▪ Difficulté d'instaurer une large visibilité du programme (composante 1) dans un contexte de négociation politique

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quasi-exécution de 3 projets : PASAPE-FED et 2 projets ONUDI
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commission européenne, Proposition de financement n°9 ACP CM 18 ▪ Commission européenne, Fiche d'identification, 27 Juin 2006 ▪ Convention de financement entre la Commission européenne et la République du Cameroun, Programme d'appui et de soutien à l'accord de partenariat économique entre l'Union européenne et l'Afrique centrale (PASAPE), 9^{ème} FED, 11 Octobre 2007 ▪ République du Cameroun, Avenant à la convention de contribution de l'ONUDI, 16 décembre 2008 ▪ République du Cameroun, Requête pour un avenant à la convention de financement, 18 février 2010 ▪ Commission européenne, PASAPE, avenant n°1 à la convention de financement n°749/CM, 12 Juillet 2010 ▪ Commission européenne, Monitoring report, 17 Avril 2009 ▪ Commission européenne, Monitoring report, 16 Avril 2010 ▪ Transtec, Mission d'évaluation à mi-parcours du programme d'appui et de soutien à l'accord de partenariat économique (PASAPE) – 9 ACP CM 18, Juin 2010 ▪ Meeting Notes 408 & 938

Intervention Title	Renforcement de l'autonomie et de l'auto-promotion des organisations paysannes pour le développement socioéconomique des communes de Garoua Rurale et de Gashiga au Cameroun CM-ONG
Country / Region	Cameroun, communes de Garoua Rurale et de Gashiga
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: ONG-PVD/2005/017-215 ▪ Contract number(s): n°118626
EC aid modality	Gestion centralisée indirect et gestion décentralisée
Intervention Start date & End date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Date de démarrage: 01/01/2007 ▪ Date finale : 31/12/2009
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget total du programme d'action : 430.572 € (date ?) ▪ Contracté: pas d'infos ▪ Déboursé : pas d'infos
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): CE et Centro Orientamento Educativo – C.O.E. Italie ▪ Partenaire local : Archidiocèse de Garoua ▪ Groupe(s) cible(s) : 201 paysans de 25 GIC (Groupes d'Initiative Commune) des communes de Garoua rurale et de Gashiga; près de 200 paysans de 25 groupes informels des communes de Garoua rurale et de Gashiga ▪ Bénéficiaires finaux : Les familles des paysan(ne)s des GIC et des groupes informels (2800 personnes) ; la population des Communes de Garoua Rurale et de Gashiga (60500 personnes).
Intervention Description	<p>L'action se caractérise comme une action qui:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ reconnaît l'importance de la société civile, des organisations des communautés locales, dans le cas spécifique des GIC (Groupes d'Initiative Commune), dans la genèse des processus de développement durable et qui, pour cela, entend les soutenir; ▪ reconnaît les conditions de pauvreté extrême sous toutes ses formes (sociale, économique, sanitaire, culturelle, etc.) des populations rurales de la zone d'intervention et qui, par le renforcement des GIC, entend donner une réponse à leurs besoins fondamentaux et renverser la tendance de la pauvreté. En plus une approche méthodologique participative visant à maximiser l'implication des groupes cibles dans la mise en œuvre de l'action et une perspective stratégique de genre, transversale à toute l'intervention, promouvant l'égalité des opportunités des sexes sont des éléments permettant d'atteindre les objectifs de l'action de façon plus efficace et durable.
Programme Background & History	Le projet d'appui à l'autonomie et de l'auto-promotion des organisations paysannes pour le développement socioéconomique financé par l'UE des communes de Garoua Rurale et de Gashiga (Barndaké) commencé le 1 ^{er} janvier 2007 par le Centre de Formation Agropastorale de l'Archidiocèse de Garoua se proposait de consolider les acquis de la phase pilote dans la période contractualisée 2007-2009.
Overall objectives	Contribuer à la réduction de la pauvreté et au développement social, économique et humain dans les communes de Garoua Rurale et de Gashiga
Specific objectives	Renforcer l'autonomie opérationnelle et économique, la représentativité et la capacité d'auto-promotion et de plaidoyer des organisations paysannes des communes de Garoua Rurale et de Gashiga
Expected results	6 animateurs en mesure de s'occuper de la formation et de l'accompagnement des GIC; 1 bibliothèque organisée et qui fonctionne; 3 manuels didactiques publiés; 50 GIC des communes de Garoua Rurale et de Gashiga renforcés dans leurs capacités; 25 nouveaux GIC constitués; 1 fédération des GIC constituée; production agropastorale des GIC augmentée; vente des productions des GIC améliorée; 1 Cahier avec les conclusions de l'évaluation finale du projet publié.
Main Activities	Former des animateurs pour l'accompagnement des GIC ; créer une bibliothèque ; réaliser

	des manuels didactiques, créer un stock de moyens de production, créer des magasins de stockage ; accompagner des groupes informels de paysans à l'organisation en GIC ; suivre les GIC dans la constitution d'une Fédération ; former les paysans des GIC à l'organisation et à la gestion ; aux techniques culturelles, à la création de micro-projets productifs, aux stratégies de commercialisation ; réaliser des actions de soutien à l'activité productive des GIC ; réaliser un Cahier avec les conclusions de l'évaluation finale du projet
Main achievements	<p>La pertinence de l'action du projet a opéré des degrés divers des changements sociaux, économiques et environnementaux. Au plan social, la floraison des GIC a renforcé l'élan de solidarité, d'entraide, d'union. Les membres du GIC ont le réel sentiment désormais d'être une entité homogène qui partage des aspirations communes. Les barrières ethniques sont battues en brèche par le sentiment d'appartenir à une communauté institutionnelle.</p> <p>Le revenu familial décrit depuis la mise en œuvre du projet une courbe ascendante. Les techniques culturales ont permis aux organisations paysannes d'optimiser la productivité. La pratique de semis en ligne et de sarclage de l'avis eux-mêmes des paysans ont augmenté la productivité. L'amélioration de la production et la maîtrise des stratégies de commercialisation permettent aux paysans de réaliser des bénéfices conséquents et ainsi de disposer des ressources financières leur permettant d'accéder aux soins de santé primaires, d'améliorer qualitativement leur régime alimentaire et d'assurer la scolarité de leurs enfants. Il importe cependant d'amplifier ces changements, car les besoins sont loin d'être couverts en totalité, mais en référence à la situation initiale, il est fondé de conclure à des mutations sociales importantes.</p> <p>Au plan économique, l'action du projet qui visait à former les organisations paysannes aux techniques culturales, à les former sur les circuits de commercialisation a permis aux paysans de mieux vendre leurs produits. Le bénéfice généré par cette option permet aux membres des GIC d'initier des opérations de cotisation et d'épargne. Le train de vie des paysans a amorcé un saut qualitatif. Sur l'environnement, l'intensification des activités d'agriculture, d'élevage et de financement de microprojets, a détourné ceux des paysans qui tiraient l'essentiel de leurs économies de la coupe et la vente des bois de chauffe.</p>
Main difficulties	Non renseignées dans les docs consultés
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget : annexe III ▪ Contrat de subvention ▪ Cadre logique ▪ Description de l'Action : Annexe I ▪ 2ème rapport intermédiaire technique et financier : année 2008 ▪ Rapport narratif final : année 2009

Intervention Title	Integrated Development Programme for the Caribbean Rum Sector CR-RUM										
Country / Region	Caribbean region										
Commission Ref.	FED/2001/015-561										
EC aid modality	Programme financed from the EDF VIII regional programme										
Intervention Start date & End date	Start date: signature of the Financing Agreement in January 2002, but actual implementation started in December 2002 End date: June 2010 (following a 3-year extension)										
Budget	Planned: €70.0 million Committed: €70.0 million Contracted: €66.6 million (as of January 2010) Disbursed: €46.1 million (as of January 2010)										
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor: European Commission ▪ Implementing agencies: The Secretary General of Cariforum was designated Regional Authorizing Officer. He entrusted the West Indies Rum and Spirits Producers Association (WIRSPA) with the implementation of the programme. ▪ Direct beneficiaries: Rum producing companies ▪ Final beneficiaries: Rum producing companies 										
Intervention Description	<p>The Rum programme had four elements with the following financial allocations:</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">▪ Cost Share Grant Scheme</td> <td style="text-align: right;">€46.60m</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">▪ Rum Marque Programme</td> <td style="text-align: right;">€16.90m</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">▪ Institutional Support WIRSPA</td> <td style="text-align: right;">€ 3.45m</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">▪ Technical Assistance</td> <td style="text-align: right;">€ 2.10m</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">▪ Monitoring and evaluation</td> <td style="text-align: right;">€ 0.95m</td> </tr> </table> <p>The Cost Sharing Grant Scheme (CSGS) was meant to subsidise investments by the rum industry in four domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modernisation and Capital Investment ▪ Waste Treatment & Environment. Protection ▪ Distribution & Marketing ▪ Business Development Services (business plans, feasibility studies, etc.) <p>A notable feature of the CSGS was that once projects submitted for funding had been approved, the company responsible for the application had to pre-finance the activities and then was reimbursed an agreed percentage (65% for waste management and 50% for other investments) upon submission of proof that the activities had taken place and relevant supporting documentation.</p> <p>The Rum <i>Marque</i> Programme aimed to support the establishment and use of an ‘Authentic Caribbean Rum’ <i>Marque</i>, which would provide the umbrella for the marketing and promotion activities of affiliated rum producers. The intention of this element of the programme was to expand the value and volume of branded high quality rum sales in the target markets. This component of the overall programme was implemented under conventional EDF procedures.</p> <p>These two elements were seen as directly complementary.</p> <p>The third and fourth elements of the programme consisted of institutional support to the WIRSPA and technical assistance support.</p>	▪ Cost Share Grant Scheme	€46.60m	▪ Rum Marque Programme	€16.90m	▪ Institutional Support WIRSPA	€ 3.45m	▪ Technical Assistance	€ 2.10m	▪ Monitoring and evaluation	€ 0.95m
▪ Cost Share Grant Scheme	€46.60m										
▪ Rum Marque Programme	€16.90m										
▪ Institutional Support WIRSPA	€ 3.45m										
▪ Technical Assistance	€ 2.10m										
▪ Monitoring and evaluation	€ 0.95m										
Programme Background &	The origins of the Integrated Development Programme for the Caribbean Rum Sector lie in the unilateral decision of the EU to liberalise access to the EU rum market under an										

History	EU/US agreement concluded in 1996. Under this agreement, the trade preferences for traditional African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) rum (duty free export quotas) were <i>de facto</i> eroded. Being aware of the challenges this unilateral action would give rise to, Caribbean governments gave voice to the concerns of rum producers and opened the dialogue with the EU in order to find an appropriate policy response. With the start of the negotiations on a successor agreement to the Lomé convention, the Caribbean rum industry intensified its lobbying efforts for the inclusion of specific provisions aimed at supporting the rum sector. This resulted in December 1999 in the joint ACP-EU declaration on rum, which included the EU commitment to finance 'an integrated sector specific programme for the development of ACP exporters of rum'.
Overall objectives	Enhance the competitiveness of the rum sector and ensure the transition of Caribbean rum producers from commodity to branded products
Specific objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plant modernisation ▪ Waste treatment ▪ Product distribution and marketing to increase sales of branded rum
Expected results	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishment of an adequately financed and manned producers association 2. WIRSPA distilleries modernized and affluent disposal systems installed 3. Distribution and marketing strategy for the promotion of the Caribbean rum sector identified and implemented
Main Activities	<p>In relation with Result 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Manning of WIRSPA in line with its new mandate and adequate premises ▪ Provision of services to members (training, information dissemination, marque management, support to distribution and marketing arrangements, technical assistance, etc.) <p>In relation with Result 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plant up-gradation ▪ Training of technical and managerial staff ▪ ISO 9002-14001 certification ▪ Study and installation of waste treatment systems <p>In relation with Result 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development of a rum marque ▪ Provision of marketing intelligence ▪ Provision of sales/promotion personnel. There should be a Caribbean Rum marque manager in key export countries (Germany, Italy, Spain, UK) ▪ Time of promotion personnel could be hired by brand owners from money credited to them for sales/marketing in EU ▪ Provision of promotional support ▪ Provision of market visitation funds
Main achievements	<p>The programme evaluation states that “according to all parties involved the programme has had a major impact on enhancing the long-term competitiveness of the Caribbean rum industry while improving compliance with environmental standards”.</p> <p>The programme met the goals of the revised Logframe and facilitated industrial restructuring of the sector by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transforming WIRSPA into a more effective and relevant industry association (it gained 6 new members and represents 13 of the 15 Caribbean ACP countries) ▪ Enhancing rum production capacity and efficiency to meet future demand (The Caribbean Rum Sector is composed of 32 companies of which 25 benefited from the programme and 21 received assistance for investments in modernisation and new facilities) ▪ Reducing negative environmental impact directly and indirectly though improved

	<p>waste treatment processes and energy-saving co-generation plants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facilitating the transition from bulk commodity export to branded, value-added rums, including through the design and promotion of the Caribbean Rum Marque. <p>This positive assessment of the programme effectiveness is contradicted by ComExt statistics. They reveal that Caribbean rum exports to the EU increased by nearly 70% between 2000-2002 and 2007-2009. But this development is entirely due to an extremely strong increase (172.0%) of rum exports from Trinidad and Tobago. Excluding T&T, Caribbean rum exports to the EU have remained stable. Furthermore T&T rum is sold at a very low and stagnating price.</p>
Main difficulties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The legitimacy of using EDF funds to support commercial companies (and furthermore companies producing alcohol) was strongly questioned in Brussels. ▪ Reimbursement procedures to be followed under EDF rules provoked delays in the implementation of the Cost Sharing Grant Scheme. ▪ The Marque design was finalised in March 2008, 44 months behind schedule, leaving only two years for the marketing campaign ▪ Not all companies make use of the Marque in their marketing activity ▪ The programme did not integrate related industries such as Caribbean tourism or sugar ▪ While major resources were dedicated to foreign technical assistance nothing was done to develop local expertise
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrated Development Programme for the Caribbean Rum Sector, Financing Agreement and Technical and Administrative Provisions for Implementation ▪ Final Evaluation of the Development Programme for the Caribbean Rum Sector, Draft report ▪ Braun-Munzinger, C. & Goodison, P., Trade and Production Adjustments in ACP Countries, Lessons from the Caribbean Rum Programme

Intervention Title	Support to the competitiveness of the rice sector in the Caribbean CR-RIC
Country / Region	Caribbean region
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: 9 ACP RPR 006 (Former system) ; FED/2003/016-291 (includes 30 different contracts)
EC aid modality	Project approach
Intervention Start date & End date	Start date: 12 November 2003 End date: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operational phase: 30 September 2011 (initial: 30 September 2008) ▪ Closure phase: 30 September 2013 (initial: 30 September 2010) Following Addendum n°1 of 25 October 2006 which extended the duration of the programme to allow repayments of the financing facility to CARIFORUM
Budget	Committed: €24m (FA) Allocated: €22,373,621 (CRIS extraction in 2010) Contracted: €22,048,190 (CRIS extraction in 2010) Paid: €21,331,714 (CRIS extraction in 2010)
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor: European Commission / Delegation in charge: Guyana ▪ Implementing agencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional coordination office established within the Caribbean Rice Association for the regional sub-programme; - Ministries of Agriculture of Guyana and Suriname for national programmes ▪ Direct beneficiaries: Caribbean Forum of the ACP States, represented by the Secretary General of the Cariforum, Regional Authorising Officer ▪ Final beneficiaries: State and non-State agents (farmers, millers and exporters) involved in the rice sector
Programme Background & History	<p>In recognition of the loss of trade preferences enjoyed by ACP rice exporters in the EU market due to result from liberation measures under the Cotonou Agreement, the EC issued a joint declaration on Rice (Art. 24 of the Cotonou Agreement) which states its “commitment to enhance the competitiveness and efficiency of the ACP rice sector in order to maintain a viable and sustainable rice industry”. This programme is directly enshrined in the spirit of this joint declaration.</p> <p>During the identification phase of the programme, a diagnostic study of the Caribbean rice industry (2001) followed by a feasibility study (2003) have been carried out. The diagnostic study analysed the rice industry in Guyana, Trinidad & Tobago, Jamaica, Belize, Dominican Republic and Suriname (production, milling, trade, services, policy framework), highlighted the main constraints and proposed recommendations. The feasibility study (3 volumes) proposed three action plans: one for Guyana, one for Suriname and one for the region. It includes in each volume the trends of the rice industry, the assessment of the constraints, and a proposed action plan which includes details on the proposed intervention (objectives, components, budget, organisation). The financing agreement has then been signed in November 2003.</p>
Overall objectives	<i>“To develop the competitiveness of the Caribbean ACP rice industry.”</i>
Specific objectives	<i>“To increase the efficiency and sustainability of the rice industry in Guyana and Suriname.”</i>
Expected results	<i>“Guyana and Suriname</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>National rice policy and strategies adopted by the Governments of Guyana and Suriname</i> ▪ <i>Water management improved in both countries</i> ▪ <i>Performing millers identified and supported in the preparation of financial support requests</i> ▪ <i>Performing millers trained in milling operation and maintenance</i> ▪ <i>Research activities oriented to the private sector identified and implemented</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Producers, millers and exporters integrated into effective and sustainable associations aiming the general benefit of rice operators</i> ▪ <i>Private sector benefiting from working capital</i> <p>Regional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Programme activities properly coordinated and monitored</i> ▪ <i>Market expanded through commercial research, promotion and exchanges</i> ▪ <i>Integrated marketing information and intelligence available and disseminated”</i>
Main Activities	<p>“Guyana and Suriname</p> <p>1. <i>Technical assistance, expertise and training</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Support to the State and non-State actors in setting-up a National Strategy with clarification of the role of the stakeholders, national long-term investment plans, capital requirements and most appropriate financial instruments, research and extension services</i> ▪ <i>Provide expertise to analyse the needs of millers, their viability, technology endowment and financial situation and advice them on access to credit</i> ▪ <i>Promotion of horizontal collaboration and vertical integration of producers, millers and farmers through expertise and training</i> <p>2. <i>Water management</i> <i>Rehabilitation of primary canals and equipment for maintenance</i></p> <p>3. <i>Research and extension</i> <i>Provide funds to proposals aimed at improved production techniques</i></p> <p>4. <i>Financial Facility</i> <i>Provide funds for the private sector after a clear delineation of the needs (study)</i></p> <p>Regional</p> <p>1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>TA support for overall coordination and monitoring</i> ▪ <i>Support to market promotion and expansion</i> ▪ <i>Rice marketing intelligence</i> <p>2. <i>Identification, analysis and decision on research and extension activities</i></p> <p>3. <i>Evaluation</i></p> <p>4. <i>Audit”</i></p>
Main achievements	<p>The final evaluation presents a rather critical assessment of the results attained by this programme. It highlights only a few positive results.</p> <p>Per main component, the final evaluation notes:</p> <p><u>Technical assistance (including training):</u> Positive results achieved for technical aspects regarding rice production, processing and marketing. In particular, successful training has been delivered to millers, to banking staff in the context of the Financial Facility and to farmers supported by the PMU.</p> <p><u>Research and Extension</u> This component mainly focused on (i) the production of basic, certified seeds out of good lines, (ii) the establishment of cooperatives to produce and label the seeds, (iii) the introduction of Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) in fields and Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) in the mills and on (iv) the investigation of innovative products out of rice biomass. As a result, seed production has been developed and farmers benefited from a better access to seeds.</p> <p><u>Water management</u></p>

	<p>The infrastructure component registered good results in Guyana (Dawa Pump) Suriname: institutional developments: Water Users Associations have been established as a result of the programme.</p> <p><u>Financial Facility</u> The capacity of the bank loan staff has been improved particularly in Suriname.</p>
Main difficulties	<p>The final evaluation notes that the design was overambitious. Indeed, the LF established OVI's such as rice exports, yields and area cultivated. However, the project was too small to have an impact on more than a small part of the industry. There is also an attribution problem: price fluctuations influence these OVI's and it is difficult to attribute specific evolutions to the programme only. The impact of the programme in improving the industry's performance is hard to estimate.</p> <p>Per main component, the final evaluation notes:</p> <p><u>Marketing component (regional sub-programme)</u> Suffered from a poor design and unrealistic performance targets. It raised awareness of the industry but benefits in terms of enhanced export marketing capacity have not been registered.</p> <p><u>Technical assistance (including training)</u> Suffered from delays during implementation because of inflexible and cumbersome procedures and from confusion as to its purposes (<i>"lack of clear definition on the FA of the context in which national rice strategies were to be developed"</i>). National sector policies (e.g Drainage and Irrigation in Guyana) and strategies for both countries have not been developed due to a lack of commitment/ownership on the part of the beneficiary governments.</p> <p><u>Research and Extension</u> Due to time and budget limitations, the objective to achieve a sustainable seed industry was not fully realised. Additionally, the actual quantitative impact of increased use of quality seed on milling yields is unclear. Seed and paddy yields increased slightly but not as substantially as expected and possible.</p> <p><u>Water management</u> The infrastructure component in Suriname suffered from engineering design failures in relation to the amount of resources available. Institutional improvements have been limited in both countries.</p> <p><u>Financial Facility</u> The relevance has been questioned: while affordable credit for producers is necessary for a viable rice sector, credit could not be accessible to most farmers given the high risks involved and limited collateral. Moreover, it had no chance to achieve sustained impact because of the absence of complementary support.</p> <p>Coordination with other donors has been reported as not having been a major point of attention.</p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financing Agreement between the European Commission and the Caribbean Forum of ACP States, Support to the Competitiveness of the rice sector in the Caribbean, November 2003 ▪ Addendum n°1 to the Financing Agreement n°9052/REG, 25 October 2006 ▪ Agrotec Spa, Diagnostic Study of the CARIFORUM rice industry, 2001 ▪ Agrotec Spa, Feasibility study of the CARIFORUM rice industry, 2003 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guyana National Action Plan - Suriname National Action Plan - Regional Action Plan ▪ SOGES Spa, End of programme evaluation of the programme: Support to the

	<p>Competitiveness of the rice sector in the Caribbean, Final Report, Draft, 11 November 2009</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ European Commission, Monitoring Reports dated 05/12/2005, 02/11/2006 and 04/01/2008▪ European Commission, Project Synopsis▪ European Commission, Response Sheets 30/11/2005▪ MN 700
--	--

Intervention Title	Coffee Improvement Programme IV (CIP IV) in Ethiopia ET-CIP
Country / Region	Ethiopia
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2001/015-643 ▪ Contract number(s): n°6500/ET
EC aid modality	Project approach
Intervention Start date & End date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Start date : 01/07/2002 ▪ End date planned : 30/06/2008 ▪ End date likely : 31/12/2009
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planned: 24.140.000 € (31/08/2008) ▪ Primary commitment (EC funding) : 15.000.000 € (31/08/2008) ▪ Secondary commitment (funds contracted of EC contribution) : 11.041.000 € (31/08/2008) ▪ Other funding (government and/or other donors) : 9.140.000 € (31/08/2008) ▪ Total EC funds disbursed : 7.023.000 € (31/08/2008) <p>Nevertheless, the situation known at the date (NB. not filled) of the completion report indicates an overall budget implementation rate of 51%.</p>
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission (15.000.000 €), Government (7.784.270 €) and farmers (1.364.540 €) <p>The beneficiaries and parties involved in the sector and their interests include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Coffee Farmers</u> These number around 1.3 million. Most are men. Family labour is most involved in the harvesting of the crop. Coffee farmers are particularly exposed to price changes by the volatility of the crop in the world market. For most of these people coffee represents their main source of cash income, and is an important part of their farming system. ▪ <u>Coffee Labourers and Workers</u> Coffee generates a considerable number of jobs on farm, at the up-country processing plants, and in the mills in Addis Ababa. Most of the agro processing employees are women. As with the farmers, coffee represents an important source of income for them; other opportunities for work are extremely limited. ▪ <u>Up-Country Coffee Buyers and Processors</u> This role is increasingly being played by the private sector, who put their own assets as collateral to the financial institutions when borrowing money for construction of processing facilities. They are exposed to risk in the present marketing system, because of price changes occurring between purchases of the crop from farmers to sale at auction. At present coffee processors cannot also be coffee exporters. ▪ <u>The Coffee and Tea Quality Control and Liquoring Unit</u> The Unit is an organ of Government, administratively part of CTA, and is located at the Central Market in Addis Ababa. It is responsible for liquoring (classifying by taste and appearance) the crop as it arrives for auction, and also to give clearance to exporters prior to export. ▪ <u>The Coffee Exporters</u> Exporters are responsible for exporting the crop to foreign buyers. However, none of the coffee exporting businesses can be officially owned by foreign buyers. The exporters too are exposed to risk because of the delays between buying at auction and selling, and the lack of a financial system, which allows hedging and forward selling. ▪ <u>The CTA</u> This is the Authority responsible for running the sector and also regulating its internal operations. It has seen its powers diminished over the years. It still has regulatory and statistics gathering functions. Its relations with an increasingly

	<p>important private sector need to be redefined as well as the extent to which it exercises its role as regulator;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Regional Governments and their Bureaux</u> The Regions principally concerned with coffee are Oromiya and Southern (i.e. SNNP) Regions. They have been responsible for implementing the extension and other on-farm aspects relating to coffee. However, they suffer from a large workforce and a weak budgetary base - the recent CIPm evaluation was highly critical of extension's effectiveness. ▪ <u>The Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organisation</u> The Organisation's role is primarily in selecting disease resistant varieties, establishing the national coffee collection, and protecting the genetic resource base of the crop. The organization's performance for the last 20+ years has been mediocre. ▪ <u>The National Bank of Ethiopia (NBE)</u> NBE is responsible inter alia for the country's foreign exchange flows, including those generated by coffee. One instrument used for the sector is the Coffee Price Differential Setting (Differential) Committee, which sets minimum export differentials for different coffees. It was the conclusion of the CIP III Evaluation that the actions of the Committee have resulted in delays in selling coffee. ▪ <u>The Financial Institutions</u> The financial institutions have loaned funds to the sub sector's main actors. The lenders are obviously keen to protect their loans and ensure their repayment. As a major sub sector of the economy, coffee is an important area of lending for this group; ▪ <u>Other Beneficiaries</u> These include transport companies, forwarders, traders and goods and service providers to participants in the sub sector. They are especially affected in the countryside by downturns in coffee activity.
<p>Intervention Description</p>	<p>The Coffee Improvement Project (CIP IV) was designed to improve the standard of living of the smallholder producers in Ethiopia's five coffee growing regions, through the enhancement of coffee earning potential.</p> <p><u>Project Purpose</u></p> <p>It was recognised in the problem analysis that there are areas where significant increases in incomes could occur. Coffee extension services have let the farmer down and as a result agronomic practices are inadequate; changes in agricultural practices, which are significant in technique but not in time, would give substantial increases in yields. Quality improvements were observed in the recent evaluation, but rigidities in the marketing system do not allow for optimum prices to be paid. Finally, the non-availability in most of the coffee growing areas of suitable Coffee Berries Disease (CBD) resistant land races again depresses farm gate prices since the local quality and characteristics of coffee are being diluted by non premium cultivars, thereby reducing the differential premium paid. Thus, the means of assisting in achieving the improved standards of living in the Overall Objective are identified in the LF through the Project Purpose of « realizing the earning potential of coffee smallholders ».</p>
<p>Programme Background & History</p>	<p>CIP IV was the fourth phase of EU-supported Coffee Improvement Programme commenced in 1997, more than 30 years ago. Compared with the previous phases CIP IV was characterized by a much larger geographic area, a wider range of activities and a significant lower budget: € 15 millions granted by EU.</p> <p><u>Origins and Preparation of the Project</u></p> <p>The formulation of this Project followed the evaluation of the 'Project for the Improvement of Coffee Production in the Peasant Sector (CIP III)' between the European Union (then Community) and the Government of Ethiopia carried out in late 2000. That</p>

	<p>Project was originally approved in August 1989 and closed in June 2000. It followed two earlier CIPs, which had been implemented between 1976 and 1988. The primary aim of all three had been to increase incomes of coffee farmers in the 18 (originally 15) coffee growing areas (woredas) through coffee extension activities, improved on-farm coffee practices, supply of Coffee Berry Disease (CBD) resistant varieties, and promotion of food crops in the farming systems.</p> <p>It is in the context of the end of CIP III that the Coffee Support Project has been formulated and a Formulation Report prepared (dated April 2001). The objectives are to "identify a new project for a further phase of assistance to the coffee sector".</p>
Overall objectives	The overall objective was to improve standards of living in the growing areas. Coffee yields and quality were identified as the main factors to meet this objective.
Specific objectives	/
Expected results	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To increase the proportion of local varieties of high quality coffees 2. To increase yields of smallholders coffee farmers
Main Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Improved delivery of coffee research results 1.2 Conservation of Ethiopia's and the world's coffee arabica genetic resource 1.3 Promote Ethiopia's coffee in the marketplace 2.1 Provision of an effective coffee extension service 2.2 Sustained increased supply of CBD resistant coffee seedlings with local landrace characteristics 3.1 Project management and co-ordination
Main achievements	<p>Main achievements have been registered in the field of Extension, Nursery and Research.</p> <p>Under "Extension component" and as far as the training of Development agents is concerned, the initial objective had been fulfilled as from 3rd Programme Estimate. Besides training the coffee extension service was made more effective thanks to the provision of vehicles, motorcycles, bicycles and pruning tools.</p> <p>With the creation of 65 new Government nurseries and the organization of individually managed nurseries, the objective has been achieved of a sustained increase in supply of CBD resistant coffee seedlings with good quality of the landrace type for the growing areas.</p> <p>Under Research had been established an experimented liquoring team which enables from now on to complement with quality assessment the landrace selection works.</p> <p>Thanks to CIP IV support to running costs and the procurement of essential laboratory material and equipment selection works were continued which resulted in 12 new varieties released, as well as research works on by-products.</p> <p>An important workshop was held in August 2007 on the occasion of "four decades of coffee research".</p> <p>Lately a substantial support was brought to JARC biotechnology laboratory with the delivery of specific tissue culture equipment for a total amount of € 213,000 and steady links have been established between JARC and Cirad through training session in Montpellier and short term missions to Jimma.</p> <p>Regarding "Conservation component" the PFM activities better planned and more intensively developed after the MTR had nevertheless to suffer from a high instability in the staff operating on the forest conservation sites.</p>

	<p>It is worth mentioning under “Marketing component” the support of the Project to the participation of MoARD officials in international conferences, as well as the recent purchase of an equipment intended for OTA analysis.</p>
<p>Main difficulties</p>	<p><u>Lessons learned</u></p> <p>4.1. <u>Policy and programme context</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A situation that at first sight does not make sense: most of visitors to the Project left with the impression of a sound Government disinterest for the coffee sector. The impression is that more attention is dedicated to other agricultural products for exports, mainly flowers and spices. <p>The restructuring suffered by the sector these last decades may confirm this impression: between 1979 and 1995 the Ministry of Coffee and Tea Development was responsible for coffee policy. The Ministry was abolished in 1995 and replaced by Coffee and Tea authority. This has represented a reduction in power and authority since the CTA acted then under an Administration Board.</p> <p>Then the focus on the coffee value chain was diffused by the dissolution of the Coffee & Tea Authority (CTA) and the separation of Development and Marketing Departments during the transfer of the coffee industry to MoARD.</p> <p>In December 2007, the restructuring of Ministry according to functions rather than commodities diluted more applications to coffee which had already happened with the breakup of the CTA into separate department of Development and Marketing.</p> <p>In this listing a creation of the Project has not to be omitted. It is about the “National Think Tank Committee” officially adopted in August 2007 with the objective “To establish a committee that advices the government on coffee research and development for sustainable improvement of Ethiopian coffee industry. At mid-2009 the committee was considered to be “moribund”.</p> <p>Despite these measures and this situation rather detrimental to the sector, on every workshop or ceremony where it is referred to coffee, it is the opportunity for Government high rank officials to remind the significant role plaid by coffee in the development of Ethiopian economy.</p> <p>Very recently the Minister of Trade and Industry was pleased to announce that coffee had accounted for 60 per cent of foreign exchange revenue in the 2007/2008 season and that the export targets set for 2009/2010 would be largely fulfilled by coffee.</p> <p>4.2. <u>Process of project planning/design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project design was many times criticized by the different evaluation/monitoring missions, in particular for not making clear the role of the public intervention in the private sectors and not pointing out the division of tasks between the public and private sector, and what was expected from private companies. <p>For some observers coffee production, conservation and trading might be managed more and more by private investors and that the public sector should re-define its role and priorities.</p>

- Unlike what could be claimed years ago, 95% of Ethiopian coffee production is not any longer produced by small farmers but that an increasing share (so far # 11.5%) is taken by semi to modernized coffee growers representing some 35,000 hectares and high percentage of small producers are members of cooperatives.

Anyway smallholders would still account for 84% of the average annually produced and among them are found an extent variety of individual situations: from very poor to poor and middle to better off. The design of dispositions adapted to the Sector would require a sound knowledge of current situation.

The last socio-economic survey dealing with the small coffee growers was carried out at national level 20 years ago; the need for updated and reliable data is crucial and obvious.

4.3. Project scope (objectives, resources, budget, etc)

- Unlike the previous phases, the geographic coverage of CIP IV was regarded to be too large for its limited budget and the range of activities too wide. But was not this feature peculiar of a long-standing programme in its last phase of implementation?

4.4. Project management/coordination arrangements and stakeholder participation

- Poor design could be mentioned as a problem accounting for the poor output of CIP IV. In your opinion the reason for what was so qualified depends more on a deficiency in the implementation capacity at federal level, in other words in the weakness of the Project Management Unit (PMU).

It must be reminded that the Project was developed within the context of a constant restructuring of the Contracting Authority, that it was until mid-2007 year that it was decided to have an autonomous and fully staffed PMU and that it was until end of 2008 that the PMU became more or less operational. It must be observed that the very diverse range of activities would have required a wide set of diverse skills amongst those managing the Project at federal level.

Anyway, the operations managed at federal level such as the supplies, works and services and scheduled under the last Programme Estimate were the most affected. As a result the very ambitious tendering programme budgeted under PE No 5 could not be satisfactorily completed before the end of the Project. Many reasons for that:

- late start of the procedures: they had been planned to start with launching in August 2008; in fact first tender launching was in January 2009, which was then re-launched in April!
- Lengthy and slow contract award process⁷,
- Toughening in the application of EDF procedures,
- A volume of dossiers “unmanageable” within a Programme Estimate period of time.

An aggravating circumstance was that, unlike the previous PE which were all extended in order to enable the completion of on-going process within acceptable time, for being the 31 of December 2009 the end of both PE No 5 and Financing Agreement validity, there was no way of extending PE No 5 not even by the three months which would have been enough for the supply contract implementation.

⁷ Yet someone had predicted that “Under the reorganization of the MoARD procurement will take even longer than the interminable old procedures”

Four lessons learnt:

- One year is the time minimum between first submission of a tender dossier and expected provisional acceptance
- Procurement is a very hard and demanding task the outcome of which is never guarantee until the provisional acceptance (final?)
- The overloading of tasks of an administrative type came to make difficult the tasks of monitoring and restricted the field visits. In this respect and in particular, lack of feedback from the intensive training reported under “Extension component” had to be deplored.

Regarding the stakeholder participation: as it had indicated earlier in this report, until CIP IV, “Conservation” and “Marketing” had never been implicitly covered by Coffee Improvement Programme. It happened that compared with other components, “Conservation” and “Marketing” are the components where are registered the lowest “CIP activity” level. A lesson is that:

- In the absence of a strong management at federal level, the responses to CIP IV were the best where CIP had been installed for years, where “CIP was at home”

At CIP IV formulation stage it was pointed that “coffee marketing reforms would be implemented, preferably prior to the start of any activities under the new Project”.

Actually such reforms took place late in the Project life with the setting up of a national commodity exchange known as Ethiopian Commodity Exchange (ECX). In late November 2008 coffee trading officially joined the Authority and the coffee auction trading system that had been practiced for a long time in the country was replaced by the new trading scheme under ECX.

Moreover, the coffee quality inspection laboratories which were only limited in Addis Ababa had to be progressively distributed through other eight coffee producing areas.

- This drastic transformation in the marketing structures that took place late in the Project life, might have given grounds to the little cooperative attitude of the “Marketing partner” as far as CIP matters were concerned.

A consequence was that brilliant ideas as the Millenium exhibition and conference o the certification roundtable could never take shape.

4.5. Project financing arrangements

- Only 30% of the Project was said to have been managed by Regions. It was deplored that the implementers were not allowed to use the budget approved for them and many are those who blamed the PMU for not having been able to procure what they had requested in application of a so called participative approach.
- A lesson was that approval of administrative and financial departments of EU and MoFED (NAO) have to be sought for matters that have already been agreed to in the signed cost estimate.

A minimum of autonomy would have meant having the ability to implement activities already decided in the Programme Estimate without reference to others for a reconfirming decision. This does not prevent from a strict control afterwards.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In addition to the above is that the Project had been working under the MoARD rules and regulations and that even though the Project might have allocated enough budget which had been already approved by EU and NAO it was not possible to pay salaries outside the official scale and to get the highly qualified personnel that was requested for a well determined position. It was in particular the case for procurement. <p>The same obstacle arose when minor equipment was urgently needed: for instance for the purchase of a generator in order to face the power cut or the purchase of an additional computer for personnel newly recruited.</p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financial proposal coffee support project ; July 2001 ▪ Financing agreement ▪ Project Identification Sheet ▪ Rider and Budget : Addendum No.1 to Financing Agreement, Extension of the duration of implementation and budget re-allocation, 04 Sept 2006 ▪ Monthly Reports : 21 reports ▪ ROM 2007 : MR-01963.01– 01/03/07 ▪ ROM 2008 : MR-001963.02 27/11/2008 ▪ Ethiopia Mid-term Review Coffee Improvement Programme IV; EU Ref. No. 8-ACP ET-12; Final Report; December 2005 ▪ Completion report : CIP IV ; 01/07/2002 – 31/12/2009

Intervention Title	Ghana Cocoa Sector Support Programme – Phase II (CSSP2) GH-COC
Country / Region	Ghana
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2007/019-650 ▪ Contract number(s): 197181
EC aid modality	Grant agreements, service contracts and programme estimates
Intervention Start date & End date	Start: 09/07/2008 End (planned and likely): 31/12/2011
Budget	Planned: € 5,000,000 Committed: € 5,000,000 (as of <i>January 2010</i>) Contracted: € 3,922,731 (as of <i>January 2010</i>) Disbursed: € 1,735,577 (as of <i>January 2010</i>)
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission ▪ Implementing agencies: The Ghana Cocoa Board (Cocobod), the International Institute on Tropical Agriculture's Sustainable Tree Crop Programme II (IITA-STCP2) and Farm Based Organisations (FBOs). ▪ Direct beneficiaries: targeted cocoa communities, the Ghana Cocoa Board (Cocobod) and the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) staff at regional and district levels ▪ Final beneficiaries: Ghana's cocoa sector
Intervention Description	The CSSP2 is a programme based on trainings & tools to intensify cocoa production, create and vertically integrate producer organisations, and promote a participatory cocoa strategy for the country.
Programme Background & History	The first phase of the CSSP was funded by the STABEX instrument. During the second quarter of 2005, the Final Evaluation of the CSSP was carried out and formulated its recommendations for a successor programme. A revised Financing Proposal was submitted to Headquarters in June 2005. After several proposals and revisions as well as overviews of funding possibilities of the new programme, the Ghana NIP Mid-Term Review earmarked € 10 million for the CSSP2 (in 2006, the EC and the Government of Ghana agreed to lower the amount down to € 5 million).
Overall objectives	The overall objective is to contribute to an improved livelihood of smallholder cocoa farmers in Ghana.
Specific objectives	The specific objective is to improve the sustainability of cocoa production in Ghana.
Expected results	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased adoption of sustainable cocoa production methods; 2. Improved sector governance through strengthened cocoa farmers organisations and their vertical integration in cocoa governance structures; 3. Participatory cocoa strategy developed and implemented.
Main Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.a Intensify extension to cocoa farmers through participatory training methods and tools; 1.b Address the environmental and social impact of cocoa production; 1.c Improve farmers' access to high quality hybrid cocoa planting material; 1.d Support replanting a large area with hybrid cocoa varieties in former cocoa growing areas 2.a Strengthen governance and management capacities of existing and emerging cocoa farmers and community-based organisations 2.b Strengthen service provision capacity of cocoa farmers organisations 2.c Foster vertical integration of cocoa farmers organisations in cocoa sector governance structures 3.a Support participatory cocoa sector strategy formulation 3.b Carry out specific cocoa studies
Main achievements	The objectives will be exceeded in terms of vulgarisation of integrated crop and pest management and quality practices.

	<p>In terms of enhancing sector governance, the objective will also be surpassed in terms of participation targets. However many groups are not yet ready for integration into cocoa governance structures and not much progress has been made towards integrating farmer organisations in the policy decisions.</p> <p>In terms of multiplication and diffusion of new material, results have been below objectives (see hereunder); although this component has been highly relevant and provide high value for money.</p>
Main difficulties	<p>An important delay occurred before EC funds were made available. The programme therefore practically lost one year before starting.</p> <p>Important procedural difficulties were encountered at the level of the Cocobod (responsible for multiplication and distribution of material, and integration of organisations at the decision level), where the project will probably not achieve its objectives. Lots of delays were due to their staff not understanding about EDF procedures. Many problems occurred with EC regulations for access to money. The integration of farmer organizations in policy decision-making has also been more difficult than foreseen due to political and procedural reasons.</p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ghana Cocoa Sector Support Programme – Phase II Mid-Term Evaluation ▪ Ghana Cocoa Sector Support Programme – Phase II Financing Agreement ▪ Ghana Cocoa Sector Support Programme – Phase II Financing Proposal ▪ Ghana Cocoa Sector Support Programme – Phase II Identification Fiche ▪ Ghana Cocoa Sector Support Programme – Monitoring Reports ▪ MN 907, 123, 114, 131, 145, 906, 943

Intervention Title	Structuration professionnelle de la filière anacarde: une contribution durable pour la paix – Côte d'Ivoire CI-ONG
Country / Region	Côte d'Ivoire
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: ONG-PVD/2003/004-562 ▪ Contract number(s): 64188
EC aid modality	Grant to NGOs
Intervention Start date & End date	Starting date: 20/07/2004 Closing date: 16/04/2009
Budget	Planned: € 768,216 (possible? Source: CRIS database) Committed: € 112,970,793.11 (as of January 2010) Contracted: € 109,582,530.19 (as of January 2010) Disbursed: € 103,930,722.31 (as of January 2010)
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): CE ▪ Implementing agencies: ONG ▪ Direct beneficiaries: organisations professionnelles agricoles, petites entreprises et petits producteurs agricoles ▪ Final beneficiaries: Petits producteurs agricoles, en particulier les femmes
Intervention Description	Via le soutien à une ONG qui a gère l'intervention, une dizaine d'unités de transformation de noix de cajou brutes en amandes ont été mises en place. Des formations sont données pour assurer une meilleure gestion technique et administrative des unités.
Programme Background & History	<p>L'objectif initial du projet visait à insérer des groupements féminins sur des marchés du commerce équitable. Ces marchés présentaient effectivement plusieurs intérêts : (i) préfinancement du client, (ii) prix d'achat de l'amande garanti, (iii) forte valeur ajoutée, (iv) relations commerciales durables, et (v) appui technique.</p> <p>Plusieurs facteurs ont progressivement amenés à repenser l'orientation initiale du projet : (i) l'étroitesse du marché du commerce équitable, (ii) les coûts indirects de certification et de coordination du projet trop élevés, et (iii) les nouvelles orientations des référentiels Flo sur l'anacarde très défavorables à la transformation artisanale.</p> <p>Le projet s'est réorienté vers un partenariat avec un industriel (OLAM) pour diminuer les risques et réduire les coûts.</p>
Overall objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lutter contre la pauvreté ▪ Promouvoir l'égalité et l'autonomisation des femmes ▪ Assurer un développement économique et social tout en préservant les ressources naturelles ▪ Faciliter l'intégration de populations vulnérables à l'économie mondiale, notamment à travers la promotion du Commerce Equitable ▪ Contribuer à la création de valeur ajoutée par la transformation locale ▪ Contribuer à la Paix en Côte d'Ivoire en améliorant durablement les conditions de vie des femmes et des jeunes dont la situation socio-économique est affectée par le conflit
Specific objectives	Favoriser la création d'activités génératrices de revenu pour des populations vulnérables par le développement durable de la filière décorticage artisanal de la noix de cajou
Expected results	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Un système agroalimentaire de transformation locale de la noix de cajou existe dans les régions du nord de la Côte d'Ivoire <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. La technique de décorticage est maîtrisée par les bénéficiaires directs et indirects du projet 1.2. Les techniques de conditionnement des amandes sont maîtrisées 1.3. La gestion des unités de transformation est maîtrisée, le personnel est géré selon des principes transparents

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.4. La transformation de la noix de cajou est rentable 1.5. Les groupements sont capables de définir une stratégie de développement long terme, sont engagés dans des démarches de certifications et ont accès à des crédits et à de nouveaux marchés, notamment internationaux. 2. La technologie de transformation est vulgarisée dans la zone nord, rendant disponible le matériel de décorticage localement et permettant la maintenance des unités <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Les artisans locaux ont été formés à la fabrication du matériel (décortiqueuses, fours de séchage) 2.2. Le matériel est disponible localement 2.3. Les services d'entretien et de réparation du matériel existent à proximité des unités de production 2.4. La formation aux métiers de décorticage est intégrée à des programmes existants dans le domaine de la formation rurale 3. L'augmentation des volumes d'amandes commercialisées (débouchés locaux et internationaux) par les Organisations Paysannes, selon les standards internationaux en vigueur, améliore l'économie rurale du Nord de la Côte d'Ivoire. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1. La demande locale est stimulée et est en augmentation de 20 % par an 3.2. Des marchés internationaux sont identifiés et caractérisés (Bio, Equitable, réseau de PME européennes...) 3.3. Les femmes sont formées à la recherche de marché et aux techniques de marketing : réalisation de business plan, analyse SWOT des filières, rédaction de profil de marchés (méthodologie UNCTAD / WTO / ITC) 3.4. L'offre nationale est structurée pour répondre aux standards internationaux (qualité, hygiène, conditionnement) 3.5. La concertation entre les groupements et les opérateurs économiques internationaux (importateurs, transformateurs européens) est facilitée afin de permettre une meilleure connaissance du marché international par les acteurs locaux 4. Un débat public/privé est organisé, permettant la définition d'une politique concertée propice au développement de clusters agro-alimentaires dans le nord de la Côte d'Ivoire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1. Les services publics facilitent et soutiennent les initiatives économiques dans le secteur du décorticage artisanal 4.2. L'interprofession est en mesure d'intégrer les enjeux du décorticage artisanal et les groupements sont représentés politiquement dans les instances nationales et participent à la définition de politique de développement du secteur 4.3. La dimension territoriale est prise en compte dans la définition de politiques de développement 4.4. Le débat est élargi aux autres filières traditionnelles (Karité, séchage des mangues)
Main Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formation au décorticage artisanal : technique, hygiène et qualité, gestion économique et financière Préparation activité 1 : Identifier les groupements de femmes, les compétences locales en matière de décorticage, faire un état des lieux des activités de transformation et des dynamiques sociales dans les régions bénéficiaires du projet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.1. Mettre en place des unités pilotes de décorticage (10) dans les 5 régions ciblées (2/région) 1.1.2. Organiser les ateliers de formations (3 séminaires de 3 J / an). 1.1.3. Conception et diffusion de matériel pédagogique (livret technique, vidéo) 1.2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2.1. Mettre en place système de suivi

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2.2. Contrôle/correction, suivi des groupements 1.3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.3.1. Mettre en place outils de gestion simplifié au sein des groupements 1.3.2. Formation à la gestion des flux, du personnel, des rendements techniques 1.3.3. Suivi des groupements 1.4. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.4.1. Formation à la comptabilité, gestion financière 1.4.2. Suivi 1.5. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.5.1. Appuyer les groupements dans la définition de projet 1.5.2. Accompagner les projets sélectionnés par les groupements 1.5.3. Suivi, contrôle, bilan 2. Formation à la conception, fabrication et entretien du matériel de décortilage Préparation activité 2 : capitaliser l'expérience acquise par les artisans d'Abidjan dans la conception de matériel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Identifier les artisans à former dans les villes cibles 2.2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.1. Organiser des échanges avec artisans Abidjannais qui ont une expérience dans la production du matériel, avec artisans spécialisés d'autres pays 2.2.2. Conceptions de modèles plus élaborés et adaptés à l'usage des femmes en milieu rural 2.3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.3.1. Formulation des demandes d'assistance technique par les groupements des femmes 2.3.2. Assistance pour création de services adaptés proposés par artisans 2.4. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.4.1. Conception de modules de formation 2.4.2. Proposition des modules aux partenaires visés 2.4.3. Suivi du projet 3. Organisation économique de la filière : structuration de l'offre, analyse du marché et stratégie de promotion des exportations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1. Organiser des ateliers de formation sur les techniques de marketing et de la recherche de marché 3.2. Identifier et développer des réseaux de distribution appropriés pour la commercialisation des amandes 3.3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.3.1. Rechercher des marchés d'exportation : marché d'amandes bio et équitable 3.3.2. Organiser la concertation avec des opérateurs économiques internationaux : identifier partenaires possibles en Europe, présentation et promotion des produits. 3.3.3. Organiser des actions de visibilité, de promotion afin de stimuler la demande nationale 4. Contribution à la concertation secteur public/privé pour le développement des filières agro-alimentaires du Nord de la Côte d'Ivoire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1.1. Préparer les représentants des groupements à la formulation de propositions d'actions auprès des services publics 4.1.2. Organiser la concertation entre représentants des groupements et services publics et instances gouvernementales nationales 4.1.3. Suivi
--	--

	<p>4.2.</p> <p>4.2.1. Préparation des groupements aux enjeux de l'interprofession</p> <p>4.2.2. Favoriser représentation des groupements de femmes au sien de l'interprofession</p> <p>4.3.</p> <p>4.3.1. Favoriser la prise en compte des filières de transformation du nord</p> <p>4.3.2. Proposer des actions visant à renforcer les filières du nord</p> <p>4.4. Organiser des ateliers de concertation entre les différentes filières en vue de l'élaboration d'un plan d'action commun</p>
<p>Main achievements</p>	<p>Aucune évaluation de l'intervention n'est disponible. Les seules documentations disponibles sur les résultats sont la note d'information et le quatrième rapport annuel d'activités (élaboré en novembre 2010). Les résultats des activités sont les suivants :</p> <p>L'objectif en termes de quantités de noix décortiquées (1000 T) n'a pas été atteint. Fin 2010, environ 350 T de noix brutes ont été transformées par les unités du projet.</p> <p>L'objectif d'augmenter la quantité d'amandes commercialisées de 20% annuellement n'a pas été réalisé entre 2009 et 2010.</p> <p>Les réalisations suivantes sont tirées telles quelles du Logframe :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Les unités emploient 50 personnes quotidiennement dont 45 à 48 femmes, soit plus de 90%. La tenue de "listes de présence" et de cahiers de registres permettent de renseigner ▪ 4 unités ont été formées au recyclage des coques d'anacarde sous forme de briquettes de combustion (matériel disponible au niveau des unités : broyeur, presse) ▪ Ces unités ont également été renforcées au niveau de l'amélioration énergétique du processus (amélioration du foyer, du four et chauffe eau solaire) ▪ Une étude de la mesure de l'évolution du couvert végétal par télédétection de la zone nord de la Côte d'Ivoire, entre 2000 et 2010, est en cours de réalisation avec l'université Polytechnique de Lausanne et Planète Action. ▪ 3 unités sont certifiées bio et Flo et 2 unités sont certifiées bio. ▪ Ces unités sont inspectées et contrôlées chaque année par un organisme certificateur indépendant. ▪ Elles répondent aux exigences qualité de l'UE. ▪ Chaque unité dispose d'un Système de Contrôle Interne capable de renouveler la certification ▪ Au niveau de la vente locale, la VA passe de 200 à 600 FCFA/kg de noix brute ▪ Au niveau du marché conventionnel, la VA passe de 200 à 500 FCFA/kg noix brute ▪ Au niveau des marché biologique, la VA passe de 250 à 800 CFA/kg de noix brutes ▪ 10 unités ont été mises en place dans 3 zones de production, ce qui représente 500 emplois créés à travers les activités de transformation. ▪ Volumes transformés de noix brutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2008: 147T ▪ 2009 : 207T (augmentation de 29% de 2008 à 2009) ▪ 2010 : 130 T en cours de transformation. ▪ En 2010, la chute du volume de noix transformées s'explique par une très forte augmentation du prix de la noix brute sur le marché international entraînant un très fort ralentissement de la transformation ▪ Au total 939 femmes et hommes ont été formés ▪ Le rendement en amandes entières est proche de 60%. Les formations des femmes sur

	<p>les bonnes pratiques de transformation et l'appui technique apporté par OLAM leur ont permis d'améliorer significativement les rendements en entières. Néanmoins, les difficultés d'approvisionnement en noix de bonne qualité, et les faiblesses en équipement sont les deux facteurs limitants de l'amélioration des rendements. Au niveau de chaque unité, des techniciens tiennent à jour des cahiers de suivi de la production enregistrant notamment les quantités de noix décortiquées, d'amandes produites, et les rendements en amandes obtenus. Ceci leur permet de maîtriser leurs objectifs de transformation et la rentabilité des activités.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Un système de transformation des noix par lot a été mis en place garantissant la traçabilité de la production depuis la noix brute jusqu'au conditionnement. Des comités d'hygiène ont été formés. ▪ Des affiches pédagogiques sont en cours de conception. ▪ Des business plan et des outils d'aide à la décision tenant compte de facteurs internes et externes aux unités sont en cours d'élaboration. Ces outils capitaliseront l'ensemble des expériences des unités et seront transposables et vulgarisables à d'autres initiatives de transformation artisanale de la noix de cajou. ▪ Sur le marché conventionnel, la marge brute dégagée par les unités est en moyenne de 300 FCFA/kg d'amandes. (Achat matière première: 1000 FCFA/kg d'amande, Coûts transformation : 700 FCFA/kg d'amande, Vente amande : 2000 CFA/kg d'amande) ▪ Sur le marché équitable, la marge brute est plus élevée (500 FCA/kg d'amande) malgré les coûts de certification plus importants ▪ Les groupements sont capables de définir une stratégie de développement long terme : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 6 unités sur les 10 se sont regroupées sous forme de plateformes logistiques pour mutualiser des coûts de fonctionnement. Ces unités ont développé des partenariats économiques avec OLAM sur 2 ans. - 3 unités ont la double certification Flo/Bio et ont développé un partenariat à l'export avec Ethiquable. - Le développement des activités de 3 unités est aujourd'hui supporté par un organisme de microfinance. Montant accordé de 50 000€ en 2010. - 2 unités ont obtenu des financements du PNUD pour le développement de leurs activités. - Une étude a été réalisée en partenariat avec l'AFD sur la mise en place d'un dispositif d'accès au crédit pour les unités. ▪ 45 artisans ont été formés dans les 3 régions cibles. Ces artisans sont capables de fabriquer, de réparer et d'entretenir des décortiqueuses. ▪ 7 responsables d'unités ont réalisé des voyages d'affaires en Italie (Terra Madre), en France (semaine du Commerce Equitable) et en Allemagne (Biofach) et en Afrique du Sud (Agrofood Summit) et en Israël au cours desquels ils ont rencontré des clients, des industriels de la filière et des structures d'appui. ▪ Les autorités ont appuyé les unités des Savanes et du Zanzan dans les démarches de certification en agriculture biologique. ▪ Les autorités locales ont été concertées dans le cadre du partenariat pilote avec OLAM et soutiennent les unités du Bandama ▪ 2 leaders d'unités du projet sont membres du CA de l'Intercajou. ▪ Lors de la 5ème conférence annuelle de l'African Cashew Alliance (ACA), le représentant du ministère de l'agriculture a soutenu activement les initiatives de coopératives et groupements féminins en Côte d'Ivoire. ▪ Le développement de la transformation dans les filières agricoles fait parti des objectifs définis dans le cadre du Document Stratégique de Réduction de la Pauvreté (DSRP) en 2009.
--	--

Main difficulties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Des problèmes ont été causés par le fait que les autorités allemandes n'ont pas reconnu (dans les premiers mois) le certificat garantissant l'intégrité de la production biologique d'une des unités (Unité des Savanes). ▪ La maîtrise des documents et la gestion de la traçabilité, sécurité et hygiène s'avèrent difficiles ▪ L'approvisionnement en noix de qualité et la faiblesse des équipements rendent l'obtention de rendements élevés difficile. ▪ La crise qu'a traversée la Côte d'Ivoire a posé de nombreux problèmes pour le projet : les véhicules du projet ont été confisqués à deux reprises et des équipes ont été confrontées à des coupeurs de routes. ▪ Les unités éprouvent des difficultés à mobiliser de la trésorerie pour l'achat de matière première, qui représente 35 à 45% du coût de transformation ▪ L'accès au crédit s'avère difficile pour les organisations professionnelles et les prêts se font à des taux très élevés ▪ Le prix de la noix varie fortement durant la campagne ▪ Le prix de la noix brute a connu une très forte augmentation sur le marché international en 2010 ▪ Les unités du projet ont encore des difficultés quant à la gestion comptable et de leur capacité de production. Ceci s'explique par le fait que très peu d'outils ou de services ont les moyens et compétences pour offrir un conseil de qualité sur la transformation de l'anacarde et que le faible volume traité par les unités ne leur permet pas un fonctionnement régulier (seulement trois mois)
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Structuration professionnelle de la filière anacarde: une contribution durable pour la paix – Draft Rapport Année 4 ▪ Structuration professionnelle de la filière anacarde: une contribution durable pour la paix – Note d'informations ▪ Structuration professionnelle de la filière anacarde: une contribution durable pour la paix – Commented Logframe ▪ MN 819

Intervention Title	« Réhabilitation agricole en zone élaéicoles et cotonnières de Côte d'Ivoire » modifié en « Relance de l'agriculture paysanne d'exportation en Côte d'Ivoire » CI-REH
Country / Region	Côte d'Ivoire
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2008/020-255 ▪ Contract number(s): n°9882/IVC
EC aid modality	Gestion centralisée indirect et gestion décentralisée
Intervention Start date & End date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Date de démarrage: 14/12/2008 ▪ Date finale prévue: 30/06/2011 ▪ Date final probable: 30/06/2011
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget total du programme d'action : 21.230.000 € (15/09/2008) ▪ Contracté: pas d'infos ▪ Déboursé : pas d'infos sauf pour PA-4P Elaiculture et Hévéaculture (cf. MR) : 2.568.160 €
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): CE ▪ Implementing agencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volet « palmier et hévéa » : gestion centralisée indirecte à GTZ - Volet « autres cultures paysannes d'exportation » : gestion décentralisée : Maître d'ouvrage = Ordonnateur National ; Maître d'œuvre = Ministère de l'Agriculture; - Volet « Appui au PNFSR » gestion décentralisée : Maître d'ouvrage = Ordonnateur National ; Maître d'œuvre = Direction du Foncier rural et du Cadastre Rural du Ministère de l'Agriculture - Volet « Pistes rurales » gestion décentralisée : Maître d'ouvrage = Ordonnateur National ; Maître d'ouvrage délégué = AGEROUTE - Volet « Qualité de mise en œuvre » : gestion décentralisée à l'exception des audits et évaluations. ▪ Direct beneficiaries: Etat ivoirien, organisations professionnelles agricoles, petites entreprises et petits producteurs agricoles ▪ Final beneficiaries: Petits producteurs agricoles
Intervention Description	<p>Le programme" Relance de l'agriculture paysanne d'exportation de Cote d'Ivoire comporte 5 volets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appui aux petits planteurs de palmiers et d'hévéas ▪ Appui aux petits planteurs d'autres cultures paysannes d'exportation ▪ Appui au Programme de Sécurisation du Foncier rural ▪ Pistes rurales ▪ Qualité de la mise en Œuvre
Programme Background & History	<p>Contexte sectoriel</p> <p>L'agriculture paysanne d'exportation a souffert de la crise ivoirienne qui a aggravé les dysfonctionnements internes de certaines filières (coton, cacao, café) et qui a entraîné une hausse des coûts du transport intérieur nuisible aux prix payés aux producteurs. Le contexte international a des effets contrastés : la compétitivité de toutes les productions agricoles d'exportation est affaiblie par la dégradation de la parité dollar/euro et par la hausse du coût des intrants et des carburants, mais la hausse des prix du pétrole entraîne également celui du cours des oléagineux et du caoutchouc.</p> <p>Pour la zone forestière au sud de la Côte d'Ivoire, les cultures pérennes d'exportation sont les principales sources de revenus du monde rural. La production de cacao, de l'ordre de 1.300.000 tonnes vient au premier rang, mais elle stagne du fait de la politique des prix et des problèmes institutionnels. En revanche, la production de caoutchouc connaît un boom puisqu'elle est passée de 130.000 tonnes en 2000 à 172.000 tonnes aujourd'hui, dont 60%</p>

provient des plantations paysannes. La production d'huile de palme tourne autour de 280.000 tonnes depuis 10 ans provenant pour une moitié des plantations industrielles et pour l'autre moitié de 35 000 plantations villageoises. Elle représente 80% de celle de la zone UEMOA. La crise a considérablement ralenti le rythme d'extension et de renouvellement des plantations ivoiriennes alors que la demande sous-régionale d'huile de palme ne cesse d'augmenter. Toutefois, les phénomènes de plantation ont connu un certain regain d'intérêt, grâce aux prix de la dernière campagne.

Dans le nord du pays, la production de coton est passée de 400 000 tonnes de coton-graine en 2001 à 150 000 tonnes en 2007. Cette activité occupait 280 000 planteurs en 2001 mais on ignore leur nombre actuel. La crise du secteur s'est notamment traduite par la réduction de nombreux services apportés par les sociétés cotonnières dans le nord du pays. Simultanément, le nord du pays s'illustre par un phénomène de diversification agricole en direction de l'anacarde, dont la noix de cajou est le produit principal. Les exportations ont crû de 20.000 tonnes au début des années 90 à 250.000 tonnes aujourd'hui.

Par ailleurs, la crise ivoirienne a mis en exergue la question foncière comme source de conflits importante. La croissance démographique et les flux migratoires aggravent les tensions pour l'accès à la terre. En situation de crise, lorsque l'Etat de droit n'est plus respecté les litiges se transforment en violence et les droits acquis sur les terres sont remis en cause. Dans certaines régions, notamment l'Ouest, cette situation entrave les activités agricoles d'exportation, met les planteurs en situation de précarité et entraîne des pertes de récolte voire des dégradations de plantations. Face à cette situation, la loi n098-750 du 23 décembre 1998 apporte un cadre juridique clair qui vise à prévenir les litiges par la transformation des droits coutumiers de propriété au d'usage en droits officiellement reconnus.

Enseignements tires et complémentarité

Dans la partie sud du pays, l'étude de l'amélioration du peuplement végétal des cultures pérennes paysannes (BDPA, 2006) a permis d'identifier les secteurs de l'hévéa et du palmier à huile, comme des secteurs où il est possible d'accompagner des dynamiques socio-économiques existantes. Cette étude a également montré que le point critique pour le renouvellement ou l'extension de ces cultures était la mise à disposition du matériel végétal performant, accompagné de conseil en phase de plantation. Ce matériel végétal de qualité existe en Côte d'Ivoire, notamment dans les stations de recherche et de production de matériel végétal situées près d'Abidjan, mais il convient de le rapprocher des producteurs.

Dans la partie nord du pays, les fonds STAB EX ont apporté un appui significatif à la culture du coton. L'étude d'une stratégie sectorielle coton (Italtrend 2006) a permis aux acteurs publics et privés de dégager des priorités et d'orienter l'utilisation des fonds européens. Des actions ont ainsi été menées ou sont engagées pour l'assainissement financier du secteur, sa restructuration institutionnelle, le renforcement des capacités des OPA et de l'équipement des producteurs. Néanmoins, les réformes ne sont pas encore achevées. Pour les orienter, un document de stratégie sectorielle et un plan d'action ont été élaborés par le ministère de l'Agriculture et deux études (sur fonds STABEX) sont en cours pour examiner la réorganisation du financement des intrants et les modalités de gestion du risque sur les prix.

Les fonds STABEX apportent un appui au Programme National de Sécurisation du Foncier Rural (PNSFR) sur la période de novembre 2006 à avril 2009. Sa méthodologie et

	<p>ses procédures sont maintenant acquises. Les services du Cadastre rural se déploient progressivement dans les départements, des actions de communication sont lancées pour informer les usagers ainsi que des opérations de délimitation des terroirs ou de certification des parcelles. En 2008, ce programme national recevra également l'appui financier de la Banque Mondiale.</p> <p>Le programme de réhabilitation des pistes cotonnières financées sur fonds STABEX a donné la priorité aux ouvrages de franchissement et aux zones critiques (points à temps). La mise en œuvre, exécutée à travers 17 contrats de travaux, 3 contrats de contrôle et sous la supervision de l'AGEROUTE, s'est avérée décevante. Les travaux n'ont été réceptionnés qu'à hauteur de 50%, ce qui s'explique essentiellement par l'insuffisante capacité des entreprises locales et par leur tendance à accepter davantage de marches qu'elles ne peuvent exécuter. Les conséquences en seront tirées dans la reformulation du volet pistes proposé au financement FLEX 2006 et 2007.</p> <p>L'appui communautaire financé par le FLEX 2006 et le FLEX 2007 est conçu comme un complément aux interventions financées par le COM Stabex 99/2 dont les 2 secteurs d'intervention sont l'appui aux cultures paysannes d'exportation et la réhabilitation des infrastructures rurales. Le FLEX 2006 ciblait la culture du palmier et des pistes rurales. Le FLEX 2007 constitue une augmentation de plafond financier et un avenant au programme FLEX 2006, par l'élargissement à toutes les cultures paysannes d'exportation de son objectif spécifique de relance agricole.</p> <p>Les interventions financées par les fonds FLEX 2006 et FLEX 2007 complètent les efforts menés pour contribuer à la sortie de crise et à la stabilisation socio-économique, entrepris dans le cadre des différents Programmes d'Urgence de Réhabilitation (PUR I, II, III et IV) du 9^{ème} FED. Il s'intègre également au deuxième secteur d'intervention proposé par le 10^{ème} FED « Cohésion sociale et la réhabilitation d'infrastructures sociales et économiques » et au secteur non focal "Appui à l'amélioration de la compétitivité des filières agricoles".</p>
Overall objectives	Les objectifs globaux de l'intervention sont la réduction de la pauvreté en milieu rural et la stabilisation sociale du pays
Specific objectives	<p>L'objectif spécifique est l'augmentation des revenus en milieu rural par :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ l'amélioration de la productivité des plantations paysannes de palmier à huile dans le sud-ouest de la Côte d'Ivoire. ▪ l'amélioration des conditions de transport dans les zones de production de coton et d'huile de palme, par la réhabilitation du réseau de pistes rurales ;
Expected results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R1 : La productivité et la compétitivité des cultures paysannes d'exportation sont améliorées (hévéa et palmier ; autres cultures paysannes d'exportation) ▪ R2 : Le programme national de sécurisation du foncier rural (PNSFR) approfondit et étend ses activités dans les zones d'agriculture paysanne d'exportation ▪ R3 : Les pistes rurales sont durablement réhabilitées ▪ R4 : Le programme financé par les fonds FLEX est mis en œuvre de façon efficace et efficiente
Main Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A.1.a. Hévéa et Palmier <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification des bénéficiaires - Mise à disposition de packages agronomiques et encadrement technique des pépiniéristes + Conseil agricole aux acquéreurs de matériel végétal - Conseil en gestion / organisation et appui à la sécurisation foncière des pépiniéristes + promotion - Appuis aux OPA - Coordination - Visibilité

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A.1.b. Autres cultures paysannes d'exportation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renforcement des services aux planteurs (vulgarisation agricole, fourniture de semences, etc.) et appuis à l'équipement - Appuis aux OPA - Appuis aux restructurations et réformes sectorielles ▪ A.2 Appui au Programme National de Sécurisation du Foncier Rural <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renforcement des capacités des acteurs de la mise en œuvre de la loi 98-750 - Campagne de communication - Délimitation des terroirs - Certification des parcelles ▪ A.3. Pistes rurales <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Etudes préalables, APD et contrôle des travaux - Réhabilitation des pistes - Maîtrise d'ouvrage déléguée ▪ A.4 Qualité de la mise en œuvre <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Etudes d'impact environnemental - Visibilité - Etudes, assistance technique - Monitoring du MINAGRI - Audits - Evaluations
<p>Main achievements</p>	<p>Le MR ne concerne que « GTZ - convention de délégation pour la mise en œuvre du projet d'amélioration du peuplement végétal (PA-4P) ».</p> <p>I) Hévéa, toutes les activités ont été réalisées dans les temps suivant la séquence prévue dans le cadre logique et participent pleinement à l'atteinte des résultats : i) la qualité de l'accompagnement de la GTZ est jugée bonne ; ii) celle des prestataires est relativement moyenne en 2009-2010 (fourniture de matériel d'occasion, mauvais suivi de l'irrigation, d'où une perte de 20 à 50% du bois de greffe, dépôt des boutures loin des pépinières ; iii) mais elle est en amélioration permanente (remplacement à 100 % du bois de greffe défectueux, prise en charge de 10-15% de charges additionnelles).</p> <p>II) Palmier. En raison du désistement en début de projet du prestataire identifié, PALMCI, et des procédures administratives GTZ et UE relativement rigides, les activités ont été suspendues jusqu'à signature de l'avenant en février 2010. Moins de 10% des activités prévues ont été menées jusqu'à présent (identification des bénéficiaires et prestataires techniques, formation des pépiniéristes). Ce retard d'un an ne pourra pas être rattrapé comme ces activités sont calées sur les calendriers culturels et climatiques.</p> <p>Le taux global d'atteinte des résultats en termes de création de PEPMV est de 56% : 100% pour l'hévéa (50/50) et 0% pour le palmier (0/40).</p> <p>I) Hévéa. Le taux de réalisation des jardins à bois de greffe (JBG) reste très élevé : 97%. Au niveau des 50 PEPMV, en termes de viabilité : i) 100% disposent des compétences techniques en conduite de pépinière d'hévéa ; ii) 1000 greffeuses ont les capacités techniques et matérielles ; iii) le taux de réussite des porte-greffes était en janvier 2010 de 77%, mais celui des JBG de 57% seulement. Au vu des résultats du 1er cycle, il est donc nécessaire de poursuivre l'accompagnement : ex. dans le Bas-Sassandra, après 1 an, 53% des PEPVM sont déjà considérées comme viables techniquement et financièrement et</p>

	<p>87% ont de fortes probabilités de l'être dans un an si elles sont subventionnées pour le 2ème cycle.</p> <p>II) Palmier. Le taux d'atteinte des résultats est nul. Cependant, le taux de création de PEPMV Palmier a de forte probabilité d'atteindre les 100% fin 2010. Le taux de viabilité technique et financière des PEPMV Palmier risque d'être assez faible à la fin prévue du projet en raison en partie d'une qualité de prestation moindre par rapport à PALMCI.</p>
Main difficulties	<p>Le MR ne concerne que « GTZ - convention de délégation pour la mise en œuvre du projet d'amélioration du peuplement vegetal (PA-4P) ».</p> <p>i) les différentes parties prenantes (interprofessions, industries, communautés, Conseils Généraux) ont été faiblement impliquées en amont du projet ; ii) la durée du projet de 2.5 ans est insuffisante pour s'assurer de l'intégration des PEPMV (Petites Entreprises de Production de Matériel Végétal) dans les filières ; iii) aucune stratégie de sortie de projet n'a non plus été clairement définie, d'où une pérennisation faiblement assurée, notamment pour le palmier. En début et cours de projet, un certain nombre d'ajustements ont été introduits, indicateur de la faiblesse dans la conception du projet : i) certains facilement applicables au niveau contractuel (ex. modification des contributions financières) ; ii) d'autres avec des conséquences importantes en termes d'efficacité, impact et durabilité du projet (ex. palmier à huile : retard d'un an suite au désistement d'un partenaire et de la lourdeur pour la signature de l'avenant).</p> <p>La situation conflictuelle qu'a connue la Côte d'Ivoire cette année 2011 a probablement empêché le déroulement du projet tel qu'il a été initialement prévu.</p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FA ▪ Rider FA : avenant n°1 15/09/2008 ▪ MR « GTZ - convention de délégation pour la mise en œuvre du projet d'amélioration du peuplement vegetal (PA-4P) » 30/08/2010 ▪ MN 819

Intervention Title	Participation of African Nations in Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standard-Setting Organizations (PAN-SPSO) KE-PAN
Country / Region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Member States of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) ▪ Member states of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) ▪ Member states of the South African Development Community (SADC) ▪ Member states of the East African Community (EAC) ▪ Member states of the East and South Africa Region (COMESA) ▪ Member states of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) ▪ Member states of the Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CEN-SAD) ▪ The Authority responsible for carrying out the programme is the Secretary General of the ACP group of states ▪ Who delegates his power to the director of the African Union Department for Agriculture (Ethiopia – Addis Ababa) <p>Who delegates his power to the director of the Director of the African Union Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (Kenya, Nairobi)</p>
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2006/020-739 ▪ Contract numbers: 196817, 196818 & 196819
EC aid modality	Support is given in the form of a grant to the implementing agencies. These agencies are then responsible for providing the training studies and coordinating activities of the PAN-SPSO.
Intervention Start date & End date	Start date: unknown End date (planned): 31/12/2013
Budget	Planned: € 3,855,000 (of which 3,350,000 are provided by the EU) Committed: € 3,350,000 (as of January 2010) Contracted: € 1,775,895 (as of January 2010) Disbursed: € 1,251,269 (as of January 2010)
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission, the African Union Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) & the African Union Inter-African Phytosanitary Commission (AU-IAPSC) ▪ Implementing agencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The overall responsibility and coordination for the project implementation lies with the AU-IBAR; - The AU-IAPSC assists the AU-IBAR in overseeing the implementation of the phytosanitary aspects of the project; - Several aspects of the project will be implemented via the following regional economic communities: ECOWAS, IGAD, SADC, EAC, COMESA, ECCAS and CEN-SAD ▪ Direct beneficiaries: ACP member states of the African Union who are at the same time members of the WTO and participate in the activities of the OIE, IPPC and CAC as well as the identified Regional Economic Communities. African nations that aren't members of the African Union will indirectly benefit from the exchange of information. ▪ Final beneficiaries: African agricultural (including livestock and fisheries) producers, market operators and agro-processors.
Intervention Description	The intervention includes training, studies and capacity building to integrate African countries effectively in SPSOs.
Programme Background & History	Agriculture and agricultural trade is considered to have enormous potential to contribute to poverty reduction in Africa. However, to have access to international markets, agricultural products must comply with the WTO Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) standards. Many African countries find it difficult to comply with SPS measures and can

	<p>therefore not fully benefit from the preferential market access offered by the EU or the US Africa Growth Opportunities Act (AGOA) for certain products.</p> <p>The SPS Agreement declared the standards elaborated by the Office International des Epizooties (OIE), the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the <i>Codex Alimentarius</i> Commission (CAC) should be of international standing and that all members should participate in elaborating the standards.</p> <p>Participation of African countries in the OIE, IPPC and CAC is limited in terms of numbers and effectiveness. The lack of participation in establishing the standards contributes to their poor up-take at national levels.</p>
Overall objectives	Reduction of poverty and enhanced food security in Africa through greater access for agricultural products (including fisheries and livestock) from African countries to international markets.
Specific objectives	More effective participation of African countries in the activities of the Office International des Epizooties (OIE), the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the <i>Codex Alimentarius</i> Commission (CAC) during the formulation of international standards on food safety, animal and plant health.
Expected results	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. African countries are strengthened to select and equip participants for effective participation in Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) standard setting meetings; 2. Technical capacity of African countries to articulate new standards, develop science-based arguments, and assess economic implications of proposed standards is strengthened; 3. Knowledge of participants (representing African countries in International Standards Setting Organisations on available diagnostic and food safety laboratories and other SPS-related facilities, and the understanding of their actual capacities increased; 4. Relevant SPS-related information is acquired and disseminated to African countries.
Main Activities	<p>For each result, a series of activities are planned:</p> <p>To achieve result number 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop priority setting modules (with objective selection criteria) at national/REC level to select (a) meetings to attend and (b) persons to attend (assist countries/RECs to use them to prioritize attendance at SPS meetings); ▪ Liaise with RECs/countries to identify SPS issues of common regional/national interest and provide analysis of current SPS standards establishment on them, while encouraging use of existing web portals on SPS; ▪ Organize (with RECs) workshops to assist them in designing regional strategies for attendance of countries at the International Standard Setting Organisations (ISSO) ▪ Identify experts in particular SPS fields and facilitate them to provide briefing to participants prior to ISSO meetings; ▪ Support the participation of selected participants (among others through the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF)); ▪ Develop a monitoring and evaluation system that keeps track of attendance at meetings and follow-up of activities on particular meetings. <p>To achieve result number 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organize training workshops on the use of science-based methods and development of scientific arguments in standard-setting; ▪ Promote links between private sector individuals and/or institutions having a stake in SPS issues with the public sector in order to enhance their contribution in the assessment of standards; ▪ Organize annual consultation meetings each for Directors of Food Safety, Veterinary Services and Plant Protection to share ideas and information prior to ISSC meetings;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compile research results and scientific information related to most relevant standards and produce briefings on each of them; ▪ Produce leaflets that simplify most relevant articles of OIE, CAC and IPPC Codes and avail these to countries for use by their participants; ▪ Identify standards which African countries want to modify and/or propose, and facilitate the preparation of dossiers for ISSO meetings; ▪ Develop economic arguments to assess impact of SPS standards; ▪ Establish south-south links with other developing countries, identify areas where they have excelled and the methods used in SPS standard-setting, organize and facilitate joint meetings between them and representatives of African countries; ▪ Strengthening of African countries' link to and use of the STDF by contributing to the STDF, availing seed money for further SPS activities in Africa. <p>To achieve result number 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Produce an inventory of existing diagnostic and food safety laboratory facilities, evaluate their current and potential capacities at national and regional levels, and maintain an information management system for diagnostic and food safety laboratories; ▪ Compare SPS normative requirements with existing diagnostic and food safety laboratory facilities; ▪ Develop guidelines on harmonization of diagnostic and food safety laboratories at regional level, including proposals for selection of reference laboratories; ▪ Identify SPS related laboratory training opportunities, and encourage national laboratory staff to take advantage of such opportunities. <p>To achieve result number 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrate phytosanitary information into the ARIS database to include plant pest prevalence information similar to the zoosanitary information; ▪ Maintain updated sanitary information on the IBAR managed ARIS database (extended to non-PACE member countries); ▪ Produce fact sheets containing data and information on relevant SPS issues regarding animal and plant production and marketing, and avail these to countries for their participants to use during standard-setting meetings.
Main achievements	<p>Since the programme began recently, achievements that can be found in the annual reports consist mainly of what “has been done” rather than results obtained by the project. Examples of achievements are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support to the Conference of Ministers responsible for animal resources ▪ Eight experts in the field of food safety issues were identified to provide comments on draft Codex committees papers ▪ Terms of reference of proposed modalities for the formation/strengthening and operation of National SPS Committees is drafted. ▪ Food safety: a consultation process were conducted by the PCU with all national Codex contacts points (NCCPs) to identify issues of interest to Africa being discussed in Codex committees. Issues were well identified and proposed for discussion during the NCCPs meeting on 1 – 4 December 2009. The Coordinator of Codex-Africa (CCAFRICA) has actively participated in this process. ▪ Etc.
Main difficulties	<p>Delays occurred in the implementation of the project because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Of two changes of the IBAR director (the project coordinator); ▪ The Regional Economic Communities, which became key implementing partners of the project needed to go through time-consuming administrative processes before beginning implementation.

Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ PAN-SPSO Financing Agreement▪ PAN-SPSO Financing Agreement Rider 1▪ PAN-SPSO Financing Agreement Rider 2▪ PAN-SPSO Programme estimate 1▪ PAN-SPSO Programme estimate 2▪ PAN-SPSO Annual Report, August 2010▪ PAN-SPSO Note to delegation▪ PAN-SPSO Training for Trainers reports from Nairobi and Bamako
----------------	---

Intervention Title	Programme d'appui au secteur agricole à Madagascar (PASAM) MG-FOOD
Country / Region	Madagascar
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FOOD/2005/017-812 & FOOD/2006/018-309 ▪ Contract number(s): FOOD/2005/017-812:144626/145977/146010/146024/159406/162332/62958/169708 FOOD/2006/018-309: 146635/151103/166255/166290/167749/200242/ 208975
EC aid modality	Budget support + Subsidies to Agricultural Development Funds at regional level (Fonds Régionaux de Développement Agricole) + project financing of NGOs for the establishment of agricultural support centres (Centres de Services Agricoles) at district level
Intervention Start date & End date	Start: 2007 End date: 2012
Budget	PASAM 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planned: €9 million ▪ Committed: €9 million ▪ Contracted: €4.767 million (as of January 2010) ▪ Disbursed: € 2.984 million (as of January 2010) PASAM 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planned: €10 million ▪ Committed: €10 million ▪ Contracted: €9.547 million (as of January 2010) ▪ Disbursed: €6.977 million (as of January 2010)
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission ▪ Implementing agencies: Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Elevage et de la Pêche (MAEP); ONG ▪ Direct beneficiaries: MAEP ; ONG ▪ Final beneficiaries: Agriculteurs
Intervention Description	<p>The intervention combines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Support in the form of budget support to the restructuring of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries. This restructuring process primarily aims at de-concentrating at regional level the Ministry capacity; (ii) Support to the establishment at regional level of privately managed Agricultural Development Funds; (iii) Support to the establishment at district level of agricultural services centres (Centres de Services Agricoles – CSA) managed by NGOs. CSAs do not themselves provide services to farmers. They act as intermediaries between farmers and farmer organizations on the one hand, and providers of services (credit, extension services, etc.) on the other hand. <p>It must be noted that this project, which primarily addresses the food security issue, does not have a particular focus on agricultural commodities.</p>
Programme Background & History	<p>PASAM is a follow up of EC funded programmes aimed at improving food safety in Madagascar (Programmes d'Appui à la Sécurité Alimentaire -PASA), which have been implemented in 1998 (PASA1), 1999 (PASA2) and 2003/2004 (PASA3).</p> <p>It is complemented by a programme supporting the development of infrastructure in rural communities of South Madagascar (Programme d'Appui aux Communes et Organisations Rurales).</p> <p>Besides the budget support component of PASAM, the EC provides to Madagascar</p>

	<p>General Budget support the Government's poverty reduction strategy.</p> <p>The Government of Madagascar adopted in 1999 an Action Plan for Rural Development (Plan d'Action pour le Développement Rural – PADR). This Action Programme should have been updated in 2005 as National Action Plan for Rural Development, but we did not find any track of such a document on Internet..</p>
Overall objectives	<p>Overall Objective, Specific Objective, Expected Results and Activities are the same for PASAM1 and PASAM2</p> <p>Overall Objective: Contribute to reducing poverty and improving food safety in rural areas through improved performance of the agricultural sector</p>
Specific objectives	<p>Same SO for PASAM1 and PASAM2</p> <p>Make the MAEP regional structures operational and develop at district level a system of technical and financial support to agricultural producers</p>
Expected results	<p>Same expected results for PASAM1 and PASAM2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The institutional reform of the MAEP is implemented at the level of its regional antennas (Directions Régionales de Développement Rural - DRDR) 2. Within three years structures for the provision of technical and economic support to farmers (Centres de Services Agricoles – CSA) are established in all rural districts, these structures are operational and sustainable 3. In all three Southern regions of Madagascar regional funds for agricultural development (Fonds de Développement Régional Agricole – FRDA) are established and operational; they finance regionalised agricultural policies
Main Activities	<p>In order to achieve Result 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reallocation of human resources and recruitments benefiting to DRDR ▪ Training of DRDR staff members ▪ Equipment of DRDR ▪ Implementation at regional level of sub-sectoral policies <p>In order to achieve Result 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support the establishment of CSAs ▪ Gradually establish CSAs in all districts throughout the country <p>In order to achieve Result 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Define the legal framework for FDRA and the modalities for mobilising their resources ▪ Support and strengthen the capacity of regional actors to manage FDRA ▪ Provide competitive financing to regional projects
Main achievements	<p>In relation with Result 1: Implementation poorly effective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Better distribution of staff between the MAEP central unit and the DRDR, but thanks to a strong reduction of staff at central level with very limited increase of staff at regional level ▪ Training of MAEP staff delivered but content of training courses too academic ▪ Distribution of tasks between the MAEP central unit and DRDR insufficiently clarified ▪ Limited capacity of DRDR to support the development of CSAs and FDRAs ▪ Agricultural Sector Programme (Programme Sectoriel Agricole – PSA) not finalised <p>In relation with Result 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most CSAs have been established and are operational but their effectiveness is still limited <p>In relation with Result 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FDRAs have been established in 6 regions on a pilot basis but do not yet have a legal status

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FDRAs are regional antennas of a National Fund (Fonds de Développement Agricole – FDA), which has however not yet been established ▪ If their field of intervention is not precisely defined FDRAs might duplicate other institutions, the IMF (Institutions Mutualistes de Financement) previously established to finance on a short term basis the production costs incurred by farmers ▪ Effectiveness of FDRAs cannot yet be assessed.
Main difficulties	<p>Implementation of the project, in particular of its component at the MAEP, suffers from the situation of political crisis that prevails in Madagascar since January 2009. In June 2010 the European Commission decided, in compliance with Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement, to suspend the provision of budget support to support to the Government of the Republic of Madagascar as well as the implementation of the NIP financed from the 10th EDF. This decision affects implementation of the PASAM project and the sustainability of CSAs.</p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conventions de Financement et Dispositions Techniques et Administratives des programmes PASAM1 et PASAM2 ▪ Evaluation à mi-parcours du Programme d'Appui au Secteur Agricole à Madagascar ▪ MN 801 à 818 ▪ Evaluation technique et de performance du Programme d'Appui à la Sécurité Alimentaire PASA 99 (version papier) ▪ Présentation du programme CSA : Réunion nationale de lancement des projets d'appui à la mise en place des CSA (11 Mars 2008) ▪ MN 801 à 818

Intervention Title	Programme d'Appui à la Réforme de la Filière Coton (PARFC) au Mali ML-COT
Country / Region	MALI
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2006/020-723; 20723 (CRIS); 13488 (OLAS) ▪ Contract number(s): 19617 à 19621, 205568 et 217689 (un total de 7 contrats).
EC aid modality	Appui budgétaire sectoriel (en gestion décentralisée) et appui projet
Intervention Start date & End date	Début : 12/04/2007; Fin : 31/12/2011
Budget	Engagé: 15.000.000 € (13/01/2010) : 8,7 M€ pour l'appui budgétaire sectoriel et 6,3 M€ pour une aide complémentaire (appui projet). Contracté: 14 198 922 € (13/01/2010) Déboursé: 13 381 329 € (13/01/2010)
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): CE ▪ Implementing agencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volet I (Restructuration du Secteur Coton) : Maître d'ouvrage = Ordonnateur National (ON FED) ; Maître d'œuvre = Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances / MRSC (Mission de Restructuration du Secteur Coton); - Volet II: (alphabétisation) : AFD, APCAM (Assemblée Permanente des Chambres d'Agriculture) ; - Volet III : Ministère de l'Équipement et des Transports (MET) (BCS, § 1.3) ▪ Direct beneficiaries: Etat malien, association de producteurs de coton (Coopératives de Production de Coton – CPC, Unions de CPC), Union coopérative MOBIUM (Mouvement Biologique Malien, filière « coton bio »), IPC (Interprofession de la filière coton du Mali). ▪ Final beneficiaries: Producteurs Maliens de coton
Intervention Description	<p>La CF indique que l'intervention concertée de la CE et de l'AFD vise à appuyer la restructuration du secteur coton et la mise en œuvre du Cadre Stratégique de Développement du Secteur Coton (CSDSC) afin de favoriser un développement économique durable et équitable dans les zones cotonnières. Cela passe par une amélioration des revenus des producteurs de la zone cotonnière, mais aussi par la sécurisation et la diversification de ces revenus (CF, annexe 2, p3).</p> <p>Le document de synthèse de projet donne une description plus restreinte de l'intervention. Elle a pour objectif d'améliorer les performances institutionnelles et économiques de la filière coton et en particulier : (1) Mener à terme le processus de réforme engagé : filialisation et privatisation de la Compagnie Malienne de Développement des Textiles (CMDT) ; (2) Permettre aux producteurs d'acquérir une plus grande maîtrise de la filière, d'en assumer le rôle de catalyseur et de renforcer leur contrôle sur le processus de réforme et (3) Réhabilitation/ reconstruction d'environ 350 à 400 km de pistes dans les zones où les perspectives de développement (CE, Synthèse de projet, 2010).</p> <p>NB. Le financement comporte 3 composantes (CF, annexe 2, p.3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ un appui budgétaire sectoriel (AB) de 8,7 M€ divisé en 2 tranches fixes et 1 tranche variable assurant le financement des activités inscrites au Chronogramme Révisé du Processus de Réforme du Secteur Coton (CRPRSC) (CF ANNEXE 1) mises en œuvre par la MRSC dont une contribution au Fonds de Soutien garantissant la fonctionnalité de la filière jusqu'à la privatisation et amorçant la mise en place d'un dispositif de lissage; ▪ un appui projet de 6,3 M€ (budget engagé) comprenant : ▪ des actions d'alphabétisation fonctionnelle en direction des organes dirigeants des CPC afin de contribuer, en étroite complémentarité avec les actions du PASE II de

	<p>l'AFD (cadre logique, CF, annexe 3b) au renforcement des capacités des producteurs en matière de pilotage de la réforme puis du fonctionnement de la filière;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ un appui projet de réhabilitation de pistes cotonnières en direction de zones particulièrement enclavées et amenées à prendre une place significative dans le cadre du zonage des zones de production afin de préserver la qualité du coton graine récolté en réduisant le temps de stockage avant enlèvement pour égrenage.
<p>Programme Background & History</p>	<p>La filière cotonnière représente pour le Mali un enjeu fondamental dominant toutes autres productions agricoles. Le coton est le second produit d'exportation après l'or et est au centre des activités de 165.000 exploitations dont dépendent 3 millions de personnes (FIP, §3). Il contribue à hauteur de 30 à 50 % aux recettes d'exportation selon les années et à environ 10% du PIB. La CMDT reste la plus grande entreprise d'égrenage de coton du monde (CF, annexe II, p.2). Le secteur coton reste cependant fragile et la filière traverse de nombreuses difficultés. Les prix internationaux du coton, qui se vend en dollars US sur le marché mondial, sont au moment de la formulation du PARFC orientés à la baisse en raison des gains de productivité et des subventions qui pèsent sur le niveau des cours. Par ailleurs, la chute du dollar US par rapport à l'euro depuis le début de l'année 2002, pèse lourdement sur les prix exprimés en dollars US et convertis francs CFA. A prix au producteur constant et toutes autres choses égales par ailleurs, le seuil de rentabilité de la filière malienne est passé de moins de 50 cents la livre en 2001/02 à plus de 60 cents en 2005/06, sous le seul effet de la dépréciation du dollar EU par rapport à l'euro et par conséquent au franc CFA (CF, annexe II, p.2).</p> <p>La filière cotonnière représente donc un enjeu politique dont l'importance tend à paralyser les actions et réformes qui seraient nécessaires pour adapter la filière aux nouvelles conditions économiques (FIP, §3).</p> <p>La FIP (§5) mentionne que la tendance à la baisse du prix mondial du coton et l'inscription de la filière malienne dans l'économie libérale sont les principes de référence qui justifient la nécessité de réformer la filière pour lui permettre de conserver sa performance.</p> <p>Depuis 2001, un processus de réforme de la filière est en cours et le gouvernement a ainsi adopté une "Lettre de Politique de Développement du Secteur Coton" (LPDSC) à la suite des Etats Généraux du Coton qui définissaient une stratégie assortie d'un plan d'action couvrant la période 2001-2002 (CF, annexe II, p.2). Cette réforme, centrée sur la privatisation de la CMDT, veut renforcer la productivité de la filière, donner au coton une place prépondérante en matière de lutte contre la pauvreté, d'amélioration des conditions de vie des populations, de contribution à la croissance et, surtout, diminuer substantiellement le risque budgétaire que la filière entraîne sur le budget de l'Etat.</p> <p>Le Conseil des Ministres a adopté en 2003 un Plan d'Actions Actualisé de la LPDSC prévoyant notamment la privatisation de la CMDT à l'horizon 2006 par sa scission en trois ou quatre sociétés cotonnières privées. En 2004, le Président de la République a annoncé un report de la privatisation en 2008 en faisant valoir les difficultés auxquelles les privatisations en cours dans la sous-région étaient confrontées et la nécessité d'une plus grande implication des producteurs dans l'organisation et le fonctionnement de la filière (CF, annexe II, p.2).</p> <p>La réforme est donc centrée sur la libéralisation de la filière et la privatisation de la CMDT en situation de monopole étatique (Etat majoritaire) et connaissant des crises financières à répétition, en particulier depuis 1999, amplifiées par la nature peu compétitive de la filière malienne et par une agriculture extensive difficilement à même de s'adapter à de nouvelles conditions (FIP, §2).</p>

D'après la FIP, il résulte qu'une IPC (Interprofession Coton), une bourse électronique au coton fibre et l'OCC (Office de Classement du Coton) sont des préalables à la privatisation car ils constituent le paysage institutionnel dans lequel la privatisation se déroulera et dont les soumissionnaires devront tenir compte. Ces préalables sont prévus dans le CRPRSC (CF, ANNEXE 1).

La CF relève que, depuis la crise de 1999/2000, le gouvernement du Mali est intervenu à plusieurs reprises, soit sous forme d'avances remboursables et/ou de subventions auprès de la CMDT pour permettre à cette dernière de présenter aux banques commerciales une situation financière lui permettant de mener les activités d'achat du coton graine et la distribution des intrants aux producteurs (CF, annexe II, p.10).

En 2005, le gouvernement du Mali a adopté le Cadre Stratégique de Développement du Secteur Coton (CSDSC, CF ANNEXE 2) assorti d'un plan d'action « Chronogramme Révisé du Processus de Réforme du Secteur Coton (CRPRSC) » (CF ANNEXE 1) dont la mise en œuvre est confiée à la Mission de Restructuration du Secteur Coton (MRSC) pour mener à terme la privatisation et la libéralisation de la filière coton. Cette feuille de route de la privatisation et de la libéralisation de la filière coton constitue le document de référence unique tant pour le gouvernement que pour les partenaires techniques et financiers" (BCS, §1.1; Monit? report, p2; CF, annexe II, p.2.)

Le plan d'action du CSDC est chiffré à 350 M€ pour les années 2006 à 2008. Le coût de la mise en œuvre de la réforme y est estimé à 3,6 M€, sur base d'un chronogramme détaillé alors que 25 M€ sont budgétisés pour la mise en place d'une bourse coton, d'un office de classement du coton et d'un fonds de soutien au prix du coton (.FIP, §6).

Leçons apprises (CF, annexe 2, §2.6) :

- Les difficultés rencontrées pour la mise en œuvre de la réforme ont mis en évidence la complexité de la filière ainsi que les enjeux politiques, économiques et sociaux. C'est ainsi que la nouvelle stratégie de réforme comporte de multiples volets qui doivent permettre de conduire le changement sans déstabiliser la filière.
- La privatisation est insuffisante pour relever les grands défis auxquels la filière est confrontée. Les réformes en cours dans les filières de la sous-région montrent que si le double processus de privatisation et de libéralisation est indispensable pour affranchir les filières de la dépendance du budget de l'Etat et faire prévaloir une rationalité économique dans leur gestion, il ne permet pas à lui seul de relever les principaux défis auxquels la filière est confrontée à savoir, l'amélioration de sa compétitivité et la gestion de la volatilité des cours de la fibre.
- Le processus de recentrage de la CMDT sur l'égrenage et la commercialisation de la graine et de la fibre a fait émerger de nouvelles difficultés. Ainsi, les producteurs ne disposent pas encore des supports institutionnels adaptés ni des savoirs faire ni des ressources pour assurer dans de bonnes conditions les fonctions qui leur incombent désormais (ex. exécution des programmes annuels de réhabilitation/entretien des pistes).
- L'alphabétisation fonctionnelle est un préalable à toute réforme institutionnelle et à toute action de renforcement de la compétitivité - L'échec de certaines privatisations dans la sous-région montre que pour aboutir, les réformes structurelles doivent être soutenues par la mise en place d'un partenariat équilibré entre les sociétés cotonnières et les producteurs solidairement responsables des performances de la filière. La construction d'un tel partenariat adosse à des interprofessions exige des organisations de producteurs à caractère professionnel autonomes à la fois financièrement et

	<p>techniquement. Or, la mise sur pied d'un réseau performant d'organisations de producteurs reste un objectif irréaliste si elle ne s'appuie pas sur un nombre suffisant de personnes alphabétisées.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ L'amélioration de la qualité du coton graine passe par l'amélioration des conditions de récolte et de stockage, mais l'évacuation du produit à temps et dans de bonnes conditions constitue une garantie de meilleure qualité pour laquelle la réhabilitation et l'entretien des pistes cotonnières est stratégique. ▪ La mise en place d'un mécanisme de soutien s'avère nécessaire pour atténuer l'amplitude des variations des revenus des producteurs. En effet, le maintien du niveau des cours mondiaux à 59 cents/lb et une poursuite de la dépréciation du dollar par rapport au franc CFA ne permettront pas de respecter le prix de campagne tel que déterminé dans le cadre du protocole d'accord de janvier 2005. ▪ Pour le court/moyen terme, il n'existe pas d'alternative à la culture du coton: malgré son caractère peu rémunérateur dans certains cas, les producteurs la poursuivent car c'est la seule culture qui bénéficie d'un prix fixé à l'avance et qui garantisse l'accès au crédit agricole et donc aux intrants. Il importe donc dans un premier temps de travailler à la consolidation de la filière coton et à l'amélioration de sa productivité, en prenant en compte les besoins d'une diversification qui ne pourra se faire que sur le moyen/long terme.
Overall objectives	"Mener à terme le processus de réforme de la filière coton afin de rétablir la compétitivité et durabilité sur les marchés internationaux"
Specific objectives	<p>« Améliorer les performances institutionnelles et économiques de la filière coton » et en particulier :</p> <p><u>Objectif n° 1</u>: Mener à terme le processus de réforme engagé: conclusion du processus de filialisation et de la privatisation de la CMDT, mettre en place des organes de régulation de la filière, Réduire les effets de la volatilité des cours de la fibre sur le revenu du producteur par la mise en place d'un fonds de soutien puis d'un fonds de lissage</p> <p><u>Objectif n° 2</u>: Permettre aux producteurs d'acquérir une plus grande maîtrise de la filière, d'en assumer le rôle de catalyseur et de renforcer leur contrôle sur le processus de réforme</p> <p><u>Objectif n° 3</u>: Procéder à la réhabilitation/ reconstruction d'environ 350 à 400 km de pistes dans les zones où les perspectives de développement de la production sont importantes et dont l'enclavement compromet sérieusement la sortie à temps et dans de bonnes conditions de la production récoltée » (Synthèse de Projet, p.1)</p> <p>NB. Le document BCS observe que l'OG et les OS du PARFC de la CF (annexe 3a), ne sont pas identiques à l'OG et aux OS du cadre logique, tels que repris dans le document de synthèse du projet et qui sont pris en compte par la mission ROM.</p> <p>La seule différence apparente se situe dans la CF (annexe II, p.4 et annexe 3a) où l'OS est décliné en 4 objectifs. Les OS 1, 3 et 4 correspondent aux objectifs repris dans le document de synthèse du projet. L'objectif qui est ajouté dans la CF (objectif 2) est en fait dévolu à l'AFD (PASE II) et consiste à: « Conforter le dispositif de gestion interprofessionnelle par l'aménagement des relations Etat-Filière et par l'amélioration de l'information statistique et agro économique sur la filière ». En fait, le cadre logique de la CF (annexe 3a) est conforme avec celui du document de synthèse du projet.</p>
Expected results	"R1. Aboutissement du processus de privatisation de la CMDT et de libéralisation du secteur incluant : la privatisation des filiales issues de la CMDT assortie d'une participation des producteurs à leur capital, la libéralisation de la filière et la mise en place des organes de régulation et la mise en place d'un dispositif opérationnel de soutien intra-annuel puis inter-annuel des cours de coton (contribution au Fonds de Soutien et appui à la

	<p>conception d'un fonds de lissage) ;</p> <p>R2 La professionnalisation des producteurs et de leurs organisations et notamment les CPC et les UCPC est engagée incluant les organes dirigeants de la majorité des CPC (6 709) et de chacune des UCPC (300) comptent un minimum de 5 néo-alphabètes, les CPC/UCPC sont capables de conduire des actions d'alphabétisation en direction des producteurs individuels</p> <p>R3 L'amélioration de la desserte des zones visées afin de contribuer à la réduction des coûts et délais des transports des intrants comme du coton graine, faciliter l'évacuation du coton graine vers les usines d'égrenage en préservant sa qualité et une implication accrue des transporteurs privés dans les deux zones concernées » (Synthèse de Projet, p 1).</p>
Main Activities	<p>Par rapport : au volet I « Appui à la mise en œuvre de la réforme » : (1) fonctionnement de la MRSC ; (2) Soutien à la participation des producteurs aux concertations ; (3) Etudes/consultations menant à la privatisation de la CMDT ; recomposition du paysage institutionnel et fonctionnel de la filière (notamment mise en place d'une interprofession coton – IPC-) ; (4) Abondement du fonds de soutien mis en place</p> <p>Par rapport au volet II : « Projet d'Alphabétisation pour accroître la professionnalisation des producteurs et de leur organisations » : (1) Appui à la maîtrise d'œuvre d'APCAM ; (2) Conception et mise en œuvre des formations en alphabétisation ; (3) production de matériel pédagogique</p> <p>Par rapport au volet III : « réhabilitation de pistes » : (1) réhabilitation de 160km de pistes (région de Kita) et de 279km (région de Bougouni) (CL, annexe 3a).</p>
Main achievements	<p>Ce qui apparaît dans les documents, en particulier le rapport BCS de la mission ROM: I(1) effectué, mais annulation de la seconde tranche fixe (0,7 M€) destinée au MRSC⁸ ; I (4) effectué à hauteur de 5M€ (tranche variable)</p> <p>III (1) : terminé</p> <p>NB. Les 0,7M€ ont été alloués par la DCE au soutien de la filière « coton bio », activité non initialement prévue dans la CF.</p>
Main difficulties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ La fiche d'identification (§2, page 5) indique que la filière cotonnière représente pour le Mali un enjeu politique dont l'importance tend à paralyser les actions et réformes qui seraient nécessaires pour adapter la filière aux nouvelles conditions économiques. La fiche précise que différents chronogrammes ont été établis pour la réforme du secteur coton. Ils ont été marqués par des retards et/ou des propositions pour le rythme de mise en œuvre trop ambitieux voire irréalistes. ▪ Ces retards se sont poursuivis lors de la mise en œuvre du volet I du PARFC ayant pour conséquence l'annulation de la seconde tranche fixe (0,7 M€) destinée au MRSC ▪ En conséquence, relations très tendues DCE-MSRC (BCS, §2.1) ▪ Volet II (alphabétisation) en retard dû au retard du projet PASEII/AFD BCS, §2.1)
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Checklist for 1st step quality support – Identification phase ; avril 2005 (file

⁸ Le décaissement, en mars 2008, de la tranche variable de € 5 M pour le Fonds de Soutien (aux prix coton)) et des tranches fixes (€ 3 M, juin 2008) et € 0,7 M, non versé) est soumis à 4 conditionnalités générales: (1) poursuite du programme de réforme de la filière coton, (2) gestion satisfaisante des finances publiques; (3) mise en œuvre satisfaisante du CRPRSC, (4) comptes de la CMDT certifiés. En plus de ces conditionnalités générales, la convention prévoit des conditions particulières pour chaque tranche. Ainsi, au moment de la mission ROM (février 2010), le financement de la 2^{ème} tranche fixe (0,7 M €) était annulé pour non satisfaction à une conditionnalité de décaissement : non réalisation des travaux relatifs à l'ouverture du capital des filiales aux producteurs après la mise en œuvre de toutes les modalités de création des filiales (voir modalités de règlement des tranches d'appui budgétaire, CF, annexe II, p.16 ; annexe 6).

	<p>« 06031_checklist_quality_stepIC2_E1_E6rev.doc»</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fiche d'identification (FIP), mars 2006 (fichier « PIF.signed.pdf ») ▪ Etude sur la mise en place d'un fonds de soutien des prix du coton graine, rapport final, mars 2006 (fichier « 060731.Rapport Final FDS Mali 22 mars.doc ») ▪ Rapport de mission P. Herlant au Mali, juin 2006. (fichier « 060727.rapport mission PH juin Mali 2006 final.doc »). ▪ Procès-verbal : oQSG n°32/2006 de la direction C-ACP, septembre 2006 fichier « 060913.oqsg-C_minutes_final.doc »). ▪ Convention de financement n°9636/MLI, mars 2007 (fichier « CFsigné.pdf ») ▪ Lettre de l'ONFED relative à la CF 9636/MLI, juin 2007 (fichier « C2_0613102806_001.pdf ») ▪ Lettre de l'ONFED relative à la CF 9636/MLI, mars 2008 (fichier « Courrier ON décaissement 2008.pdf ») ▪ SYNTHÈSE DE PROJET (fichier « PS.pdf ») ▪ Demande accord attribution contrat de subvention, juillet 2009. (Fichier « AccordSubvention.pdf ») ▪ Convention DCE-AFD, juin 2009 (fichier « CDELAFD.pdf »). ▪ ROM -Monitoring report : Summary, 2010 (fichier « MR.pdf ») ▪ ROM Fiche récapitulative pour les conclusions (BCS), 26 février 2010 ▪ Meeting note reference numbers: xxxxxx
--	--

Intervention Title	Facilitating Agricultural Commodity Trade (FACT) in the Pacific PAC-FACT
Country / Region	Pacific. Project falls under the Pacific Regional Indicative Programme (addresses the focal sector (priority area) of Regional Economic Integration)
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2007/020-777 ▪ Contract number(s): 197168 (Contribution Agreement SPC)
EC aid modality	<i>(e.g. project approach, Sector Budget Support, Pool funding / Trust funds)</i>
Intervention Start date & End date	FA date: 18/10/2007 Contractors' signature date: 11/12/2007 Planned end date: 11/12/2012 Period of execution up to 31 December 2014
Budget	Planned: € 4,000,000 (RIP) no other donor contributions € 225 000 contribution from the beneficiary (SPC?) Committed: € 4,000,000 (as of January 2010) Contracted: € 3,905,000 (as of January 2010) Disbursed: € 1,461,012 (as of January 2010)
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission ▪ Implementing agencies: Secretariat of the Pacific Community (regional organisation) ▪ Direct beneficiaries: commercial farmers and forest resource owners with commercial enterprises ▪ Final beneficiaries: rural communities through increased incomes from trade activities
Intervention Description	<p>'FACT' aims to transform selected commercial ventures into export-oriented, demand-driven enterprises consistently supplying overseas markets with competitive products. FACT focuses on increasing the competitiveness of exports by addressing and, where necessary, upgrading substandard components of the supply chain of a limited number of representative export products, working with producers who already have some basic skills and experience in commercial production and marketing. This is done by identifying concrete activities along the supply chain that can assist producers in exporting their goods. The experience gained and case studies generated will assist the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and member country governments to disseminate information to the wider community and encourage the adoption of best practice techniques by all growers and exporters, thus ensuring that the project delivers long-term benefits on a broader scale.'</p> <p>In fact the PAC-FACT is thus designed as a pilot initiative, a small project with a very specific focus which has the potential to be upscaled if successful.</p> <p><i>Source: Project synopsis</i></p>
Programme Background & History	<p>Commodity trade is regionally recognised as the main priority for economic development in PACPS and is thus the centre of national policies and ODA strategies. The rural sector represents 40-80% of PACPS populations. Poor average annual agricultural growth rates over the past decade have worsened rural poverty, the deterioration of natural resources and food security.</p> <p>'Revenue from increased trade is expected to contribute to the alleviation of rural poverty by providing improved opportunities for rural communities. The most serious export problem is the lack of competitiveness of products on foreign markets, a problem that concerns the whole supply chain, including production, post harvest handling, downstream processing, packaging, marketing and presentation at points of sale. The improvement in the competitiveness of exports by commercial farmers is constrained by a lack of regular access to information and training due to inadequate or non-existent national information, communication and extension services, and by lack of access to</p>

	<p>financing to upgrade equipment and post-harvest facilities needed to supply competitive export products.’</p> <p><i>Source: Project Synopsis</i></p>
Overall objectives	To promote and increase trade in PACP countries (contributes to PRIP REA result 4: ‘increased volume and expanded range of exports from the Pacific Islands)
Specific objectives	To sustainably increase the quality and range of exports of agriculture and forestry products in and out of the Pacific region
Expected results	<p>(1) Expanded range of traded agricultural products.</p> <p>(2) Improved and sustained quality of traded agricultural products.</p> <p>(3) Achieved consistency of supply of traded agricultural products.</p>
Main Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Survey PACPS and select up to 15 new or existing enterprises and AGFOR export products ii) Develop commercially based selection criteria to narrow down the number of enterprises and use them to select the 15 enterprises iii) Analyse production, export and marketing requirements and design of supply systems for selected AGOR export enterprises from optimum locations. iv) Evaluate and refine above v) Facilitate the establishment, operation and ongoing improvements of production programmes for selected exports based on designed supply chains vi) Evaluate new species, varieties, breeds and products to increase quantity, range and diversity of exports vii) Facilitate reform of production and marketing policy and laws viii) Facilitate development of post harvest quality assurance, processing and packaging and operators skills to increase SPS compliance, market access, shelf life and reduce bulk, increase durability and add value to increase the competitiveness of export products ix) In collaboration with government agencies, PITIC and trade gents, facilitate exports and support promotions of Pacific products x) Provide ICT and training support in quality standards, post harvest processing, packaging, marketing, market access and compliance with SPS and Codex standards xi) Upscale and disseminate information on the project activities and results.
Main achievements	<p>The MR (2009) states it is early days yet to look at results but outputs produced so far were of great use to the AGFOR firms and the readiness with which they took up the project outputs and incorporated them in their own practices is a good indication that the project will most likely achieve its planned results within the current time frame of implementation.</p> <p>The project delivered a significant amount of survey and analysis prior to the identification of the strategic needs of individual AGFOR enterprises and started delivering certain outputs to some of the enterprises it works with. These include economic and systems analysis of production, export and marketing requirements and design as well as the development of business plans for some of the enterprises and the provision of technical support as well as improvements to a smaller group. Outputs are judged to be responding directly to the needs of the enterprises.</p> <p>Improvements being implemented include improved silviculture and germplasma for a balsa wood exporter, equipment and technical advice for an exporter of organic spices, the provision of an axis press for more efficient production of virgin coconut oil, advice on post-harvest and processing improvements, etc. Other project outputs include providing</p>

	<p>various of the enterprises with information on Good Manufacturing Practices, help in developing Quality Assurance Management Systems, value chain and market studies, training in HACCP (Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point) practices in order to help the exporters become HACCP certified, etc. These outputs respond directly to needs of the enterprises, are highly appreciated by these and are very likely to contribute to the intended results.</p> <p>The MR also cites some unplanned achievements: linking up of firms</p> <p><i>Source: MR124441.01 (09/2009)</i></p>
Main difficulties	So far no major difficulties or potential risks are noted by the MR.
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification Fiche (signed 11/10/2006) ▪ PS ▪ FA, Rider and Contribution Agreement ▪ MR124441.01 (09/2009) and RS ▪ Brochure 'FACT Project completes its second year', August 2010

Intervention Title	Insertion favorable des organisations paysannes professionnelles de la région de Kolda au Sénégal sur les marchés porteurs des filières sésame et noix de cajou (Anasame) SN-ONG
Country / Region	Sénégal, Région de Kolda
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: ONG-PVD/2006/018-227 ▪ Contract number(s): C-134472
EC aid modality	Ligne budgétaire ONG, ? projet (après appels à proposition ?)
Intervention Start date & End date	FA 12/12/2007 Start date: 01/01/2008 (48 mois) Final date planned: 31/12/2012
Budget	Ligne budgétaire 21 02 03 'Participation communautaire à des actions en faveur de pays en développement exécutées par des ONG' ⁹ (€208 158 340) ; ce projet fait partie du programme annuel de travail (PAT) 2006. Cout total : €928 246 dont 75% (€696 184) est demandé à la Commission ¹⁰ Committed: € 696 185 (as of date) Contracted: € xxx (as of date) Disbursed: € xxx (as of date)
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission et cofinancement avec l'ONG européenne AVSF-CICDA (Agronomes et Vétérinaires Sans Frontières) ▪ Implementing agencies: Comité de Lutte pour la Fin de la Faim (COLUFIFA) ▪ Direct beneficiaries: 2.500 familles productrices de sésame et d'anacarde regroupées au sein de 3 organisations faitières : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fédération Départementale des producteurs d'anacarde de Vélingara (500 familles) - Fédération des producteurs de Vélingara (en cours de structuration – 500 familles) ▪ AAJAC-COLUFIFA (1.500 familles) ▪ Final beneficiaries: 10.000 familles impliquées dans la production de sésame ou d'anacarde dans la région par effet de régulation des prix, en ciblant sur les familles en situation précaire.
Intervention Description	Sous la ligne budgétaire ONG, co-financement d'un projet de développement de la production et commercialisation (en vue de l'exportation) du sésame et de l'anacarde dans une région du Sénégal. L'action proposée s'inscrit largement dans une optique de renforcement des capacités des acteurs locaux organisé autour d'organisations professionnelles agricoles performantes et représentatives vouées à assurer l'amélioration des revenus des populations paysannes à la base par l'accès aux marchés porteurs, aux services de conseil et d'appui, aux moyens de productions.
Programme Background & History	La région de Kolda dispose d'un potentiel agricole important, mais c'est également la deuxième région la plus pauvre du pays. Les causes de cette situation sont multiples : i) faiblesse de la rémunération de la production agricole, liée à une productivité agricole faible ; ii) faiblesse des revenus extra-agricoles; iii) enclavement de la région et éloignement des marchés porteurs ; iv) difficultés pour l'accès à l'équipement agricole (traction

⁹ 'Ce projet vise notamment à aider les populations défavorisées par le biais du cofinancement avec des ong européennes, à informer et sensibiliser l'opinion publique européenne aux problèmes de développement et à renforcer la coopération et la coordination entre les ONG et les institutions communautaires.'

¹⁰ Les bénéficiaires participent également aux couts mais les contributions concrètes demandées en contrepartie de l'aide ne sont pas vraiment l'objet d'un contrat ou d'un suivi. Les contributions des bénéficiaires concernent (suivant le type d'appui) : i) le terrain et la fourniture de matériaux locaux et de main d'œuvre ; ii) l'entretien; iii) une contribution au fonds de roulement (5%).

	animale). Le projet se propose d'apporter des solutions au travers d'un appui à l'accès aux marchés à forte valeur ajoutée bien valorisés par le marché du commerce équitable et de la certification biologique, ceci par le renforcement des capacités d'intervention et de gestion de 3 organisations paysannes faitières de la région : AJAAC COLIFIFA dans le département de Sedhiou, Fédération des producteurs d'anacarde et Fédération des producteurs de sésame dans le département de Vélingara.
Overall objectives	L'amélioration des revenus issus de l'agriculture dans la région de Kolda, pour lutter contre la pauvreté des ménages ruraux, en particulier des familles vulnérables, par le maintien de systèmes de production durables.
Specific objectives	Renforcer les capacités d'organisations paysannes professionnelles par une insertion favorable sur les marchés de qualité (Commerce équitable et biologique) du sésame et des noix de cajou, notamment
Expected results	<p>R1. Des alternatives commerciales durables à haute valeur ajoutée sont maîtrisées directement par les organisations paysannes consolidées, en exploitant notamment les segments de marché du commerce équitable et de la certification AB (noix de cajou, huile de sésame et source de diversification comme fonio et riz de bas-fond) ;</p> <p>R2. La productivité des systèmes de production est améliorée durablement grâce à une gestion optimisée de la fertilité et à l'amélioration de l'accès aux moyens de production et</p> <p>R3. Les Organisations Faitières, renforcées notamment au niveau de leurs groupements de base, participent activement aux débats de politique sectorielle et mènent des actions de plaidoyer.</p>
Main Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. Appui-conseil des organisations dans les processus de certification (FLO et AB) 1.2. Appui à l'accès aux marchés et promotion commerciale 1.3. Programme d'appui à la mise en marché 1.4. Mise en place de centres communautaires de collecte, transformation et conditionnement (noix de cajou et huile de sésame) 2.1. Programme d'optimisation des systèmes de gestion de la fertilité par la promotion de la stabulation en saison sèche (optimisation de l'usage de la fumure, cultures fourragères). 2.2. Programme de crédit d'équipement agricole aux exploitations familiales pour accès aux moyens de production (culture attelée, petits équipements d'exploitation, stabulation) 3.1. Programme de renforcement organisationnel des groupements de base et organisations faitières 3.2. Voyage d'étude et d'échanges des responsables, des salariés et de membres des organisations faitières
Main achievements	<p>D'après le MR le projet progresse bien avec l'ensemble des activités prévues commencées et notamment la certification AB acquise (mais devant être renouvelée régulièrement). Un dispositif de collecte des productions de sésame a été mis en place, des prospections commerciales ont été menées et certains contrats de vente ont été passés.</p> <p>Pour l'anacarde, deux centres de conditionnement ont été installés. Pour la fertilité, un nombre limité de compostières (5 sur Vélingara, aucune à Sedhiou), sont entrées en fonctionnement. Des formations en culture attelée ont été dispensées et certains producteurs vont pouvoir accéder aux crédits d'équipement.</p>
Main difficulties	Pour le sésame, on relève de faibles quantités de production (plus faible que prévues) suite à une défection partielle de nombreux producteurs (vente directe) et de mauvais rendements. La masse critique pour réaliser des exportations n'est pas atteinte, mais les perspectives pour la campagne 2010 sont favorables.

	<p>Un certain nombre de défauts relevés incluent : procédures de gestion perfectibles, non prise en compte d'exigence techniques agro-alimentaire « Bio »: « marche en avant », séparations des flux, stockage produits finis, traçabilité. De plus, une faiblesse des RH pour gérer les approvisionnements, la transformation et la mise en marché des produits transformés de bonne qualité est notée (avec notamment, la comptabilité simplifiée par activité non systématique entraînant des difficultés d'analyse de la rentabilité des unités de transformation). La chaîne de contrôle qualité est encore imparfaitement définie et maîtrisée. De façon générale, les résultats sont intéressants et prometteurs, mais quantitativement trop réduits pour laisser entrevoir une atteinte significative des résultats à court terme, en termes quantitatifs. Il n'est pas réellement identifié à ce stade d'effet négatif ou positif non planifié.</p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Synthèse de Projet (PS) ▪ Communication du 15 Juin 2006 sur l'adoption du PAT 2006 et les décisions de financement qui en résultent au titre de la ligne budgétaire 21 02 03 ▪ Monitoring Report MR-128528.01 du 12/03/2010 ▪ VSF-CICDA commentaires au MR ▪ Rapport de mission de la Délégation au projet de Juillet 2010. ▪ VSF-CICDA, Rapport annuel d'activités du projet ANASAME, Année 2009 ▪ Etude de la filière Anacarde, Rapport Final, Baobab Saveurs. 2010. ▪ Etude de la filière Sésame, Rapport Final, Baobab Saveurs. 2010. ▪ Meeting note reference numbers

Intervention Title	Implementation and Coordination of Agricultural Research & Training (ICART) in the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) Region SAR-RES
Country / Region	Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) Member States/ Region
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financing Agreement N° 9053/REG ▪ Accounting number: 9 ACP SAD 001 ▪ Identification number: REG/7438/000 ▪ Decision number: FED/2003/016-361
EC aid modality	Project/Programme-based approach
Intervention Start date & End date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Start: 14 November 2003 (as date of financing agreement) ▪ End (planned and likely): 31 December 2010 (operational implementation phase) and 31 December 2012 (execution phase) <p>It should be noted that there were administrative and procedural delays in starting the ICART programme due to some incompatibilities between the design of the programme, based on the 8th EDF conditions, and its implementation under the 9th EDF regulations. Consequently, both the Regional Authorising Officer and the EC decided to revise the original programme concept of ICART 1 (signed at the end of 2003) slightly to extend the time for implementation of all programme activities. Corresponding changes have been integrated in the new ICART 2 financing agreement which was signed at the end of 2006.</p>
Budget	Planned: €10.2 M (as date of 2003) Committed: € 10.2 M (as date of 2003) Contracted: € 8,98 M (as date of 2006) Disbursed: € 6.38 M (as date of 2006)
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission (RIP-EDF, and also EPRD South Africa) ▪ Implementing agencies: Technical assistance, steering group committee, the SADC Secretariat, a coordinating unit (within FANR Directorate) as well as a Technical Advisory Committee ▪ Direct beneficiaries: SADC Member States, research networks and universities ▪ Final beneficiaries: Agricultural researchers ▪ Indirect beneficiaries: researchers Small scale farmers' of the SADC Member States <p>It has been noted by the MTR (2008) that NARS in the SADC Member States do not constitute a clearly defined group of beneficiaries. There are neither membership rules, nor does a statute or regulation exist for NARS.</p>
Intervention Description	<p>The ICART programme will address common regional researchable constraints and opportunities in agriculture. It will improve the capacity of National Agricultural Research System (NARS) to manage regional initiatives, thereby making a major contribution to the long-term sustainability of regional research as well making important inputs to the SADC rural development sector.</p> <p>The proposed sub-regional programme to support agricultural research and training in Southern Africa will have the following four components:</p> <p>1. Institutional support to the SADC Secretariat (€ 3.60 million) to increase its capacity to: i) promote regional integration of agricultural research activities by developing a strong articulation between the different levels of research implementation (national, sub-regional and regional and ii) play a role as the Sub-Regional Organization (SRO) member of the Forum for the Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA) to coordinate the agricultural research and training in SADC region.</p>

	<p>2. Support to Research Networks (RN) development (€ 2.95 million) for researchers or professionals who have a common scientific interest and share interest for networking activities such as exchange of information, dissemination of results, organization of workshops or seminars and promotion of training programmes. New networks will be proposed and some of the current networks may be merged to be more consistent with the research areas, defined as regional priorities.</p> <p>3. Regional Research Projects (RP) to be implemented through mechanisms of "Competitive Grant Funds" (€ 5.60 million). The objectives of this component are: i) to reduce the high level of rural poverty mainly by making agriculture more competitive to raise the poor farmers' income; ii) to offset the high rate of natural resource degradation, with focus on soil, water and biodiversity; iii) to develop effective rural policy options, institutional and farmers organizations to support the agricultural production systems and to link the farmers to the market. Technologies proposed will also have to take into account the socio-economic aspect links to the negative impact of the HIV/AIDS on the agricultural production and productivity as well the role of women farmers.</p> <p>4. Specific activities of Information, Communication and Training (€ 2.35 million) that cannot be funded through competitive funds such as establishment of a sub-regional interactive information system, editing of a sub-regional newsletter, establishment of a regional scholarship fund, development and improvement of teaching materials.</p>
Programme Background & History	The Strategic plan for the agricultural research and training in Southern Africa approved by the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) Region is a result of wide consultations with regional experts and stakeholders. The Strategy is a basis for the forging of new research institutions coalition involved in agricultural research and training for the benefit of the "Recipient Region : SADC Region", especially the small-scale farmers, in Southern Africa who have been kept out of the mainstreams of agricultural development efforts by former agricultural policies farmer community. The objective of the strategy is to develop the necessary structures, resources, products, procedures and operations to contribute to regional economy growth and poverty alleviation.
Overall objectives	The overall objective of the ICART programme is to contribute to regional economic growth and poverty alleviation by organizing in the SADC region, innovative research and training activities aiming at overcoming the constraints to achieve a sustainable use of natural resources through improved technologies and policies that will enable resource-poor smallholders to achieve improvements in their livelihoods.
Specific objectives	The regional research programme of actions will enable National Agricultural Research System (NARS) in the 14 SADC countries to enhance their national efforts in order to improve incomes of small-scale farmers, processors, traders and other beneficiaries while maintaining the natural resource base. By addressing common regional researchable constraints and opportunities in agriculture, the programme will also improve the capacity of NARS to manage regional initiatives, thereby making a major contribution to the long-term sustainability of regional research as well making important inputs to the SADC rural development sector.
Expected results	Through the implementation and coordination of agricultural research and training programme in the Southern Africa SADC will achieve the following results:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Result 1:</u> SADC has the regional capacity to coordinate agricultural research and training. SADC Secretariat will have developed the capacity to act as a sub-regional organisation (SRO) to promote and coordinate operations for agricultural research and training. ▪ <u>Result 2:</u> Research Networks are established in accordance with the research priorities for the SADC region. Networking activities are separated from research activities. New Networks have been established and some of the current networks have been merged to be more consistent with the regional research priorities. ▪ <u>Result 3:</u> The Competitive Fund System (CFS) has improved performance of the regional agricultural research and training programme. The regional consortia have addressed regional research priorities through a demand driven approach. Cooperation mechanisms have been developed between partners. Priority has been given to address issues for small-scale farmers' development. ▪ <u>Result 4:</u> Competitively funded research projects provide results and outputs to meet rural development needs. Relevant outputs or technologies are available for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Efficient use of natural resources and improvement of sustainable market-oriented smallholders' production systems. The developed technologies take into account the HIV/AIDS socio-economic impacts on the agricultural production and productivity as well the role of women farmers in this particular context. - Natural resource conservation, with focus on soil, water and biodiversity. New research-farmer-extension linkages and developed farmers' organizations are improving transfer and adoption of technology to support the agricultural production systems. ▪ <u>Result 5:</u> A regional information system is operating. A regional research information and communication system based on regional Research & Development outputs is providing products to disseminate the programme results and support rural development ▪ <u>Result 6:</u> The scholarship fund has strengthened the regional training capacity. The sub-regional Scholarships fund has strengthened the sub-regional MSc programme and the technical training capacity in agricultural and veterinary sectors.
Main Activities	<p>The activities required to achieve the results are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Activities for result 1:</u> Strengthen SADC management capacity <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. Recruitment of 4 regional staff positions (Regional Coordinator, Program Officer, Financial officer SADC Financial Department, Information and training Officer) 1.2. Establishment of a SADC Steering Committee for the Agricultural Research and Training programme 1.3. Establishment of a Stakeholders Conference common for all the programmes and networks. ▪ <u>Activities for result 2:</u> Establish Research Networks (RN) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Organize a regional workshop to define relevant Research Networks according to regional research priorities 2.2. Establish a specific management structure for each RN 2.3. Develop a 5-year strategic plan and annual works plan and budget for research and capacity building of each RN 2.4. Implement agreed annual work plans, monitor performance and reporting channel for the RN management

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define mechanisms to improve linkages between RN to ensure cross-network information flow ▪ <u>Activities for result 3:</u> Improve the performance of the regional research through the establishment and organization of the Competitive Fund System (CFS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1. Develop a plan for preparing calls for competitive research proposals. 3.2. Establish a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for project appraisal and selection. 3.3. Hold an extraordinary Steering Committee meeting to officialise procedures for the competitive funds system management. ▪ <u>Activities for result 4:</u> Implementation of Competitively Funded Research Projects to address rural development priorities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1. Selection of research projects submitted by regional Consortia in the following priority research domains: i) Development and improvement of sustainable market-oriented smallholder Production systems; ii) Sustainable management of natural resources & environment and iii) Empowerment of institutions for rural development. Projects will be selected according to their capacity to develop technologies for a more efficient use of natural resources, to improve smallholders' production systems; to take into account the current impact of the HIV/AIDS on the agricultural productivity and to address the specific constraints of women farmers. ▪ <u>Activities for result 5:</u> Establish the Regional Information and Communication Programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1. Develop electronic information sources, databases and web site. 5.2. Develop ICM-ICT and undertake capacity building to improve availability and use of electronic information resources. ▪ <u>Activities for result 6:</u> Establish the Regional Training Programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.1. Develop teaching materials and tools based on local resources to make university teaching more effective and relevant to local situations. 6.2. Establish a sub-regional Scholarships fund for postgraduate and professional training. 6.3. Identify mechanisms to ensure research and training synergies.
Main achievements	<p>According to the MTR (October 2008), main achievements of the programme were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ many researches have already been participating in formal and informal research networks, while the ICART programme has not yet established research networks according to research priorities for the SADC region; ▪ all competitive research grant funds have been allocated to seven projects and regional research cooperation has been successfully promoted as all projects include several SADC Member States; ▪ research projects did not demonstrate improved effectiveness and research is still more descriptive than analytical. So, these projects will bring a modest contribution to economic development of the region and its Member States; ▪ much time has been devoted to design a strategy for the development of the information system, but this strategy is still only at a draft stage; ▪ there were serious delays in the MSc programmes due to administrative problems of the participating universities but they are now working.
Main difficulties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Delay in the implementation of the programme, with the publication of the Situation analysis of Agricultural Research in July 2008 (while the programme was launched in 2003) and due to the death of the ICART project manager. Only 18 months later, a new Coordination Unit (CU) team was put in place ▪ Lack of understanding of the programme purpose on behalf of the stakeholders;

	<p>ICART is not seen as a special project to build-up NARS capacity and to compliment their on-going activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communication issues (no evidence of regular meetings, no briefing of the new Technical Assistance team, little communication to SADC Member States, etc.) ▪ Lack of cooperation and communication between the project manager and the Steering Committee ▪ Monitoring issues: The SADC Secretariat did not ensure overall monitoring of the programme according to EDF rules, monitoring was not used as a tool, no sufficient monitoring visits to SADC Member States and NARS ▪ Delays in the organisation of MSc programmes due to administrative issues with involved universities
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financing Agreement N° 9053/ REG, including annexes (e.g. technical and administrative provisions for implementation) ▪ Programme estimate No 9ACPSAD 001- V2, start-up period from 1st November 2004 to 30th April 2005, 14 November 2003 ▪ Monitoring report (ref.: 01954.01), 21 February 2007, including the project synopsis ▪ Mid Term Evaluation Mission, Final report, Delegation of the EC in Botswana, October 2008 ▪ Annual Report, 1st April 2006-31 March 2007 ▪ Regional Training Programme (RTP), guidelines for grant applicants responding to the call for proposals 2005-2006 ▪ Competitive Regional Agricultural Research Fund (ICART CRARF), guidelines for grant applicants responding to the call for proposals 2005-2006 ▪ Terms of Reference for the Consultancy to undertake a Situation Analysis in order to assess, and formulate support strategies for, the National Agricultural Research Systems and Agricultural Research Networks in the SADC Region (EUROPEAID/ 119860/C/SV/multi) ▪ ICART, Situation Analysis of Agricultural research and training in SADC region (Tanzania), July 2008 ▪ ICART Interim Project Coordinator, Draft Final Report (for mission November 2005 – June 2006), June 2006 ▪ ICART, Inception Report, 1st February 2006 to 31st March 2006, Programme Coordination Unit ▪ ICART, Programme estimate n° 2, Operational Period from 1st February 2006 to 31st March 2007 ▪ ICART, Programme estimate n° 2, Operational Period from 1st April 2007 to 30th September 2008 ▪ ICART, First Quarterly Report for the period April 2006 to June 2006 ▪ ICART, Second Quarterly Report for the period 1st July 2006 to 30th September 2006 ▪ ICART, Fourth Quarterly Report for the period 1st January 2007 to 31st March 2007 ▪ ICART, Fifth Quarterly Report for the period April 2007 to June 2007 ▪ Situation Analysis of Agricultural Research and Training in the SADC – Tanzania, July 2008

Intervention Title	Support project to strengthen commercial capacities of agricultural producers in Tanzania TZ-ONG
Country / Region	Tanzania (United Republic of)
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget line: ONG-PVD/2004/006-239 ▪ Reference number of the Grant contract: ONG-PVB/2005/096-162
EC aid modality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project-based approach (through NGOs)
Intervention Start date & End date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Start: 1/04/2006 ▪ End: 31/03/2009
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planned: 734,319 € ▪ Committed: 734,319 € ▪ Contracted: 734,319 € ▪ Disbursed: 734,319 €
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission ▪ Implementing agencies: Association FERT (France) and Mviwata (Tanzania) ▪ Direct beneficiaries: Producer organisations located in four regions of Tanzania (Morogoro, Dodoma, Iringa and Tanga) ▪ Final beneficiaries: Small-scale farmers
Intervention Description	<p>The Support Project to Strengthen Commercial Capacities of Agricultural producers in Tanzania had six key results and a corresponding number of activities. Expected outputs included benefiting from rural markets development project, developing management skills for four market boards which should ultimately lead to them being autonomous, construction of two new half bulk rural markets, building up of strong farmers' groups and develop sustainable marketing links, creation of a market information centre and promotion of Tanzanian agricultural products.</p> <p><i>Source: ROM reports, 22 December 2006</i></p>
Programme Background & History	<p>Mviwata, a network of farmers and FERT, a French organization, jointly implemented the Support Project to Strengthen Commercial Capacities of Agricultural Producers. Drawing on experiences gained from implementation of a previous Rural Markets Development Project (RMDP), and the agriculture sector policy objectives.</p> <p>The project is aligned to the national agricultural policy strategy and objective of improving the living conditions in the rural areas through increased income generation from agricultural and livestock production, processing and marketing. Building on this, the project intended to contribute to the creation of an enabling production and marketing environments.</p> <p><i>Source: ROM reports, 22 December 2006</i></p>
Overall objectives	The project's overall objectives were to improve the marketing conditions of agricultural products in Tanzania and thereby to increase and secure farmers income.
Specific objectives	Not specified.
Expected results	<p>Six key results were expected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Result 1: Capitalization and diffusion of experience on rural markets ▪ Result 2: Strengthening of the four existing markets ▪ Result 3: Creation and management of two rural markets ▪ Result 4: Support to producers' groups ▪ Result 5: Development of an economic information system ▪ Result 6: Promotion of agricultural products

Main Activities	Six activities were identified, namely capitalisation & dissemination of RMDP experiences, strengthening the management of four market boards, organisational and technical support to farmers' groups, development of an economic information system and promotion of agricultural products in economic forums at national and international levels.
Main achievements	<p>Achievements are presented by result:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Result 1 - Capitalization and diffusion of experience on rural markets: distribution of a comic book on the involvement of farmers' leaders in supporting marketing, transfer of experience in terms of marketing, visits to the markets, writing of the "rural markets" capitalisation document, project evaluation; ▪ Result 2 - Strengthening of the four existing markets: market assessments, better links between markets, financial management of the markets is improved, negotiations with districts for the renewal of the contracts, support to market boards and support to the marketing information system implementation in Morogoro markets and related support to markets; ▪ Result 3 - Creation and management of two rural markets: identification of the market places, market design and tendering, markets construction, support to the market boards, purchase of market equipment, legal registration of the market companies, agreements with district authorities, promotion of the markets in the surrounding villages and main cities, inauguration of the markets and start of the operations of the markets; ▪ Result 4 - Support to producers' groups: creation of producer's groups, grain storage on the markets, support to orange producers; ▪ Result 5 - Development of an economic information system: carrying out the initial Market Information System (MIS) survey, definition of the main features of the MIS, development of the management and perspectives of the MIS; ▪ Result 6 - Promotion of agricultural products: participation to national events, visits to the rural markets and to the market unit <p><i>Source: Final Narrative report, period from 1st April 2006 to 31st March 2009, June 2009</i></p>
Main difficulties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sustainability of the markets, notably due to the volume of traded agricultural products in the new created markets; ▪ Difficulty to analyse the price trends because of the multitude of other (external) parameters that influence agricultural prices; ▪ Optimise the rural markets' impact by supporting the surrounding producers in all their productive activities; ▪ Districts authorities do consider created markets as a source of income than a tool to local development; ▪ Lack of perspectives of the market unit to generate its own resources <p><i>Source: Final Narrative report, period from 1st April 2006 to 31st March 2009, June 2009</i></p>
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ROM reports (project synopsis, monitoring report and EC response sheet), 22 December 2006 ▪ Final Narrative report, period from 1st April 2006 to 31st March 2009, June 2009 ▪ Note: The project was closed by the time of the evaluator's field mission and the regions in which the project had been implemented were not amongst those visited.

Intervention Title	Establishing an export market for certified responsible coffee with smallholder producer groups in Uganda UG-COF
Country / Region	Uganda
Commission Ref.	ONG-PVD/2005/096123
EC aid modality	Project Approach. Grant to a NGO following a call for proposals
Intervention Start date & End date	Start date: May 2006 End date: May 2010
Budget	Planned: €690,370 Committed: €690,370 Contracted: €690,360 Disbursed: €621,333 as of January 2010
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission: €690,370 (72%); Stichting Solidaridad: €169,401 (18%) ▪ Implementing agencies: Stichting Solidaridad + Kulika Charitable Trust as local implementing partner ▪ Direct beneficiaries: Smallholders growing coffee ▪ Final beneficiaries: Smallholders growing coffee in the Kamuli district
Intervention Description	<p>The project is located in the Kamuli district in the central eastern region of Uganda. The project implementation involves the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Selection of some 3,000 farmers of which 2,000 have already undergone a USAID-funded training programme (completed in 2004) and have established a direct commercial link with the coffee company Ibero Uganda; ▪ Assessment of the needs and constraints to implement a total quality improvement concept in compliance with the UTZ Kapeh Code of Conduct ▪ Appointment, among farmers belonging to the first group, of “key farmers” in the proportion of one key farmer for 25 farmers ▪ Training of key farmers on coffee quality improvement and implementation of the UTZ Code of Conduct ▪ Provision of extension service by the key farmers to their fellow farmers ▪ Certification of farmers ▪ Conclusion of a buying arrangement between Ibero Uganda and certified farmers ▪ Provision to farmers of logistical support (warehouse facilities, transport services, etc.)
Programme Background & History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Solidaridad was the founding father of the Max Havelaar label ▪ Kulika Charity Trust is an Ugandan NGO providing scholarships and implementing community-based development programmes. ▪ UTZ CERTIFIED (formerly UTZ KAPEH) is a coffee certification program launched in 2002, which claims to be the largest coffee certifier in the world. It is a foundation for the worldwide implementation of a baseline standard for responsible coffee growing and sourcing. UTZ certified cooperatives, estate farms and producer groups comply with the Code of Conduct, an internationally recognized set of criteria for professional coffee growing, which includes socially and environmentally appropriate coffee growing practices, and efficient farm management. UTZ certified coffee is sold in more than 20 consuming countries, including the Netherlands, Belgium, France, UK, Scandinavia, Switzerland, Japan, US and Canada. UTZ certified coffee producers are located in Latin America, Asia and Africa. ▪ Ibero Uganda Limited is a company of Neumann Kaffee Gruppe based in Hamburg, Germany
Overall objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contribute to sustainability, pro-poor growth and social equity coffee farming of Uganda

Specific objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide Ugandan smallholder coffee growers access to the emerging market for mainstream certified responsible coffee.
Expected results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Higher incomes through improved yields and better base prices through the improved quality of coffee
Main Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support smallholder farmers in implementing a total quality improvement concept; ▪ Assist smallholders in complying with the Utz Kapeh code of conduct for certified responsible coffee ▪ Setting up an organisational structure through which farmers will be able to directly access the international market for certified coffee
Main achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 141 key farmers have been trained, who in turn have trained group members through farmer to farmer extension. ▪ The UTZ Certified Code of Conduct Certification was awarded in November 2007. ▪ Compliance with this code has led to premiums on certified coffee, higher incomes through improved yields and better base prices. Historically, responsible and traceable coffee yields an average premium of 10% above current market prices. ▪ Establishment of 4 coffee nursery sites with 177,000 seedlings as clean planting materials for the farmers for increased coffee acreage and productivity. <p>Information taken from the Kalikula Website on 24/11/2010 The monitoring of the project, carried out one year after its start, was very positive.</p>
Main difficulties	No information regarding this project has been found during the desk and the field phases
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant Contract between the European Commission and the Stichting Interkerkelijke Actie voor Latijns America Solidaridad ▪ Monitoring Report dated May 2007 ▪ www.kulika.org (Website of the Kulika Charity Fund) ▪ Wikipedia: article on UTZ Certified ▪ MN 301 to 313

Intervention Title	Sector Budget Support to the Programme of Modernisation of Agriculture in Uganda UG-SBS
Country / Region	Uganda
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2004/017-36 ▪ Contract number(s): 193739 / 193740 / 193741
EC aid modality	Sector Budget Support
Intervention Start date & End date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Start date: 2005 (FA signature by Ugandan MoF in March 2005) ▪ End date: 2007 ▪ Duration: 36 months
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planned: €17,500,000 ▪ Committed: €17,500,000 ▪ Contracted: €17,500,000 ▪ Disbursed: €17,500,000 in three instalments of €5,69 million, €6,65 million and €5,16 million)
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): Some 20 donors, the major ones being the European Union, Denmark, Ireland, IFAD, African Development Bank, United Kingdom and the World Bank support implementation of the PMA using various aid modalities such as general budget support, earmarked budget support, sector programme support and project aid. ▪ Implementing agencies: The National Agricultural Research System (NARS) and the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS), which are separate semi-autonomous bodies within the budget of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries. ▪ Direct beneficiaries: Agricultural Research Centres; Providers of extension services ▪ Final beneficiaries: Farmers
Intervention Description	<p>The intervention is a non-targeted sectoral budget support to the implementation of two components of the PMA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The development under coordination and supervision by NARS of a demand-driven smallholder oriented agricultural research system effectively linked to ... ▪ A functional system of agricultural extension services provided by private operators with subsidies of NAADS. <p>Although the SBS is not targeted, the Technical and Administrative Provisions annexed to the Financing Agreement propose a breakdown of the €17.5 million provided by the EC between NARS and NAADS.</p> <p>It must be noted that this project, which supports agricultural research and extension, does not have a particular focus on agricultural commodities.</p>
Programme Background & History	<p>In 2000 the GoU adopted a 10-year Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture as an implementation component of its Poverty Eradication Action Plan (first adopted in 1997, then updated in 2004).</p> <p>The PMA mission is eradicating poverty by "transforming subsistence agriculture to commercial agriculture."</p> <p>The PMA is a poverty focused framework of principles whose main objectives are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ increase incomes and improve the quality of life of poor subsistence farmers through increased productivity and increased share of marketed production; ▪ improve household food security through the market rather than emphasizing self sufficiency; ▪ provide gainful employment through the secondary benefits of PMA implementation such as agro-processing factories and services; ▪ promote sustainable use and management of natural resources by developing a land

	<p>use and management policy and promotion of environmentally friendly technologies. Prior to the SBS in support of the PMA, the EC had supported through Stabex funds two components of the PMA: agricultural research (National Agricultural Research System – NARS) and extension services (National Agricultural Advisory Services – NAADS).</p>
Overall objectives	<p>The OO of the EC SBS to the PMA is to enhance rural livelihoods. The objective is derived from Pillar 2 of the Uganda PRSP, the PEAP of October 2004, which aims at enhancing production, competitiveness and incomes.</p>
Specific objectives	<p>The purpose of the EC SBS to PMA is to increase agricultural productivity and profitability in a sustainable manner, as a means to increase rural incomes and enhance rural livelihoods</p>
Expected results	<p>Within the broad PMA framework, the EC SBS to the PMA will contribute to the further roll-out of the NAADS and the start-up and subsequent execution of the NARS reforms. Expected results are:</p> <p>NARS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A cost-effective institutional set-up with well-managed zonal and national research stations established; ▪ Effective farmer- and client-led structures for articulating research priorities are in place and determine the zonal research agenda; ▪ Relevant research programmes are being implemented through both core and competitive (innovation, national zonal) grants; ▪ Human and physical resources of the NARS are in place to respond to the research needs; ▪ Research providers to generate relevant agricultural technologies are identified, registered, audited and capacitated; ▪ The NARS programme is efficiently and effectively managed and its operations monitored. <p>NAADS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Different categories of farmers have demand-driven access to appropriate advice and guidance for the operation of their farming/agri-business enterprises; ▪ Appropriate technologies are made available through close linkages with adaptive research to meet identified farmer needs, and market linkages are established; ▪ The quality of advice and information made available by service providers is assured through the establishment and enforcement of service standards; ▪ The capacity of service providers to meet farmers’ operational needs is developed; ▪ An appropriate institutional structure and capacities are developed at both the national and district levels to enable the programme to operate effectively (including a programme management and monitoring system being put in place)
Main Activities	<p>NARS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishment of the National Agricultural Research Council (NARC); ▪ Restructuring of the institutions that are to remain as part of the realigned national agricultural research system; ▪ Allocation of core funds for the carrying out of “strategic” research and of other funds that are to be the subject of competitive bidding open to all agricultural research service providers ▪ Development of the capacity of research service providers ▪ Implementation of a monitoring and evaluation system ▪ Support to the governance and management structures for the competitive grants. <p>NAADS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advisory and information service for farmers ▪ Technology development and linkages with markets ▪ Regulation and technical auditing of service providers

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Private sector institutional development ▪ Programme management and monitoring.
Main achievements	<p>“There exists evidence for increase of coverage of extension services and intensification of agricultural research and NAADS objectives have been achieved; however the extension services reach only part of the farmers at district or sub-county level.”</p> <p>NAADS: “The EC has supported Ugandan extension services since 2001 under a project approach, and since 2004 under a sector-wide approach. Thus it is reasonable to assume that observed changes have been partly achieved thanks to EC’s support and EC’s permanent participation in sector working groups and policy dialogue. Extension services have significantly increased in coverage and agricultural research has been intensified during the reference period. NAADSs structures are based at district and sub-national levels and deliver demand-driven extension services (mainly) through Private Service Providers (PSPs); some 39.600 farmers’ groups were progressively established under NAADS (about 715.000 farmers). There is evidence that the quality of service providers is variable and that good quality PSPs are not available in all districts.”</p> <p>NARS: “The EC has supported NARS/NARO under project approaches since the beginning of the reference period at national and regional levels (using STABEX funds). During that time, a National Agricultural Research Policy was formulated in 2003, making research farmer-oriented and client-driven. Progress in implementation of these programmes has been made. The number of research outputs has increased; however, no evidence was found for the existence of a systematic relation between PSPs and NARS institutions, nor is there proof that the transfer of research results is systematically undertaken. Nevertheless there is evidence that EC financing as well as technical assistance have considerably contributed to institutional development and technical achievements of NARO.”</p> <p>Quoted from EC, Uganda, Country Strategy Evaluation, 2009, p.50</p>
Main difficulties	<p>NAADS: The challenges the programme now faces relate to high level of group fall-out and dissatisfaction of group members with NAADS quality and quantity of services such as training, technological development sites, access to credit and delivery of material inputs. The EC has taken the decision to withdraw its support to NAADS because of a change in NAADS activities. NAADS core activity was to subsidise extension services provided on demand to the farmer groups by private service providers. It is evolving towards a provider of free-of-charge agricultural inputs; the ruling party is taking control of the farmer groups; extension services are delivered by government employees...</p> <p>NARS: The EC has supported NARS/NARO (agricultural research) under project approaches since the beginning of the reference period at national and regional levels (using STABEX funds). During that time, a National Agricultural Research Policy was formulated in 2003, making research farmer-oriented and client-driven. Progress in implementation of these programmes has been made. The number of research outputs has increased; however, no evidence was found for the existence of a systematic relation between Private Service Providers (PSPs) and NARS institutions, nor is there proof that the transfer of research results is systematically undertaken. Nevertheless there is evidence that EC financing as well as technical assistance have considerably contributed to institutional development and technical achievements of NARO.</p> <p>Quoted from EC, Uganda, Country Strategy Evaluation, 2009, p.50 and MN 301</p>

Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ GoU, Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture: Eradicating Poverty in Uganda, 2000▪ Danida, Oxford Policy Management, Uganda's Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture, a Joint Evaluation, 2005▪ EC-GoU, SBS to the PMA, Financing Agreement, 2005▪ EC-GoU, SBS to the PMA, Technical and Administrative Provisions for Implementation, 2005▪ EC, Uganda Country Strategy Evaluation, 2009▪ MN 301 to 313
----------------	--

Intervention Title	Producers Organisation Project II in Vanuatu VU-POP
Country / Region	Vanuatu
Commission Ref.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision number: FED/2002/015-896 ▪ Contract number(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 187848 (2002) : Startup - 187850 (2003) : 1st AWP - 187851 (2004) : 2nd AWP - 187856 (2007) : Audit of PE - 187852 (2004) : Audit of AWP - 187849 (2003) : Service Contract providing Marketing Expertise - 187853 (2005) : Service Contract providing Marketing Expertise - 187846 (2005) : Education and training programme component - 187847 (2007) : Rider number 2 to PE number 4 - 187854 (2005) : Improving livelihoods by developing commercial farming opportunities - 187855 (2007) : Final programme estimate number 4
EC aid modality	Isn't clear in the programme documents: only technical assistance?
Intervention Start date & End date	Start: 01/12/2002 End (planned): 30/11/2005 End (likely): 30/12/2007
Budget	Planned: € 1,400,000 Committed: € 1,680,000 Contracted: € 1,644,197 Disbursed: € 1,643,684
Main stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor(s): European Commission (provided 52.8% of the funding), France (provided 34.6% of the funding) & the Government of Vanuatu (provided 12.6% of the funding). ▪ Implementing agencies: The Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (although the EU dealt with the Vanuatu Research and Technical Centre (VARTC) at first). ▪ Direct beneficiaries: Producer organisations and farmers that form new producer organisations. ▪ Final beneficiaries: Production sectors of cocoa, coffee, copra, beef, spices, root crops and fisheries.
Intervention Description	The programme aims at strengthening the capacity of existing Producer Organisations (co-operatives) preparing them for sustainable operations, and establishment of new organisation EU funding is used for equipment and infrastructure, provision of marketing expertise and operation of a credit line.
Programme Background & History	The project is a continuation of an earlier effort co-financed by France and the Government of Vanuatu. POP2 project involves two mostly complementary projects implemented in parallel under two separate Financing Agreements concluded between the EU and the GV (POP2) and France and the GV <i>Projet d'Organisation des Producteurs Agricoles pour la Commercialisation Associative</i> (POPACA).
Overall objectives	To improve smallholders' livelihoods by increasing their cash incomes through sustainable associative activities, entailing improved market access with emphasis on organic produce and the promotion of self-funding mechanisms and empowerment of producers.
Specific objectives	The creation of self-managed, financially sustainable market oriented producer organisations.

Expected results	<p>The overall results of the programme (in coordination with the French support) is expected to have the following results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strengthening existing producer organisations through the provision of technical assistance; ▪ Institutional strengthening of extension services and field assistants to help farmers improve their livelihoods and providing marketing support ▪ Coordination of the work of farmers into agricultural producer associations, provision of marketing advice and other inputs such as training and specialised expertise, identifying potential markets and generally facilitating contact between producers and buyers. <p>The EU support is responsible for the third result, whereas France is for the first two.</p>
Main Activities	<p>Overall activities of the POP2 (those supported overall, by French and European funds¹¹) are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Execution of a diagnosis of the smallholders sector by the PMU; ▪ Organisation of workshops; ▪ Expertise to existing POs (Producer Organisations); ▪ Establishment of new Pos; ▪ Procurement of consultancy services for designs and tender documents of infrastructural works and supplies; ▪ Tendering of same and conclusion of contracts; ▪ Training programmes elaborated and conducted; ▪ Extension services strengthened; ▪ Implementation of works; ▪ Establishment and operation of credit facility; ▪ Monitoring by Steering Committee; ▪ Mid-Term Review of project; ▪ Marketing expertise provided; ▪ Markets for exports identified; ▪ Contacts between producers and buyers facilitated; ▪ Assistance to conclusion of contracts for exports provided; ▪ Continuous assistance for consolidation of achievements provided.
Main achievements	<p>Neither the overall objective nor the specific objectives of the project were achieved (see explanations in “Main difficulties”).</p> <p>An important achievement of the project was the establishment of Revolving Credit Funds, which supported research as well as training, effective extension services, market support and market information. The RCF was an important tool for profitability and sustainability.</p> <p>During 2006, it was decided to convert the Fund into 3 grants to the Cocoa Growers Association (CGA), Coffee Organization of Vanuatu (COV) and the FSA (Farm Support Association) for sustainability purposes, based on the development of 5-year business plans.</p> <p>The Department of Agriculture was still in charge of the RCF at the time of the evaluation and it supported cocoa via the CGA. Coffee became owned by private interests and output has increased significantly to some 42 tons, compared to 7 tons prior to the project.</p> <p>The RCF is considered to have played a central role for smallholders. However, interest in</p>

¹¹ There is no available list of the activities specifically supported by EU funds.

	<p>continuing the RCF beyond the programme seems low.</p> <p>According to the third monitoring report, “<i>Smallholders, extension staff of the DARD and workers of VARTC all had access to the benefits of the project through training, improved methodologies for better production of the POs, better information and market information with the establishment and strengthening of the Management Information Support Unit (MISU), funded late 2006 by the EC.</i>”</p> <p>The awareness of local smallholders concerning the importance of commercial practices was increased thanks to the improved knowledge of extension workers and through participation in workshops and trainings.</p> <p>The institutional strengthening support of the private sector by the EU facilitated the progressive withdrawal of the Government of Vanuatu.</p>
Main difficulties	<p>According to the final evaluation report, the project’s relevance was undermined by flawed design; efficiency was hampered by funding delays and a lack of counterparts; effectiveness was lower than expected; the impact was uncertain; the financial and technical sustainability were good (but not institutionally); and cross-cutting issues were barely addressed.</p> <p>The project’s third monitoring report states that the plan had to be modified (change of the overall objective, of the logical framework, of the implementing agency, longer project execution time, etc.) because the programme was encountering big difficulties due to poor design. The intervention logics differed between donors, that the projects had separate badly constructed Logical Frameworks and that there was a lack of coordination mechanisms between the two donors. The donors each dealt with separate local partners (the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) for the French and the Vanuatu Research and Technical Centre (VARTC) for the EU).</p> <p>The projects aimed at too many Producer Organisations, which proved that they didn’t learn the lessons from the first POP (POP1).</p> <p>The institutional structures did not allow an efficient implementation of the programme. And since the French and EU interventions operated through different modalities (focus on commercialisation of cooperatives for the French and private sector support for the EU), it resulted in “double reporting”.</p> <p>Contributions also lacked timeliness and delays in French funding had a domino-effect on the EU interventions.</p> <p>Later on, these problems were addressed by progressively adapting the Logical Framework (2005), establishing a monitoring and evaluation system for the overall programme (2006) and referring to only one implementation agency (the DARD) as it can be seen in the third project synopsis.</p> <p>According to the third monitoring report, the overall objective of the project was not attained because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The targets were too ambitious ▪ The number of producer organisations was too large; ▪ Insufficient attention was paid to socio-economic factors; ▪ There was inadequate human resources in the implementation agency (the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, DARD);

	Insufficient market information or marketing logistics were provided.
Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Producers Organisation Project II (POP2) Project Synopsis 1, 2 & 3▪ Producers Organisation Project II (POP2) Monitoring reports 1, 2 & 3▪ Meeting notes 947, 1067▪ Ecorys, Evaluation of the Producers Organisation Project II, 2007▪ Landell Mills, Bault E., Alimentation locale des volailles, POPACA reports▪ Landell Mills, Coulter H., Coconut & Cocoa Marketing, Final Report, POPACA reports▪ Landell Mills, Coulter H., Coconut & Cocoa Marketing, Workshop proceedings, POPACA reports▪ Richard M., Systèmes de production dans la zone caféière de Tanna: quelle est la place de la caféiculture, POPACA reports