

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

Final Report

Volume 2: Annexes 6 to 9

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 6 TO 9

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 6: Online Survey

This annex provides the methodology used and the results of the online survey. The survey content was proposed in the Desk Report. It was sent in electronic format (and accompanied by an invitation letter from the Joint Evaluation Unit) to the EU Delegations of all ACP countries (a total of 53 Delegations covering 79 ACPs), who could fill it in online.

The surveyed Delegations are represented in the figure below (respondents are in bold; non-respondents in italic).

Survey respondents

Western Africa	Central Africa	East and Southern Africa	Southern Africa	Caribbean	Pacific
Benin <i>Burkina Faso</i> <i>Cape Verde</i> Ghana <i>Guinea (Rep. of)</i> Guinea-Bissau <i>Ivory Coast</i> Liberia Mali <i>Mauritania</i> <i>Niger</i> <i>Nigeria</i> Senegal <i>Sierra Leone</i> Togo	<i>Angola</i> Burundi Cameroon <i>Central African Rep.</i> Chad Congo Brazza. Congo (Dem.Rep.) Gabon Sudan	Comores/ Mauritius <i>Djibouti</i> Eritrea Ethiopia Kenya Madagascar Malawi Mozambique Rwanda <i>Somalia</i> Tanzania Uganda Zambia Zimbabwe	<i>Botswana</i> Lesotho Namibia <i>South Africa</i> <i>Swaziland</i>	Barbados Dominican Republic/ Cuba <i>Guyana</i> <i>Haiti</i> Jamaica <i>Suriname</i>	Fiji PNG Solomon Islands Vanuatu
8/15 or 53%	6/9 or 67%	11/14 or 79%	2/5 or 40%	3/6 or 50%	4/4 or 100%

Global Response rate:
64%

The complete results of the survey are detailed hereafter.

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
	Relevant support provided in the country																
0.8	Have agricultural commodities or trade in agricultural commodities been supported by the Commission in the National Indicative Programme (NIP) of your country with funds from the... [7th and/or 8th EDF]		Major/Focal sector	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector	Major/Focal sector	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Major/Focal sector	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector
0.8	Have agricultural commodities or trade in agricultural commodities been supported by the Commission in the National Indicative Programme (NIP) of your country with funds from the... [9th EDF]		Not included	Not included	Not included	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Not included	Major/Focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector
0.8	Have agricultural commodities or trade in agricultural commodities been supported by the Commission in the National Indicative Programme (NIP) of your country with funds from the... [10th EDF]		Major/Focal sector	Not included	Not included	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Not included	Major/Focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Not included	Major/Focal sector
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Stabex funds]	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Flex funds]	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Food Facility]	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Food crisis emergency fund]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Sugar line (AMSP)]	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Banana line (SFA)]	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [NGO budget lines]	21	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [EDF - Regional programmes (such as the All ACP programme, PIP, trade.com, PIP; trade.com, and the EPA support programme)]	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Other]			Ligne budgétaire Sécurité Alimentaire	0		FSTP							DCI-FOOD			
0.10	Are STABEX resources still being currently used in your country?	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0.10 a	Which sectors and subsectors?			infrastructure						Agriculture & Food Security						balances being used in various sectors	Agricultural research, forestry and climate change
0.10 b	When were the Stabex funds depleted/used up (year)?		0		0	2010	1111	2005	2000		2009	31.12.2010	2010	2010	2010		
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Sugar]	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Tobacco]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Banana]	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Coffee]	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Cotton]	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Rice]	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
	Relevant support provided in the country																			
0.8	Have agricultural commodities or trade in agricultural commodities been supported by the Commission in the National Indicative Programme (NIP) of your country with funds from the... [7th and/or 8th EDF]		Not included	Not included	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector	Not included	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Major/Focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Major/Focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Not included	Not included	Not included	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector
0.8	Have agricultural commodities or trade in agricultural commodities been supported by the Commission in the National Indicative Programme (NIP) of your country with funds from the... [9th EDF]		Not included	Not included	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Not included	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector	Not included	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector
0.8	Have agricultural commodities or trade in agricultural commodities been supported by the Commission in the National Indicative Programme (NIP) of your country with funds from the... [10th EDF]		Not included	Not included	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector	Major/Focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Minor/Non-focal sector	Not included	Minor/Non-focal sector	Major/Focal sector	Not included	Not included
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Stabex funds]	18	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Flex funds]	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Food Facility]	18	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Food crisis emergency fund]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Sugar line (AMSP)]	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Banana line (SFA)]	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [NGO budget lines]	21	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [EDF - Regional programmes (such as the All ACP programme, PIP, trade.com, PIP; trade.com, and the EPA support programme)]	22	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
0.9	Have interventions funded through other Commission budget lines or instruments been implemented since 2004? [Other]						FSTP			FSTP, NSA										
0.10	Are STABEX resources still being currently used in your country?	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0.10 a	Which sectors and subsectors?		Agricultural development, Food security								Crop production, livestock (sector); marketing and export (sub sector)					COFFEE+CR OP REFORMS+TEA				
0.10 b	When were the Stabex funds depleted/used up (year)?			0	2011	2008	1900	2009	2010	0		2006	2010	2009		2006	1992	2005	1993	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Sugar]	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Tobacco]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Banana]	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Coffee]	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Cotton]	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Rice]	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Oil Palm]	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Tea]	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Cocoa]	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Vanilla]	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Cashew nuts]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Rubber]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Institutional and regulatory support]	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Specific support to regional trade of agricultural commodities, including in the EPAs]	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Capacity building needed to design agricultural commodity strategies]	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Research related to agricultural commodity value chains, including support to CGIAR]	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Production factors, such as extension services and agricultural techniques, water, fertilizers seeds and energy]	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Infrastructures, including feeder roads]	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Collection and processing of agricultural commodities]	14	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Market information and advisory services to producers organisations/ producers]	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Diversification and growth]	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Oil Palm]	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Tea]	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Cocoa]	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Vanilla]	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Cashew nuts]	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Rubber]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Institutional and regulatory support]	17	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Specific support to regional trade of agricultural commodities, including in the EPAs]	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Capacity building needed to design agricultural commodity strategies]	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Research related to agricultural commodity value chains, including support to CGIAR]	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Production factors, such as extension services and agricultural techniques, water, fertilizers seeds and energy]	18	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Infrastructures, including feeder roads]	24	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Collection and processing of agricultural commodities]	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Market information and advisory services to producers organisations/ producers]	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Diversification and growth]	12	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Risk management]	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) measures]	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT)]	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Agricultural commodity value chain strategies]	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Other]				0						groundnut	coconut, fishery					
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [Support to agricultural commodities is not considered a priority in the Poverty Reduction Strategy/national development plan of the partner country]	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [There are other more pressing priorities in the partner country]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [Main support to the partner country is general budget support]	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [The European Commission has a tradition of supporting other areas in the partner country]	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [Support to agricultural commodities is provided by other donors]	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [Previous support to agricultural commodities proved difficult and slow to disburse]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [There are difficulties in the partner country to design useful support to agricultural commodities]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [Other]			La Mauritanie n'est pas un pays agricole										Agriculture has been supported			

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35	
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea	
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Risk management]	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) measures]	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT)]	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Agricultural commodity value chain strategies]	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
0.11	For all sources of funds which of the following products/ areas have been supported since 2004 ? (please tick all the relevant boxes) [Other]																	Fonds également utilisés pour clôturer des projets du passé (tous secteurs confondus)			
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [Support to agricultural commodities is not considered a priority in the Poverty Reduction Strategy/national development plan of the partner country]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [There are other more pressing priorities in the partner country]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [Main support to the partner country is general budget support]	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [The European Commission has a tradition of supporting other areas in the partner country]	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [Support to agricultural commodities is provided by other donors]	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [Previous support to agricultural commodities proved difficult and slow to disburse]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [There are difficulties in the partner country to design useful support to agricultural commodities]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0.12	If agriculture has not been supported, why ? [Other]			the country hardly produces agric commodities, extremely limited exports in general			supported														

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
	1. Contextual background the Commission to support agricultural commodities in ACP countries																
	Has the Commission identified:																
1.1.1.	Price variability of agricultural commodities as an important problem in this country?	23	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
1.1.1.	Price variability of agricultural commodities as an important problem in this country? - Comment		MRU benefitted from preferential treatment under the ACP sugar protocol. Since the 36% cut in the guaranteed EU price one of the important issues of the MRU sugar sector is price fluctuation due to exchange rates.	a flambé des prix alimentaire de 2007/2008 et des derniers mois représente un problème pour un pays qui importe environ 70% de sa consommation alimentaire. La hausse du prix du blé, du riz, de l'huile et du sucre touchent particulièrement le pays				Country depends on oil exports	Lesotho imports most of its food from SA, price variabilities play a role in food security, but are only important in case of major price hikes.				This has been a major concern for export comodoties like coffee, tea, cotton			Food import bills are high in all countries concerned.	Fluctuation of world prices for raw agricultural commodities and strength of the national currency.
1.1.1.	For which agricultural product(s) specifically?		Sugar.	blé (importation) riz (produit en partie), sucre (importation) huile (importation)						several	cotton and to a lesser extent, groundnut	rice, coconut, copra	Coffee, Tea, Cotton		Coffee, sugar and cereals	Many	Coffee, cocoa, vanilla, palm oil and copra.
1.1.2.	Competitiveness of the agricultural commodity sectors as an important problem in this country?	27	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1
1.1.2.	Competitiveness of the agricultural commodity sectors as an important problem in this country? - Comment		Competitiveness and long term viability of the sugar sector are important objectives of the sugar reform. MRU has shifted its exports from raw sugar to value added sugar ie. direct consumption sugar (since 2010 crop) and the same time also optimising the use of the by-products.	le peu de blé produit ainsi que le riz produit localement ne sont pas compétitifs par rapport au produits importés				mainly due to infrastructure problems, and lack of know-how	Lesotho does not depend on agricultural commodities. Agricultural exports are confined to livestock and mohair/wool exports to SA (in small scale).							Little and irregular local production, unattractive sector for youth etc.	High opportunity costs (transport, energy, services) affect negatively the competitiveness of the agricultural sector.
1.1.2.	For which agricultural product(s) specifically?		Sugar.	riz essentiellement		café	only one product is produced in industrial terms, sugar. all other production is by small-holders with no agro-industry in place other than		vegetables, fruits.	tea, sugar, coffee	cotton		Export comodities		Sugar	Many	Coffee, cocoa, vanilla, palm oil and copra.
1.2	Does the Delegation monitor (e.g. through its economic reporting) on a regular basis : [The price developments of the major agricultural commodities exported by the country]		Quarterly basis	Not at all	Not at all	Quarterly basis	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Yearly basis	Quarterly basis	Monthly basis	Not at all	Yearly basis	Not at all	Not at all
1.2	Does the Delegation monitor (e.g. through its economic reporting) on a regular basis : [The country's export performance]		Quarterly basis	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Quarterly basis	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Quarterly basis	Monthly basis	Not at all	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Quarterly basis
1.2	Does the Delegation monitor (e.g. through its economic reporting) on a regular basis : [The effects of EU policies on the agricultural sector]		Quarterly basis	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Yearly basis	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Yearly basis	Not at all	Not at all
1.3	Was a diagnostic study...																
1.3.1	...of the agricultural sector available to inform the programming of the Commission cooperation strategy?	19	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
	1. Contextual background the Commission to support agricultural commodities in ACP countries																			
	Has the Commission identified:																			
1.1.1.	Price variability of agricultural commodities as an important problem in this country?	23	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
1.1.1.	Price variability of agricultural commodities as an important problem in this country? - Comment					May have important social impact		agriculture is made by small holders and commodities are purchased by companies. When price is low, farmers are cultivating other crops.	beaucoup de produits sont importés et pas de connaissance sur les coûts de production locale		Commission has supported short term fluctuations in agricultural commodity export earnings through FLEX funding mechanism		il y a lieu de distinguer la variation du prix sur le plan national qui influence directement sur la sécurité alimentaire, et la variation du prix sur le plan international ayant pour impact la valeur de l'exportation		It was not been the main decision factor for the support	1	Particularly for vulnerable people.	Le Vanuatu connaît un problème politique important. La population croit que les prix sont fixés par le Gouvernement, alors qu'ils le sont par le marché mondial. Les paysans ne connaissent pas les mécanismes de fixation des prix.	price volatility of sugar, food price volatility has increased due to external shocks	Yes. Prices in staple food, rice, is submitted to both, external and internal variability. Besides, the country was formerly autosufficient in rice. Now importing 50% of needs.
1.1.1.	For which agricultural product(s) specifically?		cereals (Sorghum, wheat), livestock, cotton		Coffee, Tea, Pyrethrum	primary food products		Cotton		Rice	Coffee, oilseeds, hides and skins, live animals		vanille, riz			sugar, bananas, coffe, citrus	Staple food	Coprah, cacao et café	food crops, sugar	Rice
1.1.2.	Competitiveness of the agricultural commodity sectors as an important problem in this country?	27	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
1.1.2.	Competitiveness of the agricultural commodity sectors as an important problem in this country? - Comment				Landlocked Country Remote from markets	No real strategy despite assets		Same ase above, smallholders are cultivating the crops that gives the best return	filères agricoles encore peu organisées (mais, sorgho, ignames) et/ou volumes de production trop faibles (produits d'exportation comme le coton, café, cacao)		Less concern of the production system towards quality and standards, has limited competitiveness in the export market		la prise en compte de la qualité par tous les acteurs : producteurs, collecteurs, exportateurs reste un défi		Yes.The EU delegation has provided support to research as a strategy to increase competitiveness of the agriculture commodities. But also support through value chain approach for certain crops (rice and maize).	1		Les coûts de transport sont très élevés au Vanuatu (constitués de plusieurs îles). La qualité des produits agricoles est le plus souvent (très) faible.	livestock, food crop have competitiveness issues related to the remoteness of Fiji, dependency on oil imports, structural issues of agriculture	Yes, mainly due to low productivity, low input, poor agro-industry, bad infrastructures and accessibility.
1.1.2.	For which agricultural product(s) specifically?		Gum arabic		Coffee, Tea, Pyrethrum	cashewnuts, pineapple, ..	toutes les productions locales	cashew, cotton		Rice, Cocoa, Rubber	Fruits and vegetables, hides and skins, live animals, pulses, oilseeds	sugar	vanille, café, cacao, poivre, girofle		Cotton, tea and coffee	sugar, coffee, citrus, bananas	Coton, rice, cashewnut, mangos	Coprah, cacao et café	dairy, food crop, sheep, beef	Rice, Fruits, Vegetables.
1.2	Does the Delegation monitor (e.g. through its economic reporting) on a regular basis : [The price developments of the major agricultural commodities exported by the country]		Not at all	Not at all	Monthly basis	Yearly basis	Not at all	Yearly basis	Not at all	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Not at all	Not at all	Quarterly basis	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Quarterly basis	Monthly basis	Yearly basis	Not at all
1.2	Does the Delegation monitor (e.g. through its economic reporting) on a regular basis : [The country's export performance]		Not at all	Not at all	Monthly basis	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Not at all	Yearly basis	Quarterly basis	Yearly basis	Quarterly basis	Quarterly basis	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Not at all	Yearly basis	Not at all
1.2	Does the Delegation monitor (e.g. through its economic reporting) on a regular basis : [The effects of EU policies on the agricultural sector]		Not at all	Not at all	Monthly basis	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Yearly basis	Yearly basis	Not at all	Not at all	Yearly basis	Not at all
1.3	Was a diagnostic study...																			
1.3.1	...of the agricultural sector available to inform the programming of the Commission cooperation strategy?	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
1.3.2	...of trade available to inform the programming of the Commission cooperation strategy?	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [The importance of agricultural commodities in the economy of the country (in terms of GDP, employment, export earnings,...)]	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [The needs and priorities identified by a national policy document]	22	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [The needs and the strategic priorities within the agricultural sector]	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [A diagnostic study of the agricultural sector of the country]	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [A diagnostic study of the external trade situation of the country]	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [Specific requests from the Government]	20	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [Assistance priorities determined by the Joint Assistance Strategy]	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [Other factors]	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
1.4	Please specify			la priorité de la bonne gouvernance comme axe principale, le maintien d'un secteur de coopération stratégique et traditionnel comme les transports												7 ACP countries + 3 OCTs covered by this Delegation, so many varieties of reasons.	

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
1.3.2	...of trade available to inform the programming of the Commission cooperation strategy?	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [The importance of agricultural commodities in the economy of the country (in terms of GDP, employment, export earnings,...)]	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [The needs and priorities identified by a national policy document]	22	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [The needs and the strategic priorities within the agricultural sector]	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [A diagnostic study of the agricultural sector of the country]	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [A diagnostic study of the external trade situation of the country]	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [Specific requests from the Government]	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [Assistance priorities determined by the Joint Assistance Strategy]	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
1.4	Which factors most influenced the programming process and the choice of focal sectors in the Commission cooperation strategy for the period 2004-2009? Several answers possible [Other factors]	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
1.4	Please specify		The resumption of cooperation with Sudan in 2005 was linked to the signature of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. As part of this process, a joint assessment mission (JAM) organized by the signatory parties and development partners took place and identified the most relevant sectors for post-conflict cooperation. The Commission took the recommendations of the JAM into account when selecting the focal sectors for cooperation.									No answer available	Coordination des bailleurs de fonds			Agriculture is not a priority area under the NIP in Jamaica. The choice of providing support to the banana and sugar sector was dictated by the respective regulations and agreements (SFAs and AMS)		Pour le Projet POP 2/ POPACA, le financement européen a été décidé suite à la requête de la France (présente au Vanuatu) de contribuer au financement de la seconde phase du projet (POP 1 a été mis en oeuvre par la France avant 2002).		Except projects for rice, palm oil, micro-financing and animal production, programming has focused on good governance issues and infrastructure. Art. 96 in 2007 and 2009 have limited normal sectorial programming.

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
1.5	Have competitiveness and diversification of agricultural commodity sectors been a priority of the partner Government during the 2004-2009 period?	20	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
1.5	Have competitiveness and diversification of agricultural commodity sectors been a priority of the partner Government during the 2004-2009 period? - Comment		Included in the national strategy (ie. Multi-Annual Adaptation Strategy for sugar 2006-2015).	La Maurintani n'est pas un pays agricole				but with no important impact					following the 2008 crisis, priority given by the government to boost and diversify domestic production	PMA			Most of the islands have some kind of strategies in place to deal with the downturn in agricultural production/exports
1.6	Has trade in more general terms been a priority sector for the partner Government during the 2004-2009 period?	18	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
1.7	Has trade in more general terms been a priority sector for the partner Government during the 2004-2009 period? - Comment		Mauritius is an open middle income economy and trade is an important pillar (note, that agriculture accounted for only 3.6% GDP in 2010).					the government is trying to diversify its production and to lower its food imports.	On paper and in terms of action no. The CSP had 1.2 million euro available for trade and it has not been utilised.	In government documents and in programme financed by external resources.			Senegal is a net food importer				Especially Regional trade through CARICOM, OECS.
1.7	Does the policy dialogue between the partner Government and the Commission include competitiveness and diversification of agricultural commodity sectors (specific or as part of overall policy dialogue relating to trade)?	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
1.7	Feel free to comment on the areas/sub-sectors discussed			Le questionnaire est fait pour des pays qui ont clairement une vocation/capacité de production agricole importante. Or la Mauritanie est un pays essentiellement désertique où l'agriculture et en particulier la production de commodities a un rôle marginale				The main comment is that the current NIP has as main objectif to build part of road to connect the two main cities (Brazzaville & Pointe Noire).	EPA mainly of long-term importance for manufactured products.				The absence of a credible policy dialogue has been a key problem in the agricultural sector				
1.8	Does the policy dialogue with the partner Government include issues related to other European Policies and their impact on the country's agricultural sector (such as the Common Agricultural Policy, trade policies or other)?	16	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
1.5	Have competitiveness and diversification of agricultural commodity sectors been a priority of the partner Government during the 2004-2009 period?	20	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
1.5	Have competitiveness and diversification of agricultural commodity sectors been a priority of the partner Government during the 2004-2009 period? - Comment					included in SCRIP		Strategic plan for Sugar, cotton, cashew	la crise politique a pris le dessus	As a post war country, many priorities were identified. And the Ministry of Agriculture and Government of Liberia have been very weak and lacking a number of capacities. Therefore even if set as a priority not much was done on agriculture commodity sectors.	In the national strategy Plan for Accelerated and Sustainable Development Program, the Government has specified diversification and market orientation of production systems in view of becoming competitive		Pour le secteur développement rural, l'amélioration de la productivité, la compétitivité des filières ont été abordées		Mainly competitiveness and overall agriculture development through it's Agriculture Sector Development Strategy(ASDS)	Yes, the Ministry of Agriculture is committed to reform all the commodities boards in a move to liberalize the sectors and attract private investments.	For cotton	L'agriculture n'a pas été un secteur de concentration au Vanuatu pour le 8 ^è et le 9 ^è FED. La coopération de la CE s'est focalisée sur la croissance économique, qui inclut l'agriculture.		
1.6	Has trade in more general terms been a priority sector for the partner Government during the 2004-2009 period?	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
1.7	Has trade in more general terms been a priority sector for the partner Government during the 2004-2009 period? - Comment					Not really			la crise politique a pris le dessus	As a post war country, many priorities were identified. And the Ministry of Government of Liberia have been very weak and lacking a number of capacities. Therefore even if set as a priority not much was done on trade.	Export oriented development and integration into the global trading system have been the focus in the recent national development strategy of the government				Indirectly, yes. Recently in the 10 th EDF it become on focal area- Trade and Regional Support.			Le Gouvernement a des difficultés pour définir sa stratégie pour le secteur productif.		
1.7	Does the policy dialogue between the partner Government and the Commission include competitiveness and diversification of agricultural commodity sectors (specific or as part of overall policy dialogue relating to trade)?	18	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0
1.7	Feel free to comment on the areas/sub-sectors discussed								Important programme STABEX durant cette période 2004-2009 (café, cacao, coton, pistes rurales, forages villageoise, aménagement de bas fonds, magasins de stockage de produits agricoles)		Crops and livestock and livestock products, oilseeds		pour le 9e fed, l'appui macroéconomique est l'un des trois secteurs de concentration des appuis de l'UE		The discussions between the EU delegation and the Government are in the framework of the DPs- Government dialogue that focuses mainly until now in the Agriculture Support development Programme. The discussions focus mainly on overall improvement of the agriculture sector mainly in terms of productivity	specifically for the banana and sugar sector where the EU is the largest donor. recently the Delegation has been engaged also in the support and reform of the Cocoa sector.	Office du Niger	APES	Agriculture diversification is mostly discussed under the National Adaptation Strategy for Sugar	
1.8	Does the policy dialogue with the partner Government include issues related to other European Policies and their impact on the country's agricultural sector (such as the Common Agricultural Policy, trade policies or other)?	16	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
1.8	In which areas?		Sugar and tuna.		EPA		trade (EPA); wood (FLEGT)		milk.				Sanitary requirement for exports to EU		Food security and trade	Especially EPAs	Trade
	2. Results obtained by Commission supported interventions to agricultural commodities sectors in ACP																
	Design of agricultural commodity strategies																
2.1	Has the Commission supported the Government and the sector stakeholders in the design of agricultural commodities strategies?	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
2.1	Why not?		It was country owned and led.	parce que la Mauritanie n'est pas un pays de tradition agricole. La production du pays dans les meilleures années arrive à produire 30% de la consommation interne. La seule "commoditie" produite est le riz qui n'est pas compétitif	Agriculture is of minor importance for Namibia			There is no significant production of agricultural commodities in Lesotho.		The major institutional support programme IDAF had to be stopped due to irregularities in Programme Estimates	no specific request received						Not part of the CSP so far.
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...ensure the availability of diagnostics of the competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains]					To a large extent	To a large extent		To some extent			To some extent	To some extent	Not at all	To some extent	To a large extent	
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [... enhance human and institutional capacity needed to design agricultural commodity chain strategies]					To some extent	To some extent		To a very limited extent			Not at all	To a large extent	Not at all	To some extent	To a large extent	
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...include representatives of producer/ farmer organisations in the agricultural commodity strategy design process and their effective engagement in the dialogue]					To some extent	Not at all		To a very limited extent			To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a large extent	
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...design agricultural commodity chain strategies addressing needs and challenges identified in diagnostics]					To some extent	To a very limited extent		To a very limited extent			To some extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...design agricultural commodities strategies taking account of environment, gender, corporate responsibility such as child labour and other social rights]					To a very limited extent	To some extent		To a very limited extent			To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...lead the Government to embed its national agricultural commodity strategy into its national development strategy]					To some extent	Not at all		To a large extent			To a very limited extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To a large extent	

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
1.8	In which areas?				Trade Policies	trade policy, EPA		Sugar					Pour les appuis APE			EPA, Sugar			sugar reform (CAP reform)	
	2. Results obtained by Commission supported interventions to agricultural commodities sectors in ACP																			
	Design of agricultural commodity strategies																			
2.1	Has the Commission supported the Government and the sector stakeholders in the design of agricultural commodities strategies?	19	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
2.1	Why not?		Difficult political relationship with Sudan was not conducive for policy dialogue and for international donors to participate in the design of Government strategies.	The economy of the country is state controlled, agricultural cash crops for exports are not being produced. Exports are in general extremely limited. (It would have been helpful to define what you mean with agric corn in the context of this questionnaire, my interpretation has been cash crops for exports)					Arrêt partiel de la coopération entre 1992-2006. Reprise complète de la coopération UE-Cvt Togo en 2007.	The Commission resources, both human and financial, dedicated to Agriculture from 2004-09 have been limited.	Commission's focus was more on ensuring food security through humanitarian and emergency assistance operations. Only recently shifted towards agricultural development interventions.			Not asked to do so				Des études concernant les filières agricoles ont été réalisées par l'assistant technique du projet POP2/POPACA (2002-2007). Ces études ont permis de rassembler l'information de base pour définir des stratégies au niveau de quelques filières agricoles. Ces stratégies ont été développées par l'assistant technique alors sous contrat (financement) avec la coopération française (plus avec le soutien financier de la CE).	Initial sectorial coordination in 2004-5. Became unefficient due to political situation.	
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...ensure the availability of diagnostics of the competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains]				To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent				To some extent	To a very limited extent		To a very limited extent	To a large extent	Not at all		To a large extent	
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [... enhance human and institutional capacity needed to design agricultural commodity chain strategies]				To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent				To a very limited extent	Not at all		To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent		To a large extent	
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...include representatives of producer/ farmer organisations in the agricultural commodity strategy design process and their effective engagement in the dialogue]				To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent				To a large extent	To a very limited extent		To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent		To a large extent	
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...design agricultural commodity chain strategies addressing needs and challenges identified in diagnostics]				To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent				To some extent	To some extent		Not at all	To some extent	To some extent		To a large extent	
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...design agricultural commodities strategies taking account of environment, gender, corporate responsibility such as child labour and other social rights]				To some extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent				To some extent	Not at all		To some extent	To some extent	Not at all		To a large extent	
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...lead the Government to embed its national agricultural commodity strategy into its national development strategy]				To some extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent				To a very limited extent	To some extent		To some extent	To some extent	Not at all		To a large extent	

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...lead the Government to include its national agricultural commodity strategy into the regional agricultural strategy]					To a very limited extent	Not at all		Not at all			Not at all	To some extent	Not at all	To some extent	To a large extent	
2.1	Feel free to comment on your answers, in particular on any reasons why support was not provided/did not target these areas						The only strategy that the EU supported the Congo with was the National sugar strategy.						EU has been critical together with the donor group to design policies and strategies in agriculture				
	Competitiveness of agricultural commodity chains																
2.2	Are you familiar with the EU export helpdesk launched by the Commission (cf. website: http://exporthelp.europa.eu/index_en.html) in order to facilitate ACP access to data on tariffs, rules of origin and trade statistics?	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
2.2	If yes : [To what extent is this helpdesk is useful for the EU Delegation?]		Useful to some extent				Very useful		Very useful	Do not know			Very useful		Useful to some extent	Do not know	Not useful at all
2.2	If yes : [To what extent is this helpdesk is useful for the partner Government?]		Very useful				Very useful		Very useful	Do not know			Very useful		Do not know	Do not know	Not useful at all
2.2	Please explain your answers						They are very useful per se but the country only exports sugar as a commodity and it goes only to the CEMAC region.			We have information material available but overall the export potential for Malawi towards EU are limited			Appropriate support and well responding to needs			I know of its existence and information has been passed on to our counterparts, but I have not seen any information on how useful it is / has been for the beneficiaries	Due to negligible export of agricultural commodities to the EU.
2.3	How do you rate the Commission's overall support to trade negotiations (i.e. from Intra ACP, regional and national funds)? [EPA negotiations]		Insufficient	Don't know	Sufficient coverage of agricultural commodities issues	Don't know	Appropriate	Don't know	Appropriate	Appropriate	Don't know	Don't know	Appropriate	Don't know	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
2.3	How do you rate the Commission's overall support to trade negotiations (i.e. from Intra ACP, regional and national funds)? [WTO negotiations]		Insufficient	Don't know	Sufficient coverage of agricultural commodities issues	Don't know	Appropriate	Don't know	Appropriate	Don't know	Sufficient coverage of agricultural commodities issues	Don't know	Appropriate	Don't know	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
2.1	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...lead the Government to include its national agricultural commodity strategy into the regional agricultural strategy]				To some extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To some extent				To a very limited extent	Not at all		Not at all	To some extent	Not at all		To a very limited extent	
2.1	Feel free to comment on your answers, in particular on any reasons why support was not provided/did not target these areas							The new agricultural strategy PEDSA was only released in April 2011 after more than 3 years later than expected					Cas sucre et Bananes La contribution de l'UE concernent les appuis pour l'élaboration du programme sectoriel agricole, les appuis relatifs à la structuration des organisations paysannes au niveau régional.		The support has been through dialogue within the sectors that supports mainly for coffee, tea, cotton and sugar.	Through the sugar and the banana support programmes the Commission has been involved in supporting the GoJ in the implementation of the bananas and sugar transformation strategies. Institutional support and policy advice has been also provided for a diagnostic of the citrus and cocoa boards.				EU has provided strategic advice to the reform of Sugar sector. Sugar exports are mostly for EU and no major focus was for the regional market.
	Competitiveness of agricultural commodity chains																			
2.2	Are you familiar with the EU export helpdesk launched by the Commission (cf. website: http://exporthelp.europa.eu/index_en.html) in order to facilitate ACP access to data on tariffs, rules of origin and trade statistics?	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
2.2	If yes : [To what extent is this helpdesk is useful for the EU Delegation?]							Useful to some extent			Very useful	Useful to some extent	Useful to some extent	Useful to some extent	Useful to some extent			Not useful at all	Useful to some extent	
2.2	If yes : [To what extent is this helpdesk is useful for the partner Government?]							Do not know			Useful to some extent	Do not know	Useful to some extent	Do not know	Do not know			Do not know	Useful to some extent	
2.2	Please explain your answers									Private companies that aim at increasing and diversifying their export to european markets get in touch with the delegation to learn more about trade opportunities to EU.	HD is useful at times when making presentations to private sector representatives, though we are not clear how much it is used by them	On le consulte aussi à la demande du gouvernement ou les opérateurs privés; La délégation encourage le groupement du secteur privé à utiliser ce site.		Mainly as support information.					the EU helpdesk may facilitate rapid access to specific info (like recently, we were required to give specific info on Kava ban to Fiji Government).	
2.3	How do you rate the Commission's overall support to trade negotiations (i.e. from Intra ACP, regional and national funds)? [EPA negotiations]		Don't know	Don't know	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Don't know	Don't know	Insufficient coverage of agricultural commodities issues	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Insufficient	Insufficient coverage of agricultural commodities issues	Don't know	Don't know	Insufficient	Insufficient coverage of agricultural commodities issues	Don't know
2.3	How do you rate the Commission's overall support to trade negotiations (i.e. from Intra ACP, regional and national funds)? [WTO negotiations]		Don't know	Don't know	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Don't know	Don't know	Insufficient coverage of agricultural commodities issues	Appropriate	Sufficient coverage of agricultural commodities issues	Insufficient	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know	Insufficient	Insufficient coverage of agricultural commodities issues	Don't know

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
2.3	Feel free to comment on your answers				Under EDF 9 a trade support project particular in view of EPA was prepared but finally not signed by Namibian authorities.					Malawi has made it clear that it does not want to sign an EPA anytime soon, so the question of appropriateness of COM support is a difficult one	in the past 2-3 years, EPA negotiations have become less of a burning issue			Ce domaine est traité par la section "Economie, commerce et Gouvernance"			as from 2007 a Trade Related Assistance programme is in place at national level. At regional level, some facilities are in place to support trade negotiations and regional integration.
2.4	Has the Commission supported the partner country (Government, producers' organisations, producers) with a view to improve the competitiveness of agricultural value chains?	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
2.4	Why not?			Parce que la Mauritanie n'est pas un pays de tradition agricole elle n'est donc pas un producteur et moins un exportateur de commodities	See point 2.1a above		There is not a national agriculture strategy. The Agriculture sector is not part of the core sector and of the non-core sector.	After a chain of failures in agricultural development projects donors and Government do not view this as a priority sector.			main focus was on agricultural production						Not been a priority so far.

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
2.3	Feel free to comment on your answers						Support to the EPA negotiations through hubs and spokes and related all-ACP programs is sufficient. Support to WTO negotiations has initially been left out, but with the onset end 2010 of a NIP-financed Aid for Trade Programme this aspect (strengthening of capacities for trade negotiations) has been given adequate attention				Regional integration has been supported as focal sector in the context of the national CSP.		Concernant l'APE, les appuis couvrent six volets : agriculture, pêche, coopération au développement, service, accès au marché et questions liées au commerce.			The Commission should not provide assistance to the agriculture commodities in the framework of trade negotiations, as this assistance is seen as a "compensation package" by the private sector. The SFAs programme is a very bad example not to follow. This could lead in situations like the one in Belize where the assistance from Sugar and Bananas is 5 times the envelope of the NIP. It is also disproportionate in relation to the size of the population (and the same could apply for other Caribbean Islands)		L'appui n'a pas généré de résultats. Le Vanuatu n'a pas encore compris l'intérêt d'entrer dans les APEs. Le Vanuatu bénéficie des mesures "EBAs" (mais jusqu'à quand?)	No sufficient focus on agriculture	No relevant trade negotiations with EU.
2.4	Has the Commission supported the partner country (Government, producers' organisations, producers) with a view to improve the competitiveness of agricultural value chains?	24	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
2.4	Why not?		The initial focus of the Commission's intervention in the agricultural sector was geared towards recovering Sudan's productive capacity in areas affected by war. Following the non ratification of the Cotonou agreement by the Government of Sudan, Sudan lost access to 10th EDF and it became impossible to expand the initial focus on more development oriented interventions such as providing support to value chains.																	

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...compliance with non-tariff measures (such as sanitary and phyto-sanitary) applicable to agricultural commodity imports into the EU]		To some extent			To some extent			To a large extent	To some extent			To some extent	Not at all	To a large extent	To a large extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...stimulate research in the field of production factors and labour productivity]		To some extent			To some extent			To a large extent	To a large extent			To some extent	To some extent	To a large extent	To some extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...disseminate research results to producers/producer organisations]		To a very limited extent			To some extent			To a large extent	To a very limited extent			To some extent	To some extent	To a large extent	To some extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...improve production factors and farmers access to them (such as extension services/agricultural techniques, water, fertilizers, seeds, and energy)]		To a large extent			To some extent			To a large extent	To some extent			To a large extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a large extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...increase agricultural commodities crop yields, crop quality and quantity]		To some extent			To a very limited extent			To some extent	To some extent			To some extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a large extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...improve infrastructures (e.g. feeder roads) related to agricultural commodity production, collection and processing]		Not at all			To some extent			To a very limited extent	To some extent			To a very limited extent	To some extent	To a large extent	To a large extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...improve the collection and processing of agricultural commodities]		To a large extent			To some extent			Not at all	To some extent			To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To a large extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has 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]		Not at all			To a very limited extent			To some extent	To some extent			To some extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...an increased number of producers/ producer organisations having direct contracts with supermarket chains]		Not at all			Not at all			Not at all	Not at all			Not at all	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To some extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...an increased number of producers/ producer organisations with a label certification (e.g. organic farming)]		To some extent			Not at all			To some extent	To a very limited extent			To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...an increased number of producers/ producer organisations being coordinated at national level]		Not at all			To a very limited extent			To a very limited extent	To some extent			To a very limited extent	To some extent	Not at all	To a large extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...an increased number of producers/ producer organisations being coordinated at regional level]		Not at all			Not at all			Not at all	To a very limited extent			Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	To a large extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...increased foreign direct investments in the commodity chains, including public-private partnerships]		Not at all			Not at all			Not at all	To a very limited extent			To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To some extent	
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...the promotion of sustainable development through social and environmental codes of conduct]		To some extent			Not at all			To some extent	To a very limited extent			To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a large extent	

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...compliance with non-tariff measures (such as sanitary and phyto-sanitary) applicable to agricultural commodity imports into the EU]			To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent	Not at all	Not at all	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent		To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...stimulate research in the field of production factors and labour productivity]			Not at all	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	Not at all		To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a large extent	To a very limited extent
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...disseminate research results to producers/producer organisations]			To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent		To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a large extent	To a very limited extent
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...improve production factors and farmers access to them (such as extension services/agricultural techniques, water, fertilizers, seeds, and energy)]			To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a large extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent		To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...increase agricultural commodities crop yields, crop quality and quantity]			Not at all	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent		To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...improve infrastructures (e.g. feeder roads) related to agricultural commodity production, collection and processing]			To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent		To a large extent	To a large extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...improve the collection and processing of agricultural commodities]			Not at all	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent		Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has 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]			To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent		Not at all	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	Not at all
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...an increased number of producers/ producer organisations having direct contracts with supermarket chains]			Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent		Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	To a large extent	To a large extent	Not at all
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...an increased number of producers/ producer organisations with a label certification (e.g. organic farming)]			Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent		Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	Not at all
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...an increased number of producers/ producer organisations being coordinated at national level]			Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	Not at all	To a very limited extent		Not at all	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a very limited extent
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...an increased number of producers/ producer organisations being coordinated at regional level]			Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all		Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...increased foreign direct investments in the commodity chains, including public-private partnerships]			Not at all	Not at all	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	Not at all	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a very limited extent		Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a large extent	Not at all
2.4	Please provide your opinion on the extent to which the Commission has contributed to : [...the promotion of sustainable development through social and environmental codes of conduct]			Not at all	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent		Not at all	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a large extent	Not at all

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
2.4	Feel free to comment on your answers		EC has been supporting the economic reform program of Mauritius (including the sugar reform) through budget support (a few KPIs and specific conditions for disbursement in the EC GBS programmes have been related to sugar reform).							Questions too detailed for me							
	Diversification																
2.5	Has the Commission provided technical assistance to diversification around traditional agricultural commodity products?	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
2.5	Why not?			Parce que la Mauritanie n'est pas un pays de tradition agricole elle n'est donc pas un producteur et moins un exportateur de commodities	See point 2.1a above			There is no basis for diversification.	Not requested to.								Not been requested by the Government.
2.5	For which agricultural commodities?					pineapple, banana, oil palm	Kassava			various	cotton		This was done through a zoning strategy and priority comodities		Drought tolerant traditional crops	Bananas, sugar and others	
2.5	What type of activities?						Research on cultivars, distribution of better cultivars			value chain analysis etc	improving fiber quality		research and extension		Seed breeding and distribution, training	All kind of TA activites	
2.6	Has the Commission provided technical assistance to diversification around traditional agricultural commodity products... [...to produce more value added to their agricultural commodities (vertical diversification)?]	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
2.6	Has the Commission provided technical assistance to diversification around traditional agricultural commodity products... [...to promoting economic growth more broadly (horizontal diversification)?]	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
	Risk management																
2.7	Has the EU been involved in developing, piloting and/or applying risk management tools relevant for/ available to agricultural commodity producers in the beneficiary country?	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Weather related risks]	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Price related risks]	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Specific crop price stabilisation scheme]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Macro level]	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Level of producers' organisation]	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Producer level]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Social Safety net specific to agricultural commodities producers]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Others (please specify)]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
2.4	Feel free to comment on your answers							The sector is still very weak and was recovering of the war.				Promotion of quality and standards and market info system is being supported under the 10th EDF.	for sugar only they are other contributions to agricultural commodity value chain through EU funded COMESA implemented interventions	Exemple des thématiques des projets : diffusion des itinéraires techniques améliorées, structuration des producteurs.	Under the 10th EDF the EU has formulated a programme called "Trade and Agriculture Support Programme, phase II" that will focus mainly on improving quality (compliance of standards, packaging, etc) of agriculture commodities in order to increase trade.					
	Diversification																			
2.5	Has the Commission provided technical assistance to diversification around traditional agricultural commodity products?	19	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
2.5	Why not?			see above no agric com.					appui non significatif à la diversification via l'aménagement de bas fonds		The issue is sufficiently dealt with the partner gov't and other development partners.				It was not the strategy adopted.			Pas de commentaires.		
2.5	For which agricultural commodities?		Sorghum, groundnuts		Coffee, Tea, Pyrethrum	rice, manioc	légumineuses, mil, sorgho,	cashew, cotton and sugar		Rice		maize	vanille, café, filières horticoles			Bananas			sugar	rice
2.5	What type of activities?		Extension work with small holders		Research, Transformation	training, organisation	diffusion semences et formations techniques	Extension, research		Improvement of quality standards-parboiled rice.		reinforcing extension services and promoting conservation agriculture	renforcement de capacités techniques, renforcement des capacités organisationnelles, informations et communications (ex: CNCC et CHTH)			promotion of income generating activities in-and-off farm			marketing, diversification, infrastructure linked to market access	Development of fruits & Vegetables, in low-lands zones (bas-fonds) to diversify rice crops.
2.6	Has the Commission provided technical assistance to diversification around traditional agricultural commodity products... [...to produce more value added to their agricultural commodities (vertical diversification)?]	16	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
2.6	Has the Commission provided technical assistance to diversification around traditional agricultural commodity products... [...to promoting economic growth more broadly (horizontal diversification)?]	17	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Risk management																			
2.7	Has the EU been involved in developing, piloting and/or applying risk management tools relevant for/ available to agricultural commodity producers in the beneficiary country?	9	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Weather related risks]	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Price related risks]	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Specific crop price stabilisation scheme]	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Macro level]	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Level of producers' organisation]	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Producer level]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Social Safety net specific to agricultural commodities producers]	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Others (please specify)]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Other]	4															
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Weather related risks]	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Price related risks]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Specific crop price stabilisation scheme]	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Macro level]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Level of producers' organisation]	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Producer level]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Social Safety net specific to agricultural commodities producers]	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Others (please specify)]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Other]																
2.7	Why not ?			Parce que la Mauritanie n'est pas un pays de tradition agricole elle n'est donc pas un producteur et moins que moins un exportateur de commodities	See point 2.1a above		Not task of Nat'l Indicative Plan		not requested to.		no specific request from the government			Cette approche n'est pas développée dans les exploitations agricoles familiales.			Not been identified as a priority so far.
2.8	Has the Commission supported agricultural commodities producers' access to finance (including financial sector support pilot projects such as warehouse receipts, microfinance, etc.)? [Directly in the context of larger agricultural projects]	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
2.8	Has the Commission supported agricultural commodities producers' access to finance (including financial sector support pilot projects such as warehouse receipts, microfinance, etc.)? [Indirectly in the context of financial sector support]	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
2.8	Has the Commission supported agricultural commodities producers' access to finance (including financial sector support pilot projects such as warehouse receipts, microfinance, etc.)? [Indirectly because it contributes to a multi-donor funded initiative]	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
2.8	Has the Commission supported agricultural commodities producers' access to finance (including financial sector support pilot projects such as warehouse receipts, microfinance, etc.)? [Not at all]	16	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
2.8	Feel free to comment			La Mauritanie n'est pas un pays de tradition agricole elle n'est donc pas un producteur et moins que moins un exportateur de commodities			The Delegation is preparing a new Multiannual Indicative Programme for the AMSP where access to finance support is foreseen										
	3. Cost & Implementation																
3.1	Do you have a comprehensive picture of activities undertaken in the agricultural commodities sector which are funded by the Commission under its different instruments (EDF country and regional programmes, Stabex, Food Facility, Accompanying Measures for Sugar Protocol, Special Framework of Assistance, NGO budget lines)?	24	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
2.7	Which issues these tools addressed? [Other]	4														Insurance				
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Weather related risks]	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Price related risks]	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Specific crop price stabilisation scheme]	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Macro level]	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Level of producers' organisation]	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Producer level]	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Social Safety net specific to agricultural commodities producers]	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Others (please specify)]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.7	Which tools were implemented with Commission funding? [Other]						IPC						No tools							
2.7	Why not ?		See above 2.4a	see above no agric com.		too early for such an approach					Focus placed on poverty reduction and food security objectives.	Were not part of programmes identified: Zambia has abundant water resources that can be better harnessed to reduce weather risk management			Not that I am aware of!			Focus uniquement sur les organisations de producteurs et la transformation des produits agricoles.		No structural programme in any commodity.
2.8	Has the Commission supported agricultural commodities producers' access to finance (including financial sector support pilot projects such as warehouse receipts, microfinance, etc.)? [Directly in the context of larger agricultural projects]	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
2.8	Has the Commission supported agricultural commodities producers' access to finance (including financial sector support pilot projects such as warehouse receipts, microfinance, etc.)? [Indirectly in the context of financial sector support]	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
2.8	Has the Commission supported agricultural commodities producers' access to finance (including financial sector support pilot projects such as warehouse receipts, microfinance, etc.)? [Indirectly because it contributes to a multi-donor funded initiative]	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.8	Has the Commission supported agricultural commodities producers' access to finance (including financial sector support pilot projects such as warehouse receipts, microfinance, etc.)? [Not at all]	16	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
2.8	Feel free to comment								on observe seulement quelques projets ONG appuyant le microcrédit agricole		The food facility funding instrument help farmers access to funding from MFIs.		selon l'approche des ONG promoteurs de projets et la disponibilité des structures microfinance dans les zones d'intervention, l'accès des producteurs aux systèmes sont appuyés.		The support to access rural credit has been mainly in the context of NGO projects.	Revolving Fund for Field Rehabilitation and Cane Replanting	Yes in the context of Food Security support projects	A travers le projet POP2/POPAC A: étude de faisabilité de financement de séchoirs, crédits de campagne	subsidies for replanting and improving yields for sugar, microfinance for on farm/off farm diversification projects	Only few contributions to revolving funds and small scale financing associations (associations de services financiers). Limited support to the national rural credit fund.
3. Cost & Implementation																				
3.1	Do you have a comprehensive picture of activities undertaken in the agricultural commodities sector which are funded by the Commission under its different instruments (EDF country and regional programmes, Stabex, Food Facility, Accompanying Measures for Sugar Protocol, Special Framework of Assistance, NGO budget lines)?	24	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
3.1	Feel free to comment		Relevant for Mauritius.	seulement une partie de ces instruments sont actifs en Mauritanie	Is of very limited relevance to Namibia		I would also include the Food Security Thematic Programme	Commission support to stabilise price variability of mohair via stabex was not successful, the funds were not used and had to be recovered. Food facility projects are successfully implemented in Lesotho with a focus on subsistence farming and food security on household level. The same is valid for some budget line projects implemented by NGOs.		This is - for example - laid down twice a year in our EAMR	currently, the main tool is the food facility (around 22 M€)		Difficult communication with programmes managed at Brussels for continental or regional initiatives			Coordination of various instruments and flow of information could be improved	
3.2	When considering the projects and programmes in support of agricultural commodities funded from these different instruments, would you state that...? [Their activities are complementary]	19	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
3.2	When considering the projects and programmes in support of agricultural commodities funded from these different instruments, would you state that...? [Their activities reinforce each other]	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
3.2	When considering the projects and programmes in support of agricultural commodities funded from these different instruments, would you state that...? [They pursue the same objectives]	11	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
3.2	When considering the projects and programmes in support of agricultural commodities funded from these different instruments, would you state that...? [Their activities are overlapping]	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
3.3	To what extent did the implementation mechanisms and financing instruments used by the Commission since 2004 for support to agricultural commodities allow a cost-effective and timely attainment of the interventions' objectives?		To a large extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent
3.3	Feel free to comment on the problems encountered			les instrument ne sont pas souvent complémentaires en terme de conception. Ils répondent à des logiques souvent "politiques" et liées à une conjoncture spécifique (voir food facility)			The issue of D+3 restrains the programming of projects that should sometimes take more time like production support via market reinforcement.			Picture is different from one intervention to another; it is difficult to answer this question horizontally	STABEX programmes were implemented over a too short period of time (2 years)		This has to be looked at with in mind donor coordination. EU funding represents a very small part of what is invested in this area but with donor coordination and joint contributions, the impact is significant		La compréhension des objectifs en matière de produits de base de la Commission n'est pas évidente ...		Fragmented approach has limited the impact of results.
3.4	Have institutional capacity diagnostics been undertaken routinely at project design phase to identify potential absorption/implementation constraints?	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
3.1	Feel free to comment							All were discussed and coordinated during PROAGRI (Sector Budget Support/pooling fund). A database with all sectors has been supported by the Commission to get the overall picture.			Handled by different sections within the delegation		les activités sont définies selon les besoins identifiés sur place, mais qui répondent aux grands principes des instruments	Ver small / limited engagement. List of projects available.	In the more recent times. It is difficult to answer to detailed questions related with programmes/projects that started in 2004 for example.			Sauf peu d'informations sur l'utilisation des fonds régionaux dans le Pacifique		
3.2	When considering the projects and programmes in support of agricultural commodities funded from these different instruments, would you state that...? [Their activities are complementary]	19	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
3.2	When considering the projects and programmes in support of agricultural commodities funded from these different instruments, would you state that...? [Their activities reinforce each other]	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
3.2	When considering the projects and programmes in support of agricultural commodities funded from these different instruments, would you state that...? [They pursue the same objectives]	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
3.2	When considering the projects and programmes in support of agricultural commodities funded from these different instruments, would you state that...? [Their activities are overlapping]	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.3	To what extent did the implementation mechanisms and financing instruments used by the Commission since 2004 for support to agricultural commodities allow a cost-effective and timely attainment of the interventions' objectives?		To some extent	Not at all	To a large extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent
3.3	Feel free to comment on the problems encountered			disregard the answer which I cannot provide after answering no on 3.1 a flaw in your questionnaire design				Sector budget support guarantee ownership and coordination by Government but is penalised by its weaknesses			The output of some programmes/projects may not be commensurate with the allocated fund.	Public funds, in particular EU development funds and procedures, have limited added value compared to private sector initiative and investment. There is a need to find a way to accompany the private sector dynamics and investment rather than trying to substitute them. One concentration area could be the social welfare and enabling environment	les effets des appuis pour l'amélioration de la productivité ne sont pas palpables qu'au moins après trois ou 4 années d'intervention. L'efficacité pour la mise en œuvre n'est pas à la hauteur des attentes.	To measure cost-effectiveness for research is not always easy.	We are dealing with Bananas and Sugar in Jamaica and Belize. The banana programme was very poorly designed both for Jamaica and Belize. The sugar programme in Jamaica, implemented through budget support, is very successful. Evaluations of all these programmes are available.					Mainly budget lines with poor coordination. Two attempts in Palm oil and Producers organisations have had limited impact.
3.4	Have institutional capacity diagnostics been undertaken routinely at project design phase to identify potential absorption/implementation constraints?	18	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
3.4	Feel free to comment		The Commission's assistance has been mainly in the form of budget support, where sugar was one of the focal sectors.	la réponse réelle est : en partie oui et en partie non. Mais compte tenu de nos capacités limitées en la matière j'ai choisie la deuxième option			This is also one reason why the D+3 gets to be a constraint: government and local authorities are still learning on how to use public procurement. Until now they used mainly direct agreements.						Again, this was not necessarily EU funded but was funded by other donor in the context of joint assesment and project preparation and contributed to preparation of EU supported projects				
4. EC added value, coordination and complementarity																	
4.1	What mechanisms are in place for coordination and harmonisation of activities with other donors to support agricultural commodity value chains? Please explain in detail the role of the Commission in this respect.		No other donor supports agricultural commodities. Nevertheless in the context of regular donor coordination the Commission informs them about ongoing activities.	aucune	No mechanism since this is of little relevance	Groupes sectorielles agriculture et Développement rural	There is a donor coordination group but it is not functional	Project proposals for agricultural development have been presented and discussed by the Development Partner's Consultative Forum.	National Council of Competitiveness donor's table.	There is no working & regular Government-led coordination mechanism in the agricultural sector as a whole. Donors meet regular in the Donor Committee on Agriculture & Food Security (DCAFS). This group discusses all aspects of support to the sector, of which value chains are only one very small element.	Technical and financial partners meet in a thematic group on rural development / food security. The group was chaired by the EC until 2010.	around the Core Economic Working Group, members from WB, ADB, New Zealand, Australia, RAMSI and EU to engage with Government in Policy Dialogue, mainly around macro economic issues, but also sector issues including agricultrues	EU is very active in the Agriculture Donor group (co-chair during the last 4 years) and the Agriculture Sector Working Group. All initiatives are coordinated within this context. EU was able to influence analysis and initiatives of the government and other donors	Comité Multi-bailleurs, développement rural	Agricultural sector (ministries) co-ordination unit Donor co-ordination group	Some coordination take place in various regional coordination mechanisms. However, coordination in the agricultural sector at large could be much improved !	There is a donor partner roundtable where all donors' interventions are discussed. However, there is no working group specific for the agricultural sector and rural development. Discussions about the creation of such a mechanism are ongoing. In addition, only a very limited number of donors is involved in this sector, without a clear strategy.
4.2	Have agricultural commodities received support from joint initiatives?	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
4.2	From which donors (include also the Commission if it participates)?					CTB, FIDA, FAO	Through a FSTP funding the EU financed the production of rice via FAO which would then be bought by WFP for their "food basket"		USAID, Taiwan, Japan, IDB, Spain.	DFID, Irish Aid, Norway, World Bank			WB, EU, DANIDA, DFID, Foundations			Commission, FAO	
4.2	Why not?			parce que la Mauritanie n'est pas un pays producteur de commodities	Agriculture is of limited relevance to the country.						actually I don't know			?			See above.
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [EU Member States (MS)]	9	0			1			1				1		0		0
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [Partner Country Authorities]	10	0			1							1		1	1	1
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [International Commodity Bodies (ICBs)]	1	0												0		0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	Fiji	Republic of Guinea
3.4	Feel free to comment										For grant projects yes while for bilateral projects is no.		l'appréciation est surtout basée sur les informations financières fournies par les promoteurs, mais aucun diagnostic approfondi n'a été entrepris		There has been always evaluation of previous support which leads to recommendations for future support.		Office du Niger	Ce diagnostic devrait être mis en œuvre en juillet 2011: au niveau du Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'ordonnateur national (DESPAC) et du Ministère du Commerce, dans le cadre du projet d'appui au secteur privé (PSGSP).		
	4. EC added value, coordination and complementarity																			
4.1	What mechanisms are in place for coordination and harmonisation of activities with other donors to support agricultural commodity value chains? Please explain in detail the role of the Commission in this respect.		In the North, the only existing coordination mechanisms are those related to the implementation of pool funds such as WB managed Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF). The European Commission is an observer to the oversight committee of the MDTF in the North. In the South there is a natural resources and rural development donor group that the Commission has chaired until end 2010 and of which it is now an active member.	none	Sector Working Group Swap Group	Coordination group led by Belgium for PTF side, DUE is very active in this group	Il existe un Groupe Thématique "agriculture et développement rural" qui regroupe l'ensemble des partenaires financiers et administratifs. La DUE a initié une base de données avec l'ensemble des projets du secteur et en assure la diffusion et l'analyse	All is coordinated at PROAGRI level. All donors are invited at the partner group to share their programme. the Commission was chair and after vice-chair of this group since 2001.	La Délégation du Togo participe aux réunions sectorielles agricoles mais c'est la Banque Mondiale le chef de file du secteur (BM est le plus gros bailleurs dans le secteur). Le secteur agricole n'est pas un secteur de concentration dans le PIN 10ème FED.	Agriculture Donnor Working Group in place since 2010. EU active member of the group.	Under the DAG there is a dedicated technical working group (TWG) to ensure harmonisation of support from different donors. EU is a member of the TWG.	An agriculture donor group exists and ensures a coordinated approach to agriculture and a common dialogue with Government; however this does not include the sugar sector as it is dealt by the Ministry of Commerce and Trade instead of Agriculture. Since 2010 the EU is a member of the Troika, together with the US and the AIDB; in principle it should chair the group in 2012	le secrétariat multibailleurs a été mis sur pied pour les discussions concernant le secteur développement rural en général.	Agric SWG of MDBS	Under the dialogue structure, the agriculture sector is discussed under the Agriculture Working Group (different DPS). The Commission is an active member of the Agriculture Working Group.	we are the only donors dealing with sugar and bananas	There are Thematic Groups of donors: Rural agricultural Economy Group, Cotton group, Office du Niger group (rice), Food Security Group, etc. The Delegation participates actively to these groups	Une seule réunion avec le NAO. Pendant deux ans, il y a eu des réunions. Mais le code de conduite n'a pas été respecté. Un des partenaires (Nouvelle-Zélande) s'est retiré de l'agriculture.	Nothing	Coordination among donors. Definition of a Food Security Strategy. EU active in the group without being leader.
4.2	Have agricultural commodities received support from joint initiatives?	18	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
4.2	From which donors (include also the Commission if it participates)?		There is only the case of the MDTFs (North and south) The Commission is one of the donors in the South and an Observer in the North.		WB DFID EU	Belgium, Germany	FAO, Coop Belge, UE	Sectoral Budget Support Donors		African development Bank-IFAD. World Bank-IFAD. World Bank-Japan.	World bank, Commission, UNDP	do not include the sugar sector	IRD, UE ont financé le réseau des observatoires ruraux, élaboration de la stratégie nationale du riz. L'initiative "coalition for African Development (CARD)"		Yes but only for food crops under the ASDP basket fund: WB, FAO, IFAD, IRISH AID, AIDB and Japan.		Convention de Délégation avec l'AFD	France (POP2/POPCA) Coopération australienne et coopération de Nouvelle-Zélande (financement d'experts pour préparer un projet de soutien au secteur privé, incluant un soutien au Ministère de l'Agriculture).		Coordination around rice production, with no common strategy agreed with government.
4.2	Why not?			see above no agric com.										Do not know					see above	
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [EU Member States (MS)]	9	0				1		0	1	1	0				0	1	1		
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [Partner Country Authorities]	10	0			1			0	1	0	0	1		1	0	1	0		
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [International Commodity Bodies (ICBs)]	1	0			1			0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0		

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [World Bank (WB)]	8	0						0				1		1		1
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [Common Fund for Commodities (CFC)]	2	0												0		0
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)]	0	0												0		0
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [International Trade Center (ITC)]	2	0										1		0		0
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [Food Agriculture Organisation (FAO)]	10	0			1	1						1		1	1	0
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [Other donors (please specify)]	3					1										0
4.3	Feel free to comment on your answers						The other donor is WFP. Since the FSTP project, WFP is also starting a programme to buy more rice and beans produced locally.										There are very few donors in PNG and the main one (AusAID) is currently withdrawing from the rural development sector.
4.4	Would agricultural commodity value chains have been supported without the Commission's contribution?	25	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0
4.4	Please explain		1. EC support was indirect (through budget support). 2. EC support covered the social aspect of the sugar reform. 3. Sugar sector in Mauritius is highly private sector driven.	la Mauritanie n'est pas un pays producteur de commodities	Difficult to answer, since Commission was not involved.	-----	The need to support value chains is identified in the different donor reports	WB, IFAD and MCC would support it independent of EU support. Decisive is the Government's strategy.	USAID has a strong support programme for commodities production in DR.	Many donors are active in the sector	this is my assumption	difficult to say	Value chain approach is part of many other donors strategy.	AFD et BM	Other donors also have this as priority	No additional comments	The Government poverty reduction strategy has never included in a coherent and exhaustive manner this sector.
4.5	Since 2004 : [Discussion fora (such as thematic working groups) were set up in the country to discuss general agricultural issues or agricultural product specific issues between representatives of the Government, the Commission and other donors/organisations active in the field of agricultural commodities]	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0
4.5	Since 2004 : [The level of coordination between donors concerning activities in the field of agricultural commodities was stepped up]	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	Do not know	0	1	1	1	0	0
4.5	Since 2004 : [The Commission has increasingly supported agricultural commodities through joint initiatives]	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [World Bank (WB)]	8	0			1	1		1	1	1	0			0	0		0		
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [Common Fund for Commodities (CFC)]	2	0						0	0	1	0			1	0		0		
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)]	0	0						0	0	0	0				0		0		
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [International Trade Center (ITC)]	2	0						0	0	1	0				0		0		
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [Food Agriculture Organisation (FAO)]	10	0			1	1		1	1	0	0			0	0		0		
4.3	If the Commission supported commodity chain strategies, would you say that this stimulated other donors to contribute also? [Other donors (please specify)]	3	0						0	1		0				0		1		
4.3	Feel free to comment on your answers									Japan, USAid also participated in the value chain proposed by the UN/GoL joint programme.	The agricultural marketing project (10th EDF) attracted other donors to support market information system and quality and standard pertinent to different commodities.	for sugar	Possibilité de contribution de la part de la FAO, FIDA et du JICA	-				Les autres coopérations sont: Nouvelle-Zélande (mais elle a quitté le secteur agricole par faute de résultats), Australie		No real chain strategy supported by DUE.
4.4	Would agricultural commodity value chains have been supported without the Commission's contribution?	25	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
4.4	Please explain		There has been no value chains supported in Sudan so far as most of the activities are focused on humanitarian or recovery programmes. There are now plans from FAO and from USAID in South Sudan to move to support these.	see above no agric com.	Sever donors are very active in the sector because of good governance.	Area well covered	D'autres bailleurs sont actifs sur ce secteur, avec ou sans CE	Other donor like USAID and World Bank are not contributing to PROAGRI even if they participate in the meetings for coordination	Actuellement, la Délégation n'intervient que très peu dans le secteur agricole (STABEX terminé, Food Facility et quelques projets ONG financés par le budget sont presque terminés). C'est la Banque Mondiale et le FIDA qui interviennent le plus, notamment dans le Programme National d'Investissement Agricole et de Sécurité Alimentaire (PNIASA).	Other donors were already funding the UN/GoL joint programme	For example SNV supports honey value chain and USAID supports livestock value chain development and other donors prior to the involvement of the commission.	Private sector investment	Beaucoup de projets relatifs aux produits agricoles sont réalisés sans l'appui de l'UE : AFD-FIDA, JICA, USAID	-	There are other donors as USAID that have contributed to support to agriculture commodity value chains. And the World Bank for example with cashew nuts.	The EU is the only donor supporting the sugar and banana sectors in Belize and Jamaica, because of its historical trade arrangements (sugar and banana protocols)	USAID, World Bank, AFD, etc.	Pas de commentaires.	No support from other donor	N/A
4.5	Since 2004 : [Discussion fora (such as thematic working groups) were set up in the country to discuss general agricultural issues or agricultural product specific issues between representatives of the Government, the Commission and other donors/organisations active in the field of agricultural commodities]	19	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	Do not know	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
4.5	Since 2004 : [The level of coordination between donors concerning activities in the field of agricultural commodities was stepped up]	16	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	Do not know	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
4.5	Since 2004 : [The Commission has increasingly supported agricultural commodities through joint initiatives]	9	0	0	Do not know	1	0	1	0	1	1	Do not know	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
4.5	As discussion fora (such as thematic working groups) were set up, what general or agricultural product specific issues were discussed?												input supply, research, production, marketing, value addition	Café et bananes			
4.5	Has the commission coordinated its initiatives in the policy dialogue on competitiveness and diversification? [Yes, with the Government]	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
4.5	Has the commission coordinated its initiatives in the policy dialogue on competitiveness and diversification? [Yes, with EU Member States]	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
4.5	Has the commission coordinated its initiatives in the policy dialogue on competitiveness and diversification? [Yes, with other donors and international organisations]	17	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
4.5	Has the commission coordinated its initiatives in the policy dialogue on competitiveness and diversification? [No]	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
4.5	Has the commission coordinated its initiatives in the policy dialogue on competitiveness and diversification? [Don't know]	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
4.5	What specific issues were discussed?						mainly access to market (rural roads - main constraint); different commodities to exploit (Kassava & Palm oil)			Policy issues, issues linked to the Government's Farm Input Subsidy Programme, Food Security, Nutrition			productivity, value addition, production factors allocation	Echanges sur les interventions de chacun.			
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its initiatives of national agricultural commodity chain strategies promotion? [Yes, with the Government]	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its initiatives of national agricultural commodity chain strategies promotion? [Yes, with EU Member States]	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its initiatives of national agricultural commodity chain strategies promotion? [Yes, with other donors and international organisations]	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its initiatives of national agricultural commodity chain strategies promotion? [No]	15	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its initiatives of national agricultural commodity chain strategies promotion? [Don't know]	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
4.6	To what extent (e.g. information sharing only, joint initiatives for diagnostics, joint projects, etc.)?								Information sharing, diagnostics.				information sharing, joint initiatives for diagnostics, joint projects, project coordination, setting up coordinated funding modalities (basket funding, trust funds, etc).				
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to improved competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains? [Yes, with the Government]	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to improved competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains? [Yes, with EU Member States]	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to improved competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains? [Yes, with other donors and international organisations]	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to improved competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains? [No]	15	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to improved competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains? [Don't know]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
4.5	As discussion fora (such as thematic working groups) were set up, what general or agricultural product specific issues were discussed?					rice, soja, cotton, others			C'est surtout la mise en place du PNIASA qui est discutée pour l'instant (phase de démarrage).	not specific product discussed	beans, honey, livestock				The thematic groups are specific issues such as Food security and nutrition.		Cotton privatisation, irrigated rices and related issues, etc.	Discussions entre la France et la CE. Mais le Gouvernement participe "mollement".		
4.5	Has the commission coordinated its initiatives in the policy dialogue on competitiveness and diversification? [Yes, with the Government]	14	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
4.5	Has the commission coordinated its initiatives in the policy dialogue on competitiveness and diversification? [Yes, with EU Member States]	14	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
4.5	Has the commission coordinated its initiatives in the policy dialogue on competitiveness and diversification? [Yes, with other donors and international organisations]	17	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
4.5	Has the commission coordinated its initiatives in the policy dialogue on competitiveness and diversification? [No]	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
4.5	Has the commission coordinated its initiatives in the policy dialogue on competitiveness and diversification? [Don't know]	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.5	What specific issues were discussed?					diversification, market access, regulation, financing	Coordination des actions et acteurs	Coordination and complementarity in PROAGRI			mechanisms of improving the quality and standards of agricultural commodities.	General support to the sector; division of labour among donors; reform of agriculture policy	Utilisation des ressources stabex, réflexion sur la stratégie horticole						National adaptation strategy for sugar	Limited coordination achieved.
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its initiatives of national agricultural commodity chain strategies promotion? [Yes, with the Government]	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its initiatives of national agricultural commodity chain strategies promotion? [Yes, with EU Member States]	11	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its initiatives of national agricultural commodity chain strategies promotion? [Yes, with other donors and international organisations]	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its initiatives of national agricultural commodity chain strategies promotion? [No]	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its initiatives of national agricultural commodity chain strategies promotion? [Don't know]	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
4.6	To what extent (e.g. information sharing only, joint initiatives for diagnostics, joint projects, etc.)?					large extent	Echanges d'information sur les stratégies et actifs en matière de chaîne des valeurs	Information sharing as Government is leading the process		Joint UN/GoL programme funded by other member states (DANIDA, Sida), other donors (Japan, USAid) implemented by UN agencies and the Government of Liberia.	information sharing mainly		Echange dans l'élaboration des termes de références pour les études, participation aux ateliers de restitution des missions y afférentes, distribution des rapports.					info sharing		
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to improved competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains? [Yes, with the Government]	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to improved competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains? [Yes, with EU Member States]	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to improved competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains? [Yes, with other donors and international organisations]	15	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to improved competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains? [No]	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to improved competitiveness of agricultural commodity value chains? [Don't know]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
4.6	To what extent (e.g. information, joint initiatives, complementarity in projects, complementarity in sub-sectors covered etc.)?								Complementarity on projects.				All of the above				
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to risk management tools? [Yes, with the Government]	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to risk management tools? [Yes, with EU Member States]	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to risk management tools? [Yes, with other donors and international organisations]	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to risk management tools? [No]	21	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to risk management tools? [Don't know]	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
4.6	To what extent (e.g. information, joint initiatives, etc.)?												information,				
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to the diversification around traditional agricultural commodities? [Yes, with the Government]	18	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to the diversification around traditional agricultural commodities? [Yes, with EU Member States]	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to the diversification around traditional agricultural commodities? [Yes, with other donors and international organisations]	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to the diversification around traditional agricultural commodities? [No]	10	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to the diversification around traditional agricultural commodities? [Don't know]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
4.6	To what extent (e.g. information sharing, discussions, joint initiatives, etc.)?								Policy dialogue and information sharing.				policy design, joint initiatives				Information sharing with government and donors.

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea
4.6	To what extent (e.g. information, joint initiatives, complementarity in projects, complementarity in sub-sectors covered etc.)?					All	Informations sur les projets UE dans ce secteur, échanges avec bailleurs pour assurer une meilleure complémentarité	Information sharing and contribution through sectoral budget support		Joint UN/GoL programme funded by other member states (DANIDA, Sida), other donors (Japan, USAid) implemented by UN agencies and the Government of Liberia.	Complementarity in projects with a view to avoid duplication of efforts and to build on what has been done and achieved.		partage d'informations.		Mainly in onformation sharing			SWAP en discussion, mais surtout au niveau de projets jusqu'à présent (POPACA/PO P2 et financement d'experts)		
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to risk management tools? [Yes, with the Government]	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to risk management tools? [Yes, with EU Member States]	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to risk management tools? [Yes, with other donors and international organisations]	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to risk management tools? [No]	21	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to risk management tools? [Don't know]	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.6	To what extent (e.g. information, joint initiatives, etc.)?						Table ronde sur outil IPC			Social safety nets implemented in the framework of Joint UN/GoL programme funded by other member states (DANIDA, Sida), other donors (Japan, USAid) implemented by UN agencies and the Government of Liberia.			Echange d'information, mise en place d'alerte précoces.			Yes, with a World Bank study on parametric insurance and weather related risks				
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to the diversification around traditional agricultural commodities? [Yes, with the Government]	18	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to the diversification around traditional agricultural commodities? [Yes, with EU Member States]	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to the diversification around traditional agricultural commodities? [Yes, with other donors and international organisations]	19	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to the diversification around traditional agricultural commodities? [No]	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
4.6	Has the Commission coordinated its support to the diversification around traditional agricultural commodities? [Don't know]	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.6	To what extent (e.g. information sharing, discussions, joint initiatives, etc.)?		Basically through discussions at the level of the Federal Ministry of agriculture (undersecretary, Director General). It needs to be said though that the quality of dialogue between Government of sudan and international donors is very low, not only in agriculture but in all development sectors.			All	Echanges de résultats en matière d'adaptation de différentes variétés de cultures vivrières	Same than above		Rice value chain diversification implemented in the framework of Joint UN/GoL programme funded by other member states (DANIDA, Sida), other donors (Japan, USAid) implemented by UN agencies and the Government of Liberia.	information sharing and discussion fora.	Information sharing and discussions, notably during the drafting of the CCADP compatch	organisation des ateliers vanille jusqu'en 2006		Mainly information sharing	information sharing			Limited coordination and information sharing.	

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
4.7	A posteriori, do you consider that the Commission in-country support responded well to the needs identified in the agricultural commodities sector?		To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	To some extent	To a very limited extent	Not at all	To a large extent	To some extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent
4.7	Please specify the reasons		Importance of sugar sector to the GDP has been decreasing steadily. The EC response in form of GBS was appropriated as it supported the overall economic reform programme (and not only sugar sector).	la Mauritanie n'est pas un pays producteur de commodities donc le manque d'appui de la CE à ce secteur est cohérent avec les besoin du pays. En revanche il manque un appui spécifique à la production vivrière qui a un impact direct sur la sécurité alimentaire des ménages plus pauvres	This question is of no relevance to Namibia		Knowing that agriculture is not part of the NIP, only AMSP is being used to respond to the needs identified.	There is no such sector of significance in Lesotho and agricultural commodities are not a priority for the Government.		Commission support has been as good as the situation without credible policy dialogue allows			The EU participation has not materialized in sufficient government investment and for the Government to stick to its policy and commitments	Développement rural n'est pas un secteur de concentration.			
5. The knowledge of the Commission Communications																	
5.1	Do you know the Commission Communication (COM (2004)89) Agricultural Commodity Chains, Dependency and Poverty – A Proposal for an EU Action Plan?		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
5.1	Do you consider that this Communication, including priorities and proposed actions, provided a useful framework in your country : [...to take part in the policy dialogue with the beneficiary Government]														To some extent		
5.1	Do you consider that this Communication, including priorities and proposed actions, provided a useful framework in your country : [...to design Commission supported interventions]														To some extent		
5.1	Feel free to comment on the reasons																
5.2	Do you know the Commission Communication (COM (2004)87) Proposal for an EU-Africa Partnership in support of cotton sector development, accompanied by the Action Plan for Cotton?	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
5.2	Do you consider that this Communication, including priorities and proposed actions, provided a useful framework in your country : [...to take part in the policy dialogue with the beneficiary Government]													To a very limited extent			
5.2	Do you consider that this Communication, including priorities and proposed actions, provided a useful framework in your country : [...to design Commission supported interventions]													To a very limited extent			
5.2	Feel free to comment on the reasons																
6. End of the questionnaire																	
6.1	Do you believe agricultural commodities should receive increased support in the future in this country?	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35	
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea	
4.7	A posteriori, do you consider that the Commission in-country support responded well to the needs identified in the agricultural commodities sector?		To a very limited extent	To a large extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To a very limited extent	To some extent	To some extent	To some extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To some extent	
4.7	Please specify the reasons		The needs identified when resuming cooperation with Sudan after the peace agreement in 2005 did not include agriculture commodities as a subsector as such, but were more focused in improving food security in war affected areas. The lack of a development framework towards the future (Sudan not signatory of Cotonou agreement) will make it difficult to progress on this.	see above no agric com.		needs are to be better defined	Les projets sont bien adaptés au besoin mais les moyens disponibles ne permettent pas de couvrir toutes les zones géographiques. Par ailleurs, la faiblesse de l'administration ne permet pas de maximiser les résultats	The country was recovering from the war in general.	La Délégation a soutenu la mise en place d'un comité de concertation entre les différents acteurs de la Food Facility (comité qui a bien fonctionné), mais aucune autre coordination n'a été mise en place par la Délégation (entre autre c'était un point faible du Stabex). Actuellement, la Délégation n'intervenant que très peu dans le secteur agricole, il est du ressort des autres bailleurs d'organiser la coordination des activités dans ce secteur.		Only recently commission made the shift to supporting agricultural growth initiatives.	des réponses aux besoins pour les aspects en amont des produits sont effectives, mais les appuis en aval (commercialisation) ne sont pas suffisamment approfondis. Secteur privé assez limité		Some of the final evaluation of STABEX support points out shortfalls.	The support to the sugar sector has been very relevant. The focus of the support in the banana sector has shifted in 2007 towards more economic diversification. The results of this change are only bearing fruits now.		Oui, mais avec peu de durabilité (cf. POPACA/POP 2). A l'arrêt du financement, le Gouvernement ne poursuit plus les activités initiées.	Application of Article 96 of Cotonou due to political situation in Fiji and no disbursement of the sugar funds			
5. The knowledge of the Commission Communications																				0	0
5.1	Do you know the Commission Communication (COM (2004)89) Agricultural Commodity Chains, Dependency and Poverty – A Proposal for an EU Action Plan?		1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0			
5.1	Do you consider that this Communication, including priorities and proposed actions, provided a useful framework in your country : [...to take part in the policy dialogue with the beneficiary Government]		To a very limited extent	Not at all		To some extent		To some extent		To some extent					To some extent	To some extent					
5.1	Do you consider that this Communication, including priorities and proposed actions, provided a useful framework in your country : [...to design Commission supported interventions]		To some extent	Not at all		To some extent		To some extent		To a very limited extent					To some extent	To some extent					
5.1	Feel free to comment on the reasons		As mentioned before the quality of policy dialogue with Government is very poor in all development sectors due to the overall political framework.	see above no agric com.																	
5.2	Do you know the Commission Communication (COM (2004)87) Proposal for an EU-Africa Partnership in support of cotton sector development, accompanied by the Action Plan for Cotton?	6	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	
5.2	Do you consider that this Communication, including priorities and proposed actions, provided a useful framework in your country : [...to take part in the policy dialogue with the beneficiary Government]			Not at all		To some extent		To some extent							To some extent		To a very limited extent				
5.2	Do you consider that this Communication, including priorities and proposed actions, provided a useful framework in your country : [...to design Commission supported interventions]			Not at all		To some extent		To some extent							To some extent		Not at all				
5.2	Feel free to comment on the reasons		see above no agric com.																		
6. End of the questionnaire																					
6.1	Do you believe agricultural commodities should receive increased support in the future in this country?	26	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
6.1	Why?					80% of the population is working in agriculture	Congo has a huge agriculture potential with little population. It has all potential to be a big agricultural commodity exporter regional, continental and world wise. But... With all its agricultural potential, Congo has not yet managed to produce a base line statistics to draft a full proof agricultural strategy. Current base data is from 1985. A further support would depend on obtaining reliable data, together with reliable ownership of the proposed strategy.	It is necessary to scale up rural development and food security.	Alimentary security and potential por export and creation of employ and to support environment.	Malawi will continue to be reliant on agriculture. Malawi needs to diversify exports away from tobacco. The problem is that it is extremely difficult to support the sector without credible policy dialogue.	Senegal is still predominantly a rural country and a net food importer, hence the need to diversify its production, its resilience to shocks (price, weather...) and competitiveness.	need to diversify livelihoods, in the context of climate change hunger or food security may become an issue.	The potential of the country is not sufficiently developed whereas it could contribute significantly to economic growth, food security in the region and to industrial development	La crise alimentaire de 2008 et l'importance relative de la population rurale (pourvoyeur de ressources alimentaires à la population toute entière) démontrent à suffisance l'importance que l'on devrait accorder aux produits agricoles de base.			85% of the population in PNG live in rural areas and depend for its subsistence on agricultural production. It is believed that the only sustainable way out of poverty is agricultural productivity, diversification and activities related to income generating opportunities. In addition links with the overall governance structure related to agriculture should be explored with a view to developing a coherent overall strategy.
6.1	Why not?		MRU is benefiting from AMSP, which is a "temporary support instrument" for the period 2006-2013. Contribution of sugar sector to the GDP has been decreasing (less than 2% in 2010). Part of the economic reform program of Mauritius targets the diversification of the economy (such as ICT, fisheries, tourism...).	parce que la seule commoditie produit par la Mauritanie est le riz qui n'est pas compétitif et cette culture rentre en compétition avec la production vivrière qui assure la sécurité alimentaire de la population rurale pauvre. De plus la production intensive de riz en Mauritanie est subventionnée par l'état et basée aussi sur l'appropriation de terre villageoises, utilisées pour l'agriculture vivrière et/ou le pâturage, de la part de groupes financier et d'entreprise.	Agricultural commodities are of very limited relevance to Namibia. The only product of importance is table grape as a real niche product.											A lot of support is available through various instruments and several donors are interested in the sector. Improved coordination is the key to better results.	

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FJI	Republic of Guinea
6.1	Why?		Both north and South Sudan (the latter in particular) have a great agricultural potential that has not been fully exploited by a number of reasons.	A market based agricultural economy is needed and limited potential exists in agriculture for commercial exports, high potentials exist in fisheries. This requires political change although the fisheries sector might be supported as a first priority even under current conditions	Because for the social and economic development of the country. There is a need of (i) strengthening the transformation (value-adding) and commercialization of agricultural products (ii) modernization of the production schemes in general and (iii) increased engagement of the private sector for the countrys agricultural development.	Key to growth and development		The sector is only recovering from the war and still need a lot of support. Agriculture commodities are linked to food security and rural poverty alleviation	L'agriculture devrait être considéré comme un secteur prioritaire d'intervention au Togo car il représente 40% du PIB et occupe presque 80% de la population. Le maïs, qui est une production excédentaire, pourrait être beaucoup mieux valorisé. Il en est de même, entre autre, avec les tubercules, les mangues, les ananas et les cultures d'exportation, etc. Le potentiel agricole au Togo est en effet très important (produits diversifiés, faible utilisation de produits chimiques, etc).	Economic development in Liberia depends greatly on agriculture commodities	Unless market orientation of small holder production systems is promoted it is hardly possible to attain food security.	- les stratégies nationales pour les principaux produits agricoles de base ne sont pas encore définies; - les efforts accomplis en matière de qualité devront être poursuivis; - l'accès au marché mérite des appuis plus conséquent.		Commodities such as coffee, tea, sugar and cotton for example still represent an important percentage of agriculture GDP in the country further more it is a matter of consolidating previous support with a main focus on smallholders.		Yes, as 80% of the population lives in rural areas	Car au Vanuatu, c'est une source essentielle de croissance économique, surtout si le tourisme et l'immobilier arrêtent d'être puissants. Mais il est nécessaire de définir et mettre en oeuvre une réforme agraire. C'est obligatoire pour permettre le financement du monde rural (crédit rural).		Country in a recent democratic process. Civil government has expressed the need to re-gain autosufficiency in rice. However, the Delegation is involved in other priorities. Coordination with other donors indicate our added value is in infrastructures, good governance and basic social services.	
6.1	Why not?											no answer				The priorities of the EC cooperation should be aligned with the national development strategy and reflected in the CSP/NIP. Those ad-hoc programmes such as sugar, bananas, food facility (which are now outside the NIP) should be incorporated in the CSP/NIP or phased out.				

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Mauritius	Mauritania	Namibia	burundi	Congo-Brazzaville	Lesotho	dominican republic	Malawi	Senegal	Solomon Islands	Uganda	Cameroun	Kenya	Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean	Papua New Guinea
6.2	We thank you for your participation to this on-line questionnaire. If you have any further comments about the Commission support to agricultural commodities that was not targeted by this questionnaire, feel free to share them now.			Le questionnaire n'est pas "neutre", dans le sens qu'il est conçu comme si tous les pays étaient producteurs de commodities. Dans d'autres mots ce questionnaire n'a pas de sens pour un pays comme la mauritanie car à travers le réponses données on n'arrivera pas à comprendre beacoup sur le pourquoi en mauritanie l'UE n'appui pas le secteurs de commodities	Since Namibia has almost no potential to develop tradable agricultural products besides meat and table grapes the questionnaire is of limited value only.						The questionnaire largely refers to the 2004-09 period and since I started my posting in 2008, there are many questions I could not answer.		There is insufficient coordination at HQ level (Brussels) to design the strategy of the commission in support to development of agriculture in ACP countries, no involvement of Delegation staff in design of the strategy, no seminars to share experiences and views from the field level and from the HQ level, no strategy to disseminate information. Missing link between HQ and Delegation.				The redistribution of benefits stemming from a competitive agricultural sector among different stakeholders, particularly small households, should be given more emphasis.

Survey question code	Question	# Yes	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	34	35	
0.1	In which ACP country is the Delegation based?		Sudan	Eritrea	Rwanda	Benin	République démocratique du Congo	Mozambique	TOGO	Liberia	Ethiopia	Zambia	Madagascar	Ghana	Tanzania	Jamaica	Mali	Vanuatu	FIJI	Republic of Guinea	
6.2	We thank you for your participation to this on-line questionnaire. If you have any further comments about the Commission support to agricultural commodities that was not targeted by this questionnaire, feel free to share them now.												la partie suivi et évaluation est à compléter au plan d'action pour le soutien aux produits agricoles; la considération d'une durée plus réaliste de projets d'appuis au secteur agricole est plus qu'indispensable.								I believe that the questionnaire is relevant, however as it is backward looking is not always easy for the delegation to establish the facts of what as happened in the past of the EU support.

Annex 7: Field Mission Debriefings

The following annex includes the content of the field missions which were undertaken for this evaluation. The content is shown as it was presented to the EU Delegations at the end of field missions. Six field missions led to formal debriefing presentations, the two exceptions being Côte d'Ivoire (for which the field mission was limited to an interview with a Delegation representative in Brussels) and Tanzania (where the oral debriefing was not accompanied by a powerpoint support).

Evaluation thématique des interventions de la Commission Européenne en appui aux produits de base agricoles

Mission au Burkina Faso

Débriefing avec la Délégation de l'UE

Ouagadougou, 14 Juin 2011



Ce document est destiné à servir de support à une présentation orale et n'a pas vocation à être diffusé

Objet, objectifs et champ de l'évaluation

Objet	<p>Appuis de la Commission aux produits de base agricoles dans le contexte des politiques et approches définies par les deux Communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• COM(2004)89 Filières agricoles, dépendance et pauvreté• COM(2004)87 Proposition d'un partenariat UE-Afrique en appui au développement du secteur cotonnier <p>→ C'est une évaluation thématique, ni une évaluation de projets ou évaluation pays et encore moins un audit administratif ou de gestion</p>
Objectifs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fournir une appréciation indépendante de la coopération passée et présente de la Commission en appui aux produits de base agricoles• En dégager des enseignements visant à améliorer les futurs stratégies et programmes de la Commission
Champ	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Période 2000-2010• Tous pays ACP• Tous instruments de financement: FED, Stabex et Flex, lignes budgétaires (Programme Sucre, Programme Banane, Food Facility, etc.)

Les neuf questions d'évaluation

#	Objet de la question	Critères d'évaluation
EQ 1	Contexte des deux communications	Pertinence
EQ 2	Appuis de la Commission en termes de stratégie	Efficacité, Impact, Durabilité, Valeur Ajoutée de la Commission
EQ 3	Coordination avec les institutions internationales	Efficacité, Cohérence, Valeur Ajoutée de la Commission
EQ 4	Appuis de la Commission en termes de compétitivité	Efficacité, Impact, Durabilité, Valeur Ajoutée de la Commission
EQ 5	Appuis de la Commission à la gestion du risque	Efficacité, Impact, Durabilité
EQ 6	Appuis de la Commission en termes de diversification	Efficacité, Impact, Durabilité, Valeur Ajoutée de la Commission
EQ 7	Appuis de la Commission dans le contexte des politiques communautaires	Cohérence
EQ 8	Utilisation de différents instruments de financement	Pertinence, Efficacité, Efficience, Cohérence
EQ 9	Pertinence des deux communications	Tous critères

QE 1 : Dans son aide aux pays dépendants des produits de base agricoles, de quelle manière la Commission a-t-elle réagi au déclin tendanciel et à la volatilité des prix des produits de base agricoles?

- L'économie du Burkina Faso reste très dépendante de ses exportations agricoles: 60-70% des recettes d'exportation sont réalisées par la vente de coton (pendant la crise: moins de 60%)
- Tendence baissière du prix du coton sur le long terme confirmée pour la période 2000-2008, mais renversement de tendance (à la hausse) depuis 2009 et accélérée en 2010
- Volatilité des cours confirmée pour la période 2000-2008 et s'accélération depuis 2008
- Deux instruments spécifiques ont été définis pour adresser la tendance baissière du prix du coton:
 - Stabex: amélioration de la compétitivité (infrastructures, études et formation) et réponse partielle à la crise financière du secteur (études et apurement de dettes)
 - Le FLEX: mais utilisé en appui budgétaire
- Interventions de la Commission: surtout orientées vers l'amélioration de la compétitivité
 - PAOSA (sous FED), en appui à la structuration des Org. Prof. Agricoles (OPA), épargne/ crédit, production de riz, renforcement capacités
 - PAFFIC (sous FED): recapitalisation de l'UNPCB liée à une stratégie de sortie de crise
 - Amélioration de la fertilité des sols en coton biologique (sous ligne Food)
 - Appui à l'Université du coton (sous FED/PIR)
 - Programme Tous ACP: stratégie régionale coton UEMOA (ITC), prévention contamination coton (CFC/ IFDC/BM), Diversification/BPA/ GIPD (FAO), gestion risques climatiques (Banque Mondiale/ ARMG), stratégie gomme arabique (ITC)

QE 2: Dans quelle mesure l'appui de la Commission a permis dans les pays dépendants des produits de base agricoles la formulation de stratégies relatives à ces produits?

- La Commission n'a pas promu les filières de produits de base agricoles et la situation de dépendance comme priorités des stratégies nationales au Burkina Faso. A noter que la Commission est dans le processus d'élaboration du PNSR mené par le Gouvernement
- Cependant, l'appui de la Commission a permis de stimuler:
 - La formulation par le Gouvernement d'une stratégie commune de sortie de crise dans le secteur du coton, suite à l'élaboration du diagnostic de la filière coton et l'identification d'axes stratégiques (financement CE)
 - Au niveau régional-UEMOA: appui à la révision de l'agenda coton-textile (Programme Tous ACP), en début de mise en œuvre
 - La définition d'une stratégie de développement de la gomme arabique (Programme Tous ACP/ITC)
- En matière de support au développement de stratégie pour les produits de base agricoles, il y a peu de synergies et de complémentarités entre les initiatives de la Commission et celles des Etats Membres

QE 3: Dans quelle mesure la Commission a-t-elle encouragé les autres institutions internationales, incluant les organisations internationales de produits, à adopter l'approche des Communications visant les produits de base agricoles?

- Suite à l'adoption des plans d'action issus des deux Communications (2004):
 - La coordination avec les organisations internationales ne s'est pas renforcée dans le domaine des produits de base agricoles. Néanmoins, un cadre général de concertation dans le secteur rural existe (Troïka: Banque Mondiale, DANIDA et Coopération suisse), et la CE y est partie prenante;
 - Un cadre de concertation existe pour le coton (AFD chef de file), avec participation variable de la CE en fonction de l'évolution des ses appuis au coton
 - Il y a recherche de coordination sous le Programme Tous ACP, entre les organisations internationales et la CE à Bruxelles (siège) mais pas au niveau de la Délégation
- Pour le coton et l'anacarde, les interventions de la Commission menées à partir de la Délégation ont été complémentaires de celles d'autres PTFs
 - Coton: PAFFIC/ STABEX (CE) et Fonds de lissage/ autres appuis (AFD)
 - Anacarde: encadrement RONGEAD/ INADES-B (CE) et support Fondation Gates/ GDL
- Pour les interventions du Programme Tous ACP au Burkina Faso, il n'y a pas de cadre de concertation, incluant la Délégation, et de coordination des agences d'exécution. La coordination est faite au niveau de l'Unité de coordination du Programme à Bruxelles

QE 4: Dans quelle mesure l'appui de la Commission a-t-il contribué à l'amélioration de la compétitivité des filières de produits de base agricoles dans les pays dépendants de ces produits?

- Il y a peu d'évidences au Burkina Faso que la Commission a supporté l'environnement global burkinabé directement en lien avec les produits de base agricoles; connaissance du helpdesk (tarifs/ règles d'origine) mais pas d'utilité pour les produits de base agricoles
- Malgré l'appui de la Commission, il n'y a pas eu d'accroissement significatif et durable de la production de produits de base agricoles et il n'y a pas d'évidences que les coûts de production et de transformation des produits de base agricoles ont diminué
 - PAOSA (2007): accroissement de la production de riz de 5000 tonnes sur 2500 ha
 - Coton: baisse de la production suite à la crise financière de 2007, mais l'appui de la CE a contribué à maintenir la viabilité financière de la filière (STABEX/ PAFFIC: études, apurement de dettes, infrastructures)
 - Anacarde: pas d'augmentation de la production en lien avec le support de la CE mais développement de la transformation à petite échelle (RONGEAD/ INADES-B)
 - Programme Tous ACP: BPA/ GIPD (FAO): trop tôt pour évaluer les résultats en terme de productivité
- L'appui de la Commission a contribué à améliorer la capacité des producteurs à répondre aux demandes du marché, dans le secteur du coton (par exemple: prévention contamination coton (CFC/ IFDC)). Au niveau de l'anacarde (RONGEAD/ INADES-B), l'intervention soutenue par la CE contribue à coordonner les organisations de producteurs au niveau national (et puis régional)
- Dans certains cas (anacarde, sésame) et à l'échelle locale, l'intervention soutenue par la CE a contribué à améliorer les revenus des producteurs. Au niveau des producteurs de coton, les revenus des producteurs et du secteur du coton ne se sont pas améliorés du fait de l'appui de la Commission, mais l'appui de la Commission a contribué à maintenir la filière coton

QE 5: Dans quelle mesure l'appui de la Commission a-t-il contribué, par des dispositifs de gestion du risque et/ou protection sociale, à protéger le revenu des producteurs de produits de base agricoles des effets de la variabilité des prix?

- L'appui de la Commission a contribué au développement et à la mise en œuvre de mécanismes de compensation:
 - STABEX: coton, gomme arabique et oléagineux
 - FLEX: appui budgétaire
- Le Programme Tous ACP Banque mondiale/ARMG a initié récemment le développement d'un système de gestion des risques pour la filière coton (assurances, climat, etc.)
- Il n'y a pas de système de protection sociale soutenu par la CE au Burkina Faso
- Il n'y a pas d'évidence que les interventions STABEX ont permis de réduire la variabilité des revenus et la vulnérabilité des producteurs, des secteurs agricoles ou du pays. Il est trop tôt d'envisager des éléments d'impact en ce qui concerne l'appui de gestion des risques à la filière coton (Banque Mondiale/ ARMG)

QE 6: Dans quelle mesure l'appui de la Commission a-t-il aidé les producteurs, le secteur agricole et les pays ACP dépendants des produits de base agricoles à diversifier leur sources de revenus hors produits de base agricoles ?

- La Commission n'a pas promu la diversification des revenus hors produits de base agricoles au Burkina Faso
- A noter qu'il y a recherche de diversification des revenus agricoles au sein des exploitations (diversification des spéculations agricoles)
 - Programme Tous ACP/ FAO: Bonnes pratiques agricoles/ GIPD
 - ICCO/Helvetas/UNPCB: Filière coton biologique

QE 7: Dans quelle mesure la mise en œuvre d'autres politiques communautaires a-t-elle contribué positivement ou négativement à la poursuite des objectifs des deux Communications ?

- Prise en compte des questions genre/ environnement: variable d'une intervention à l'autre
 - Secteur coton biologique (environnement/ genre) à travers l'intervention ICCO/Helvetas/UNPCB
 - Production et transformation d'anacarde (genre) à travers l'intervention RONGEAD/INADES-B
 - PAOSA-riz (2007): pas de mise en œuvre du mainstreaming genre; malgré les recommandations de l'étude de formulation, pas de stratégie d'amélioration productif et du cadre de vie (bas-fonds – bassins versants)

QE 8: Dans quelle mesure différents instruments de financement et modalités de mise en œuvre ont-ils été utilisés pour permettre d'atteindre les objectifs des Communications de manière efficiente et en respectant les calendriers d'exécution des interventions ?

- LA CE a utilisé différents instruments de financement dans le cadre de son support aux produits de base agricole au Burkina Faso:
 - STABEX: études coton, infrastructures, apurement de dettes, équipement, formation
 - 8^{ie} et 9^{ie} FED: étude diagnostic coton, PAOSA, PAFFIC
 - PIR 9^{ie} FED, UEMOA/UNPCB, Appui à l'Université du coton
 - Ligne ONG (acteurs non étatiques): projet anacarde/ sésame (RONGEAD/INADES-B)
 - Ligne FOOD: amélioration de la fertilité des sols – coton biologique
- Au Burkina Faso, l'appui aux produits de base agricoles a eu recours à une combinaison d'instruments de financement et de modalités de mise en œuvre: appui budgétaire général pour le FLEX, appui budgétaire sectoriel pour le coton, projets/ programme, etc.
- Au niveau du secteur coton, il y a eu un appui budgétaire sectoriel dans le cadre de la stratégie de sortie de crise (PAFFIC)
- Des retards de mise en œuvre ont été notés dans certaines interventions
 - ICCO/ HELVETAS/UNPCB fertilité des sols en coton biologique
 - PAFFIC
 - PAOSA: retards importants et prolongement de la durée du programme

QE 9: Dans quelle mesure l'appui de la Commission aux produits de base agricoles a-t-il:
1) répondu aux besoins et problèmes des pays ACP dépendants des produits de base agricoles ?
2) été aligné sur les obj. politiques et les priorités des pays bénéficiaires et contribué à leur réalisation?
3) été cohérent avec les obj. des deux Communications et contribué à la réalisation de leurs objectifs ?

- Le plus souvent, les interventions de la Commission dans le domaine des produits de base agricoles ont été formulées en réponse aux besoins et problèmes du pays partenaire: secteur coton principalement.
- Le plus souvent, il y a eu alignement sur les objectifs et priorités du Gouvernement:
 - Dans le secteur coton, la Commission européenne à travers le PAFFIC et les fonds STABEX: appui à la stratégie de sortie de crise
 - Le PAOSA s'est aligné sur le « Document de stratégie de Développement rural – A l'Horizon 2015 »
 - Alignement pour les interventions du Programme Tous ACP
- A noter que la stratégie sectorielle de développement rural (PNSR) est en cours d'élaboration; le premier *draft* est attendu courant 2011
- Sur la période 2004-2010, les interventions de la Commission dans le domaine des produits de base agricoles répondent aux objectifs des deux Communications et ont contribué à la réalisation de leurs objectifs, en particulier du Plan action secteur coton-Partenariat UE-Afrique. Cependant, la décision de réaliser ces interventions ne fait pas de référence directe et explicite aux Communications

Documents et informations manquants en fin de mission

- **Stabex :**
 - Rapports de monitoring se rapportant à l'utilisation des fonds Stabex
 - Rapport d'évaluation des interventions financées par Stabex
- **PAFFIC:** convention de financement, rapports monitoring/ évaluation
- Documents concernant l'appui de la CE au **secteur privé**
- **Rappel:** questionnaire en ligne

Evaluation thématique des interventions de la Commission Européenne en appui aux produits agricoles de base

Mission au Cameroun

Compte-rendu de mission
à la Délégation de l'UE

Yaoundé, 5 juillet 2011



*Ce document est destiné à servir de support à une présentation orale
et n'a pas vocation à être diffusé*

Plan

- Programme de la mission
- Restitution par rapport au questionnaire évaluatif

Objet, objectifs et champ de l'évaluation

Objet	<p>Appuis de la Commission aux produits agricoles de base dans le contexte des politiques et approches définies par les deux Communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• COM(2004)89 Filières agricoles, dépendance et pauvreté• COM(2004)87 Proposition d'un partenariat UE-Afrique en appui au développement du secteur cotonnier <p>→ C'est une évaluation thématique, ni une évaluation de projets ou évaluation pays et encore moins un audit administratif ou de gestion</p>
Objectifs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fournir une appréciation indépendante de la coopération passée et présente de la Commission en appui aux produits agricoles de base• En dégager des enseignements visant à améliorer les futurs stratégies et programmes de la Commission
Champ	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Période (2000) 2004-2010• Tous pays ACP• Tous instruments de financement: FED, Stabex et Flex, lignes budgétaires (Programme Sucre, Programme Banane, Food Facility, etc.)

Source: Terms of Reference



3

Institutions visitées (27 juin - 5 juillet)

- Délégation de l'UE
 - Section Développement Rural - Gestionnaires des programmes ATF, PASAPE
- CAON-FED
- Gouvernement
 - MINADER, MINCOMMERCE, MINEPAT
- Opérateurs de projets
 - Assistant Technique Banane, ONUDI, MINEPAT
- Bénéficiaires
 - Banane: ASSOBACKAM, PHP, CARBAP
 - Café-Cacao: CICC, OP
- Autres bailleurs
 - AFD, SCAC, Banque Mondiale
- Parties prenantes de la filière café
 - ONCC, ANPCC, FODECC, CONAPROCAM



4

Focus de la mission

- Stratégies produits et stratégie agricole globale du gouvernement et des bailleurs
- Stabex et Programmes/projets FED et Lignes budgétaires:
 - ATF bananes (dont CARBAP)
 - Stabex (orientation café/cacao au sens large – e.a. Moungo Nkam)
 - PACICC
 - Programme Tout ACP – stratégie café
 - PASAPE
- Prise en compte des aspects priorités par la Communication 2004(89)
 - Développement d'approches stratégiques « chaîne de valeur »
 - Volatilité des prix et gestion du risque
 - Diversification
 - Intégration dans le système commercial international
 - Responsabilisation des entreprises et durabilité des investissements
- Produits d'exportation: bananes, cacao, café
- Approche filière vs approche transversale

Plan

- Programme de la mission
- Restitution par rapport au questionnaire évaluatif

QE 1 sur le contexte des deux communications (1)

Critères de jugement:

- ***Dans la majorité des pays ACP l'économie est fortement dépendante des produits agricoles de base***

Ce constat ne se vérifie pas exactement pour le Cameroun, qui n'est pas PMA et qui dispose d'une économie relativement diversifiée (pétrole, bois, mines). *Les produits agricoles de base représentent moins du tiers des exportations totales*

- ***Les prix des produits agricoles de base exportés par les pays ACP ont fait preuve de volatilité et évolué à long terme sur une tendance baissière***

La volatilité des cours du cacao et du café est une réalité. Les prix étaient très déprimés depuis 1985- toute la décennie 90 (avec fluctuations). Les cours se sont redressés depuis 2002 pour le cacao, vers 2005 pour le café.

Pour les bananes le contexte est spécifique (démantèlement de l'OCMB) avec un contingent ACP vers l'UE et une taxe (revue à la baisse) sur la banane \$ (114€/t) amenée à 75 €/t en 2020?

QE 1 sur le contexte des deux communications (2)

Critères de jugement:

- ***La Commission a adapté son aide aux PDPAB aux contraintes révélées par la tendance à la baisse des prix des produits agricoles de base et à leur volatilité***

Historiquement, à travers le système Stabex la Commission avait mis en place un système de compensation des baisses de recettes d'exportation. Ce système clôturé en 2000 a encore donné lieu à des interventions au cours de la période 2000-2010 très approximativement plus de 46M€ aux produits agricoles et leurs filières au sens large (routes, développement rural...). Le Flex n'est pas mobilisé au Cameroun.

- ***La Commission a adapté ses appuis aux produits agricoles de base aux contraintes révélées par la tendance à la baisse des prix et à leur volatilité***

Les appuis de la Commission aux produits agricoles de base (agricultural commodities) se limitent au Cameroun aux bananes, cacao et café. Globalement, les interventions ont appuyé la diversification (PDR) + la structuration des OP et information (PACICC, Moungo Nkam) et (timidement) certaines filières

QE 2 sur l'appui de la Commission en termes de stratégie de développement des produits agricoles de base (1)

Critères de jugement:

- **La Commission a promu les filières de produits agricoles de base en répondant à leur situation de dépendance comme priorités des stratégies nationales**

La banane fait partie des filières promues par la CE depuis 2000 (voir avant) selon un approche stratégique filière. Pour le café, l'approche « chaîne de valeur » est plus récente (2009) et résulte du programme Tout ACP. La stratégie de développement du secteur rural 2006 comporte un grand nombre de filières. (pas en terme de dépendance mais de relance!) mais la Commission était très peu présente dans le secteur agricole de 2000-2010

- **L'appui de la Commission a stimulé la formulation par les PDPAB de stratégies relatives aux produits agricoles de base et leur intégration dans les stratégies de développement nationales et régionales**

Oui, pour la banane (avant la COM) et plus récemment le café – mais le secteur agricole n'était que très marginalement couvert par l'appui de la Commission sur la période 2000-2010. La DCE a financé en 2008 une étude pour le développement d'une stratégie agriculture – élevage (2010) – document bloqué au MINEPIA (2011)

QE 2 sur l'appui de la Commission en termes de stratégie de développement des produits agricoles de base (2)

Critères de jugement:

- **L'attention portée par la Commission aux filières de produits agricoles de base dans les PDPAB a permis d'obtenir des résultats que les Etats Membres de l'UE n'auraient pu obtenir seuls ?**

En matière de support au développement de la stratégie « chaîne de valeur » cette notion est utilisée par les bailleurs (BM, ONUDI, AFD, ..) mais elle n'a été appliquée que récemment par le programme tout ACP pour la filière café.

A noter que cette approche est en place pour le coton depuis plusieurs années.

QE 3 sur la coordination avec les institutions internationales y compris les « ICB » sur l'approche de la COM2004 (1)

Critères de jugement:

- ***La coordination avec les organisations internationales s'est renforcée après l'adoption des plans d'action issus des deux communications sur les produits agricoles de base***

La coordination entre organisations internationales s'est renforcée suite à la Déclaration de Paris – il existe des groupes thématiques dont développement rural/agriculture sous le Comité multibailleurs – il y a une concertation mais pas nécessairement de coordination (le MINADER n'est pas (encore) représenté au groupe thématique). Il manque toujours la stratégie de développement du secteur rural (non approuvée par le MINEPIA)

- ***Les interventions de la Commission en appui aux produits agricoles de base ont été complémentaires de celles des autres bailleurs de fonds***

Même si des complémentarités peuvent être identifiées, les interventions ne sont pas conduites selon les mêmes principes et il y a des différences sur le terrain (ACEFA – AFD, PACA –BM, PAPA-UE, PPDMVCC- FODECC, ..

Il n'y a pas d'appui sectoriel ou de « basket fund » - actuellement approche projet (mais prévu pour 2013)

QE 3 sur la coordination avec les institutions internationales y compris les « ICB » sur l'approche de la COM2004 (2)

Critères de jugement:

- ***L'appui de la Commission aux organisations internationales par produits a permis à celles-ci d'adopter une approche par filière et de la promouvoir auprès des autres organisations internationales***

Non pertinent pour la mission Cameroun

QE 4 sur l'appui de la Commission en termes de compétitivité des filières de produits agricoles de base (1)

Critères de jugement:

- **Le programme de coopération de la Commission a stimulé la création d'un environnement favorable au progrès de la compétitivité des filières de produits agricoles de base**

APE, Transports & Infrastructure → Par effets indirects

- **L'appui de la Commission a contribué à accroître la production de produits agricoles de base et à diminuer les coûts de production et de transformation**

ATF: Investissements, recherche

AAACP: approche chaîne de valeur, études → répercussions à moyen-long terme

PACICC: Information, regroupement des OP, petit matériel

→ Résultats localisés PACICC (café, cacao), Mounjo Nkam (café, cacao, palmier à huile)

→ Résultats ATF (banane) (amélioration mais insuffisant...)

QE 4 sur l'appui de la Commission en termes de compétitivité des filières de produits agricoles de base (2)

Critères de jugement:

- **L'appui de la Commission a contribué à améliorer la capacité des producteurs à répondre aux demandes du marché**

PACICC: Appui à l'organisation des producteurs & information sur le marché (prix et offres groupées)

ATF : adoption des certifications ISO 14000 et GlobalGap

- **Les revenus des producteurs, du secteur et du pays se sont améliorés du fait de l'appui de la Commission à la mise en œuvre de stratégies relatives aux filières de produits agricoles de base**

Café – Cacao : effets principalement dus au prix mondiaux + transparence des prix et regroupement de l'offre

Banane : effet de stabilisation des revenus face aux adversités

QE 5 sur l'appui de la Commission à la gestion du risque (1)

Critères de jugement:

- ***L'appui de la Commission a contribué au développement et à la mise en œuvre de dispositifs de gestion du risque et/ou de protection sociale***

AAACP: seulement des études (BM)

PACICC: information sur les prix

- ***La variabilité des revenus et la vulnérabilité des producteurs, du secteur et du pays face aux fluctuations de prix ont diminué du fait d'une meilleure gestion du risque***

Banane: pas le problèmes de fluctuations des prix ms compétitivité face banane \$

Café: approche pragmatique et générale de gestion du risque non limité au prix

QE 5 sur l'appui de la Commission à la gestion du risque (2)

Critères de jugement:

- ***L'aide de la Commission aux produits agricoles de base dans les PDPBA a pris en compte les questions sociales complémentaires aux questions techniques et économiques relatives aux filières de produits***

Pas de réalisation

QE 6 sur l'appui de la Commission à la diversification (1)

Critères de jugement:

- ***L'appui de la Commission a contribué à la formulation par les gouvernements des PDPAB de politiques de diversification et de croissance***

Pas en banane (choix rester dans le secteur)

Appui de la CE à la formulation de stratégies de développement du secteur rural (non validée par un Ministère) et appui via divers PDR

PAPA pour la zone cotonnière: en démarrage (fin 2011)

- ***La Commission a favorisé la diffusion d'instruments d'aide au développement du secteur privé et l'accès à ces instruments***

PASAPE: mise à niveau, normes, qualité

Peu d'information sur les activités de la BEI (actifs en banane) et du CDE (Proinvest)

QE 6 sur l'appui de la Commission à la diversification (2)

Critères de jugement:

- ***La Commission a encouragé la diversification des sources de revenu des producteurs de produits agricoles de base traditionnels par l'adoption et la mise en œuvre de stratégies de développement rural***

Banane: investissement dans le secteur. Etude sur la diversification **des destinations**

Stabex: - Moungo-Nkam & PDR périurbain, Logone-et-Chari (développement rural participatif) - Palmier à huile: projet pilote de pépinières villageoises

AAACP: plutôt pour la redynamisation des secteurs, pas la diversification

- ***La vulnérabilité des producteurs, du secteur et du pays a diminué du fait de la mise en œuvre de stratégies de diversification***

Economie déjà relativement diversifiée

Café-cacao: libéralisation brutale des filières années '90 – abandons, actuellement politiques de relance (PACICC, (Moungo Nkam) Tout ACP,)

QE 7 sur l'appui de la Commission dans le contexte des politiques communautaires (1)

Critères de jugement:

- **Les politiques communautaires dans des domaines susceptibles d'interférer avec le domaine des produits agricoles de base et les PDPAB (par exemple la politique agricole ou la politique commerciale) ont été conçues et mises en œuvre en tenant compte de leur impact potentiel sur les produits agricoles de base**

Incohérences DG Trade – DG Dev sur la banane: accord de tarifs douaniers préférentiels privilégiés à 2 pays de la banane \$ (75€/t au lieu de 114€/t)

Le Cameroun a été chaudement invité à ratifier un « APE transitoire » alors qu'il y a une incohérence de fonds en terme d'intégration régionale vis-à-vis de la CEMAC

QE 7 sur l'appui de la Commission dans le contexte des politiques communautaires (2)

Critères de jugement:

- **Les appuis de la Commission aux produits agricoles de base ont pris en compte les questions transversales relatives au genre, à l'environnement, à la défense des droits de l'homme, aux responsabilités sociales des entreprises (travail des enfants et autres droits sociaux), à la lutte contre le SIDA ?**

Bananes: certifications ISO14000 et Globalgap on intégré les standards EU (environnement) – il y a une sensibilisation spécifique au SIDA sans qu'il y ait une prévalence particulière dans les zones des plantations

Opération séchoirs cacao: les séchoirs mis en place sous financement Stabex permettent une économie substantielle en bois de chauffe par rapport aux fours traditionnels

QE 8 sur l'utilisation de différents instruments de financement de l'appui aux produits agricoles de base (1)

Critères de jugement:

■ ***L'utilisation de différents instruments de financement a favorisé le développement de synergies et de complémentarités pour la réalisation des objectifs des deux communications***

- Stabex: infrastructures routières, PDR (Logone et Chari, périurb Yaoundé, Moungo Nkam) séchoirs cacao, eau potable, apurement de dettes, ..
- Ligne budgétaire bananes
- FED: PACICC
- Ligne budgétaire FSTP: CARBAP ...

Les fonds Stabex, la ligne budgétaire bananes, les fonds FED et d'autres lignes budgétaires ont été employés complémentirement **mais cela ne forme pas un ensemble cohérent**: programmations annuelles/pluriannuelles, gestion partagé ou externe ce « mix » **ne permet pas une approche stratégique cohérente** à moyen terme

QE 8 sur l'utilisation de différents instruments de financement de l'appui aux produits agricoles de base (1)

Critères de jugement:

■ ***Au niveau du pays, l'appui aux produits agricoles de base a eu recours à une combinaison d'instruments de financement et de modalités de mise en œuvre en vue d'apporter une réponse efficiente aux problèmes identifiés***

Au Cameroun, les instruments ont été **utilisés de manière complémentaire** en vue d'une mobilisation de fonds vers le monde agricole, écarté du PIN. Progressivement, des activités productives ont été introduites dans les PDR via le Stabex ou sur fonds FED en réponse aux besoins identifiés.

QE 8 sur l'utilisation de différents instruments de financement de l'appui aux produits agricoles de base (2)

Critères de jugement:

- **Au niveau sectoriel, les interventions ont eu recours à des instruments de financement et à des modalités de mise en œuvre adaptées aux capacités d'absorption et d'exécution des agences d'exécution, des organisations régionales et des organisations de producteurs**

Avis positif sur les agences d'exécution, tant bananes que PACICC et Moungo Nkam

Les acteurs de la filière banane ont considéré que les délais de mise en œuvre des AFT ont limité l'efficacité des interventions – mais les responsabilités sont partagées

Le PACICC a particulièrement renforcé les organisations de producteurs à s'organiser notamment en aval de la production (info prix, gpt de l'offre, contrôle qualité..)

QE 9 sur la pertinence des deux communications (1)

Critères de jugement:

- **Les interventions de la Commission dans le domaine des produits agricoles de base ont été formulées en réponse aux besoins et problèmes du pays partenaire**

Les interventions de la Commission dans le domaine des produits agricoles de base ont été fortement limitées sur toute la période 2000-2010 hormis pour la banane. Un début de réponse aux besoins et problèmes n'apparaît qu'en fin de période (2008 - ...). Les COM n'évoquent pas certaines filières locales qui sont parmi les priorités du pays (plantain, maïs, manioc, ..)

Le programme Tout ACP a mis en place une stratégie de développement de la filière café avec la collaboration de tous les acteurs selon l'approche « chaîne de valeur »

- **Les interventions de la Commission sont alignées sur les objectifs et les priorités de la stratégie nationale du pays partenaire**

Globalement, les interventions sollicités sont alignées sur les objectifs du pays qui en fait la demande. Pour la banane, les AFT sont accord avec la stratégie de nationale de maintien de la filière.

Le Cameroun peine à publier sa stratégie de développement du secteur agricole et de l'élevage, dont la formulation a été appuyée par la CE

QE 9 sur la pertinence des deux communications

Critères de jugement:

- ***Sur la période 2004-2009 les interventions de la Commission dans le domaine des produits agricoles de base ont été alignées sur les objectifs des deux communications et ont contribué à la réalisation de leurs objectifs ?***

Les communications ne sont pas connues par la Délégation ni par les partenaires nationaux.

Néanmoins, les interventions (banane, café) sont cohérentes avec les objectifs de la COM, certaines priorités étant plus soutenues que d'autres (approche chaîne de valeur, amélioration de la compétitivité, de la qualité, transparence sur les prix, groupement des producteurs et capacités organisationnelles..)

Merci pour votre participation

Thematic Global Evaluation of the European Commission Support to Agricultural Commodities

Field mission in Ghana

Debriefing meeting with the Delegation

Accra, 14 June 2011

*This document is designed as support to the oral presentation
and is not intended to be used separately*

Agenda

- Why we're here (reminder)
- Who we've met
- What we've learned
- What we'll do

Why we're here

■ Objectives

- Evaluation of past and present cooperation for agricultural commodities
- Identify key lessons for future strategies and programmes

■ Subject

- Support according to EU Action plan on Agricultural Commodities (2004)
EU Africa Partnership on Cotton (2004)

■ Scope

- ACP countries from 2000 to 2009

■ Funds

- EDF, Stabex, Flex, and relevant thematic & geographical budget lines

Agenda

■ Why we're here (reminder)

■ Who we've met

■ What we've learned

■ What we'll do

Who we've met

- **EU Delegation**
 - Managers of EDF programmes & cooperation officials
- **Government**
 - Ministries of finance, trade & industry, and transport
- **Implementing agencies**
 - IITA-STCP, SPU & CRIG
- **Beneficiaries**
 - Farmer organisation in Amansie Central District, Ashanti Region
- **Other donors**
 - GIZ/KfW, World Bank, AFD
- **Others**
 - COCOBOD M&E department, Ghana Export Promotion Council



5

Agenda

- **Why we're here (reminder)**
- **Who we've met**
- **What we've learned**
- **What we'll do**



6

EQ 1 – Contextual Background

- **Commodity dependence characterises a majority of ACP countries**
 - Figures to be checked
 - Non-traditional exports increasing
 - Dependency in terms of GDP & employment: not sure
- **Prices of agricultural commodities exported by ACPs have demonstrated a long-term declining trend and high volatility**
 - Rise of cocoa price over the past years
 - Cocoa farmer gate price guaranteed
- **The Commission has adapted its support to CDDCs to the constraints revealed by long term price decline and short term price volatility**
 - Used Stabex & BAM
- **The Commission has adapted its interventions supporting agricultural commodities to the constraints revealed by long term price decline and short term price volatility**
 - Progressive move out of agriculture

EQ 2 – Support in terms of agricultural commodity strategy development

- **The Commission has promoted commodity chains and addressing dependence as a priority in national strategies**
 - Bananas
 - FASDEP 2 already adopts a value chain approach
 - CSSP 2 promotes farmer participation in policy design: no results yet
- **The Commission's support has stimulated the design of commodity strategies by CDDCs and their incorporation into national and regional development strategies**
 - No (historic reasons)
- **The Commission's attention paid to commodity chain strategies in CDDCs has had more results than could have been attained by MS alone**
 - No evidence of a common political agenda between EU & MS

EC didn't initiate the development of any commodity sector strategies

EQ 3 – Coordination with international organisations including ICBs

- **Coordination with relevant international organisations has increased following adoption of the Action Plans**
 - EC not involved in agriculture working group
- **The Commission's interventions have been complementary to those of other donors in the field of agricultural commodities**
 - No obvious synergies or complementarities
 - No overlaps (except one case in oil palm)
- **The Commission's support to ICBs has enabled them to adopt a commodity chain perspective and to spread it to other international organisations**
 - N/A

High coordination in Ghana, unlinked to the EU and the COMs

EQ 4 – Support in terms of competitiveness of agricultural commodity chains in CDDCs

- **The Commission's cooperation programme has stimulated the creation of an environment conducive to increased competitiveness of agricultural commodity chains**
 - Yes: PSTEP and TRAQUE
- **Commission support has contributed to increase agricultural commodity production and lower the average cost of production and processing**
 - C SSP 2: yields and margins. But localised and fragile
 - Feeder roads
 - No M&E systems in EU funded programmes

EQ 4 – Support in terms of competitiveness of agricultural commodity chains in CDDCs (2)

- **Commission support has contributed to improve the capacity of producers to respond to commodity market requirements**
 - COCOBOD has monopoly of exports
 - Pesticide use in CSSP 2
 - TRAQUE for quality requirements
 - Promotion of farmer organisations
 - No initiatives for fairtrade and label certified production
- **Incomes of producers, sector and countries have improved as a result of Commission's support to the implementation of commodity chain strategies**
 - Yes within the boundaries of the CSSP 2
 - Any wider developments aren't attributable to the EC
 - Sustainability of income impact beyond the project?

Small impact of CSSP 2. Impact of FR & PSTEP can't be measured



11

EQ 5 – Support to risk management

- **Commission support has contributed to the development and implementation of risk management and compensatory tools**
 - Stabex: active in the past. Entry point to agriculture and cocoa
 - Very indirectly through the Farmer Organisations in CSSP 2
 - Access to credit
 - Pest-tolerant varieties
- **Commission's support to agricultural commodities in CDDCs has included safety net issues in complement to commodity chain issues**
 - N/A
- **Income variability and vulnerability to price fluctuations of producers, sector and countries has declined as a result of improved risk management**
 - N/A



12

EQ 6 – Support to diversification

- **The Commission's support has facilitated the analysis of Government's policy choices aiming for diversification and growth**
 - Partly for bananas (only growth)
- **The Commission has encouraged the diversification of sources of livelihoods of traditional agricultural commodity producers through the adoption and implementation of rural growth strategies**
 - No intervention at the strategic level
 - In CSSP 2: intercropping. But on the long term?
- **The Commission has facilitated knowledge of and access to support instruments for private sector development**
 - Participation in the PSD working group
 - Active role in sharing knowledge on funding instruments?
- **The income vulnerability of producers, sector and countries has declined as a result of the implementation of diversification strategies**
 - Not attributable to the EC

EQ 7 – Support in the wider context of EC policies

- **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**
 - EPA negotiations still ongoing
- **Commission's support in other areas has achieved synergies with Commission support to agricultural commodities**
 - Yes: Feeder roads, TRAQUE, PSTEP + trade negotiations
- **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**
 - Taken into account at project level

EQ 8 – the use made of different financing instruments in support of agricultural commodities

■ Synergies and complementarities between different interventions

- EDF funds follow up on Stabex programmes (continuity)
- No links between regional and bilateral programmes

■ Timely and cost-effective interventions

- Not a good record for CSSP 2
- Feeder roads programme OK

■ Adapted to the absorption and implementation capacities of implementation agencies

- Not good: implementation capacities not well judged
- No evidence of risks and assumptions being looked at

EQ 9 – concluding on the relevance of the 2 COMs

■ Response to the country's needs, problems and issues

- Interventions focused on specific needs rather than national priorities

■ The choice of interventions is aligned with the policy objectives and priorities of the beneficiary country's national strategy

- Consistent with and supportive of the GoG's policies
- Prioritisation less clear

■ 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

- No direct link with the COMs
- No sector approach

Agenda

- Why we're here (reminder)
- Who we've met
- What we've learned
- What we'll do

Next steps

- Compilation of information gathered in each of the 8 countries visited
- Field phase debriefing with the Reference Group
- Drafting the final report
- Formulation of the key lessons for future strategies and programmes

Thank you for your time and assistance



Evaluation thématique des interventions de la Commission Européenne en appui aux produits agricoles de base

Mission à Madagascar

Compte-rendu de mission
à la Délégation de l'UE

Antananarivo, 31 Mai 2011



*Ce document est destiné à servir de support à une présentation orale
et n'a pas vocation à être diffusé*

Plan

- Programme de la mission
- Observations

Objet, objectifs et champ de l'évaluation

Objet	<p>Appuis de la Commission aux produits agricoles de base dans le contexte des politiques et approches définies par les deux Communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• COM(2004)89 Filières agricoles, dépendance et pauvreté• COM(2004)87 Proposition d'un partenariat UE-Afrique en appui au développement du secteur cotonnier <p>→ C'est une évaluation thématique, ni une évaluation de projets ou évaluation pays et encore moins un audit administratif ou de gestion</p>
Objectifs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fournir une appréciation indépendante de la coopération passée et présente de la Commission en appui aux produits agricoles de base• En dégager des enseignements visant à améliorer les futurs stratégies et programmes de la Commission
Champ	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Période 2004-2010• Tous pays ACP• Tous instruments de financement: FED, Stabex et Flex, lignes budgétaires (Programme Sucre, Programme Banane, Food Facility, etc.)

Source: Terms of Reference



3

Institutions visitées

- Délégation de l'UE
 - Gestionnaires des programmes Stabex et Sécurité Alimentaire
- Gouvernement
 - Ministère de l'Agriculture (UPDR, Service CSA)
 - DRDR de Tamatave et Fénérive Est
 - PSDR de Tamatave
- Opérateurs de projets
 - CTHT, AIM, AFDI
- Bénéficiaires
 - CAS de Fénérive Est et Soanierana-Ivongo
 - Paysans et collecteur ayant été impliqués dans le projet Stabex AIM
- Autres bailleurs
 - Secrétariat multi-bailleurs, FIDA
- Autres
 - CNCC, OTIV



4

Centres d'intérêt de la mission

- Stratégies produits et stratégie agricole globale du gouvernement et des bailleurs
- Prise en compte des aspects priorités par la Communication 2004(89)
 - Dépendance vis-à-vis d'un nombre limité de produits agricole d'exportation
 - Baisse tendancielle des prix
 - Gestion du risque
 - Diversification
 - Intégration dans le système commercial international
 - Responsabilisation des entreprises et durabilité des investissements
- Produits d'exportation: Vanille, Girofle, Café
- Produits vivriers : Riz
- Approche filière vs approche transversale

Plan

- Programme de la mission
- Observations

QE 1 sur le contexte des deux communications (1)

Critères de jugement:

- ***Dans la majorité des pays ACP l'économie est fortement dépendante des produits agricoles de base***

C'est effectivement le cas de Madagascar: les produits agricoles de base représentent la moitié des exportations totales

- ***Les prix des produits agricoles de base exportés par les pays ACP ont fait preuve de volatilité et évolué à long terme sur une tendance baissière***

Le prix de la vanille, qui avait atteint des sommets en 2003-2004, est retombé dès 2005 à un niveau historiquement bas.

Le marché du girofle étant extrêmement étroit, le prix fluctue largement d'une année à l'autre en fonction du niveau de production en Indonésie

Le prix du café, extrêmement bas au début des années 2000, a quadruplé entre 2003 et 2008

QE 1 sur le contexte des deux communications (2)

Critères de jugement:

- ***La Commission a adapté son aide aux PDPAB aux contraintes révélées par la tendance à la baisse des prix des produits agricoles de base et à leur volatilité***

A travers les projets Stabex la Commission a apporté une aide importante au développement des produits agricoles d'exportation

- ***La Commission a adapté ses appuis aux produits agricoles de base aux contraintes révélées par la tendance à la baisse des prix et à leur volatilité***

Les projets Stabex ont visé à améliorer la productivité, la qualité des produits et l'organisation des marchés des produits agricoles d'exportation

QE 2 sur l'appui de la Commission en termes de stratégie de développement des produits agricoles de base (1)

Critères de jugement:

- **La Commission a promu les filières de produits agricoles de base et la situation de dépendance comme priorités des stratégies nationales**

La stratégie agricole du Gouvernement donne priorité au riz. Au niveau régional l'administration de l'agriculture porte attention aux produits d'exportation mais sans stratégie clairement définie

- ***L'appui de la Commission a stimulé la formulation par les PDPAB de stratégies relatives aux produits agricoles de base et leur intégration dans les stratégies de développement nationales et régionales***

Beaucoup de documents de stratégie ont été élaborés sans être mis en application

Il n'y a pas de stratégies nationales relatives aux produits agricoles d'exportation

QE 2 sur l'appui de la Commission en termes de stratégie de développement des produits agricoles de base (2)

Critères de jugement:

- ***L'attention portée par la Commission aux filières de produits agricoles de base dans les PDPAB a permis d'obtenir des résultats que les Etats Membres de l'UE n'auraient pu obtenir seuls ?***

Aucun bailleur bilatéral n'aurait pu engager en appui aux produits de base le montant des ressources que le Stabex a mobilisées

QE 3 sur la coordination avec les institutions internationales inclus les organisations internationales par produits (1)

Critères de jugement:

- ***La coordination avec les organisations internationales s'est renforcée après l'adoption des plans d'action issus des deux communications sur les produits agricoles de base***

Non pertinent pour la mission à Madagascar

- ***Les interventions de la Commission en appui aux produits agricoles de base ont été complémentaires de celles des autres bailleurs de fonds***

Le FIDA (projet PPRR) a mené des actions en appui aux produits agricoles d'exportation analogues à celles de la Commission

Les appuis filières de la Commission ont été complémentaires d'interventions de caractère transversal d'autres bailleurs, en particulier la Banque Mondiale (PSDR), le FIDA et la Coopération Suisse (appuis aux FRDA), la FAO (sécurité alimentaire)

QE 3 sur la coordination avec les institutions internationales inclus les organisations internationales par produits (2)

Critères de jugement:

- ***L'appui de la Commission aux organisations internationales par produits a permis à celles-ci d'adopter une approche par filière et de la promouvoir auprès des autres organisations internationales***

Non pertinent pour la mission à Madagascar

QE 4 sur l'appui de la Commission en termes de compétitivité des filières de produits agricoles de base (1)

Critères de jugement:

- ***Le programme de coopération de la Commission a stimulé la création d'un environnement favorable au progrès de la compétitivité des filières de produits agricoles de base***

Les projets Stabex ont contribué localement à une organisation des marchés favorisant la valorisation de la qualité et la transparence des transactions sur les produits agricoles d'exportation. Mais ces avancées locales n'ont pas été étendues à d'autres zones.

- ***L'appui de la Commission a contribué à accroître la production de produits agricoles de base et à diminuer les coûts de production et de transformation***

Les projets Stabex ont eu un impact positif sur le niveau de production des produits agricoles d'exportation, leur qualité, leur transformation-valorisation mais ceci à un niveau local sans réplication dans d'autres zones.

QE 4 sur l'appui de la Commission en termes de compétitivité des filières de produits agricoles de base (2)

Critères de jugement:

- ***L'appui de la Commission a contribué à améliorer la capacité des producteurs à répondre aux demandes du marché***

L'organisation des marchés des produits agricoles d'exportation mise en place par des projets Stabex a permis d'assurer aux exportateurs un approvisionnement de volume significatif en produits de qualité contrôlée, mais ici encore à un niveau strictement local et sans réplication.

- ***Les revenus des producteurs, du secteur et du pays se sont améliorés du fait de l'appui de la Commission à la mise en œuvre de stratégies relatives aux filières de produits agricoles de base***

Les effets positifs des projets Stabex sur les rendements et la qualité et sur l'efficacité des marchés ont eu des effets positifs sur le revenu des producteurs mais ces effets ont été très localisés et restent fortement dépendants de la conjoncture internationale de produits de base.

QE 5 sur l'appui de la Commission à la gestion du risque (1)

Critères de jugement:

- *L'appui de la Commission a contribué au développement et à la mise en œuvre de dispositifs de gestion du risque et/ou de protection sociale*
- *La variabilité des revenus et la vulnérabilité des producteurs, du secteur et du pays face aux fluctuations de prix ont diminué du fait d'une meilleure gestion du risque*

Aucun mécanisme spécifique de gestion de risque n'a été mis en place. Mais la diversification des cultures d'exportation au niveau des exploitations agricoles diminue les risques encourus sur les revenus du fait de la fluctuation des prix internationaux

QE 5 sur l'appui de la Commission à la gestion du risque (2)

Critères de jugement:

- *L'aide de la Commission aux produits agricoles de base dans les PDPBA a pris en compte les questions sociales complémentaires aux questions techniques et économiques relatives aux filières de produits*

Aucune information n'a été recueillie indiquant que des mécanismes de protection collective ont été mis en place au niveau local, régional ou national pour protéger les producteurs contre les risques de variations de leur revenu

QE 6 sur l'appui de la Commission à la diversification (1)

Critères de jugement:

- ***L'appui de la Commission a contribué à la formulation par les gouvernements des PDPAB de politiques de diversification et de croissance***

Comme noté plus haut (QE2), la stratégie nationale de développement agricole est centrée sur la production rizicole.

- ***La Commission a favorisé la diffusion d'instruments d'aide au développement du secteur privé et l'accès à ces instruments***

Le CTHT avait vocation à susciter des investissements privés dans la transformation-valorisation des produits d'exportation.

L'activité de collecte des produits agricoles d'exportation a été professionnalisée avec l'organisation des marchés promue par les projets Stabex

QE 6 sur l'appui de la Commission à la diversification (2)

Critères de jugement:

- ***La Commission a encouragé la diversification des sources de revenu des producteurs de produits agricoles de base traditionnels par l'adoption et la mise en œuvre de stratégies de développement rural***

- ***La vulnérabilité des producteurs, du secteur et du pays a diminué du fait de la mise en œuvre de stratégies de diversification***

Les projets Stabex et l'initiative banane ont encouragé la diversification des cultures d'exportation comme source de revenu monétaire en appoint aux cultures vivrières (riz, manioc).

Cette diversification permet de lisser les effets des variations de prix sur un produit particulier et assure par ailleurs des rentrées d'argent réparties sur différentes périodes de l'année.

QE 7 sur l'appui de la Commission dans le contexte des politiques communautaires (1)

Critères de jugement:

- **Les politiques communautaires dans des domaines susceptibles d'interférer avec le domaine des produits agricoles de base et les PDPAB (par exemple la politique agricole ou la politique commerciale) ont été conçues et mises en œuvre en tenant compte de leur impact potentiel sur les produits agricoles de base**

A travers l'initiative banane et le programme sucre la Commission s'est efforcée d'atténuer les impacts sur l'économie malgache de décisions relatives à la politique agricole commune dans ces deux secteurs.

L'APE, qui pourrait avoir des incidences sur les exportations agricoles malgaches, est encore en cours de négociation

QE 7 sur l'appui de la Commission dans le contexte des politiques communautaires (2)

Critères de jugement:

- **Les appuis de la Commission aux produits agricoles de base ont pris en compte les questions transversales relatives au genre, à l'environnement, à la défense des droits de l'homme, aux responsabilités sociales des entreprises (travail des enfants et autres droits sociaux), à la lutte contre le SIDA ?**

Les appels à proposition pour l'utilisation des fonds Stabex imposaient la prise en compte de dimensions transversales (genre, environnement). La Délégation a assuré un suivi de la mise en application de ces dimensions dans la mise en œuvre des projets.

QE 8 sur l'utilisation de différents instruments de financement de l'appui aux produits agricoles de base (1)

Critères de jugement:

- ***L'utilisation de différents instruments de financement a favorisé le développement de synergies et de complémentarités pour la réalisation des objectifs des deux communications***

Les fonds Stabex et la ligne budgétaire Sécurité Alimentaire ont été employés complémentirement, les premiers pour des appuis filière et la seconde pour la mise en place de structures d'appui au développement agricole et rural en général

- ***Au niveau pays, l'appui aux produits agricoles de base a eu recours à une combinaison d'instruments de financement et de modalités de mise en œuvre en vue d'apporter une réponse efficiente aux problèmes identifiés***

La complémentarité entre instruments s'est faite au niveau régional et non au niveau pays. Dans les régions où sont pratiquées les cultures de vanille, girofle, café elle s'est faite à travers la complémentarité entre les FRDA et CSA et les initiatives soutenues par les projets Stabex.

QE 8 sur l'utilisation de différents instruments de financement de l'appui aux produits agricoles de base (2)

Critères de jugement:

- ***Au niveau sectoriel, les interventions ont eu recours à des instruments de financement et à des modalités de mise en œuvre adaptées aux capacités d'absorption et d'exécution des agences d'exécution, des organisations régionales et des organisations de producteurs***

Les CSA, financés par la ligne Sécurité Alimentaire, incitent et aident les producteurs à s'organiser en groupements de producteurs.

Les projets Stabex s'appuient sur les groupements de producteurs pour le développement des filières d'exportation.

Formation et renforcement des capacités ont été des priorités de l'appui de la Commission tant aux CSA qu'aux groupements de producteurs.

QE 9 sur la pertinence des deux communications (1)

Critères de jugement:

- **Les interventions de la Commission dans le domaine des produits agricoles de base ont été formulées en réponse aux besoins et problèmes du pays partenaire**

La création des FRDA-CSA vise à doter Madagascar d'un outil de développement agricole impliquant l'ensemble des parties prenantes bailleurs, gouvernement, agriculteurs, prestataires de services).

Les projets Stabex ont appuyé les principales filières de produits d'exportation. Ces deux approches sont potentiellement complémentaires.

- **Les interventions de la Commission sont alignées sur les objectifs et les priorités de la stratégie nationale du pays partenaire**

Oui pour la mise en place des FRDA-CSA (appropriation par le gouvernement)

Non pour l'appui aux produits d'exportation dans la mesure où il n'y a pas de stratégie nationale pour ce produits

QE 9 sur la pertinence des deux communications

Critères de jugement:

- **Sur la période 2004-2009 les interventions de la Commission dans le domaine des produits agricoles de base ont été alignées sur les objectifs des deux communications et ont contribué à la réalisation de leurs objectifs ?**

Les communications ne sont pas (ou ne sont plus) une référence pour la Délégation.

Mais les activités de coopération dans le domaine des produits agricoles de base sont en ligne avec certains des objectifs de la communication:

- ✓ importance donnée à ces produits dans les activités de la Commission
- ✓ amélioration de la productivité et de la qualité comme réponse à la baisse tendancielle des prix
- ✓ diversification y compris pour sa contribution à l'atténuation des risques
- ✓ organisation des marchés locaux favorisant l'intégration dans les marchés internationaux

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

Country Mission to Uganda

Debriefing presentation to the EU Delegation

Kampala, 21 June 2011



This document is designed as support to an oral presentation and is not intended to be used separately

Agenda

- Programme
- Main findings

Subject, objectives and scope of the evaluation

Subject	<p>Commission support to agricultural commodities in the context of the policies and approaches laid down in two Commission Communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• COM(2004)89 Agricultural Commodity Chains, Dependency and Poverty• COM(2004)87 Proposal for an EU-Africa Partnership in support of cotton sector development <p>It is a thematic evaluation, neither an evaluation of projects nor a country evaluation and still less an administrative or financial audit</p>
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide an independent assessment of the Commission's past and current support to agricultural commodities• To identify key lessons learnt in order to improve the current and future Commission strategies and programmes
Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interventions implemented from 2004 to 2010• All ACP countries• All financing instruments (EDF, Stabex, Flex, budget lines (Sugar Programme, Banana Programme, Food Facility, etc.)

Source: Terms of Reference



3

Visited institutions

- EU Delegation Agriculture and Rural Development Section
- EU Delegation Trade and Regional Integration
- Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)
- Plan for Modernization of Agriculture Secretariat (PMA)
- National Agriculture Research Organization (NARO)
- National Agriculture Advisory Services (NAADS)
- Uganda Coffee Development Authority (UCDA)
- Coffee Farmers Alliance support project - Kaweri
- Coffee Research Centre (COREC)
- Uganda Coffee Trade Federation (UCTF)
- Eastern African Fine Coffees Association (EAFCA)
- Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)



4

Focus of the mission

Agricultural development strategy

Donors support

How far the COM priorities are taken into account

1. Dependence on a limited number of agricultural commodities
2. Long term decline of commodity prices
3. Risks management
4. Diversification
5. Integration in the international trading system
6. Corporate practices and investments

Export product : coffee

Product approach vs. Functional approach

Agenda

■ Programme

■ Main findings

EQ 1 on the background of the two Communications (1)

Judgment criteria

- **Commodity dependence characterises a majority of ACP countries**

Agricultural commodities make 75% of total Ugandan exports (1995-2008 average).

Coffee: over 8 million people (in the whole value chain) derive their livelihood directly from coffee. Coffee is mainly cultivated by smallholders (1.3 million). Coffee contributes about 20% of Uganda's foreign currency earnings and constitutes two-thirds of earnings from traditional export crops.

However, at farm level, dependence on export commodities is limited. Farmers primarily aim at ensuring their subsistence through the production of staple crops. Export commodities are side crops, which provide an in cash additional income.

- **Prices of agricultural commodities exported by ACPs have demonstrated a long-term declining trend and high volatility**

Over the last ten years coffee prices have been very volatile. In the early 2000s, they were extremely low. They very much increased since then. Some experts forecast that they will remain at a high level because of growing domestic consumption in coffee exporting countries.

EQ 1 on the background of the two Communications (2)

Judgment criteria

- **The Commission has adapted its support to CDDCs to the constraints revealed by long term price decline and short term price volatility**

The EC supported the GoU agricultural strategy (PMA), which benefited among others crops to agricultural commodities, of which coffee.

The EC support to PMA focussed on research and extension with a view of improving the competitiveness of the agricultural sector

- **The Commission has adapted its interventions supporting agricultural commodities to the constraints revealed by long term price decline and short term volatility**

Specific EC-funded projects, in particular the Coffee Farmers Alliance support project, targeted the coffee sector with a view of improving productivity, quality and the efficiency of the value chain.

EQ 2 on the Commission's support in terms of agricultural commodity strategy development (1)

Judgment criteria:

- ***The Commission has promoted commodity chains and addressing dependence as a priority in national strategies***

The GoU agricultural development strategy (PMA) supported by the EC has adopted a functional approach rather than a commodity-based approach. However within the framework of the PMA preparation agro-ecological zones have been identified and three crops selected in each zone as priority focus for research and extension.

The new agricultural development strategy (DSIP) is fully consistent with the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) of NEPAD.

- ***The Commission's support has stimulated the design of commodity strategies by CDDCs and their incorporation into national and regional development strategies***

At some moment in the past, the Ministry of Agriculture (MAAIF) developed commodities specific strategies, notably for coffee, which have however not been consistently implemented nor have been updated.

Designing commodities sub-programmes as a complement to the new national agricultural development strategy (DSIP) is currently on the agenda of the policy dialogue between the Government and donors. Donors ask the Ministry of Agriculture to design a matrix crossing the functional- and commodity-based approach.

EQ 2 on the Commission's support in terms of agricultural commodity strategy development (2)

Judgment criteria

- ***The Commission's attention paid to commodity chain strategies in CDDCs has had more results than could have been obtained by MS alone***

Agriculture has permanently been a focal sector of the EC country strategy in Uganda

There is evidence of strong convergence between donors' support strategies to the agricultural sector, notably between the EC and EU Member States.

The EC played an active role in promoting donors coordination, notably as it chaired for several years the agriculture donors group.

In some cases (e.g. NARO), the EC support contributed to attract other donors

EQ 3 on the Commission's coordination with international organisations including ICBs

Judgment criteria

- **Coordination with relevant international organisations has increased following adoption of the Action Plans**

No information received on AAACP from the FAO office in Kampala

- **The Commission's interventions have been complementary to those of other donors in the field of agricultural commodities**

There is a strong coordination of donors through:

- The Agriculture Sector Working Group chaired by the government
- The Agriculture Donors Group.

Besides the multi-donor support to the PMA, donor coordination results in some sort of task sharing between donors by regions and by nature of intervention.

- **The Commission's support to ICBs has enabled them to adopt a commodity chain perspective and to spread it to other international organisations**

Not relevant for the field mission

EQ 4 On the Commission's support in terms of competitiveness of agricultural commodity chains (1)

Judgement criteria

- **The Commission's cooperation programme has stimulated the creation of an environment conducive to increased competitiveness of agricultural commodity chains**

Of the 7 areas of the PMA, only two, research and extension, both supported by the EC, have been effectively implemented. Lack of coordination between the ministries involved hampered a more homogeneous implementation of the PMA.

EC provided trade related technical assistance (notably in relation with SPS)

- **Commission's support has contributed to increase agricultural commodity production and lower the average cost of production and processing**

Through Stabex projects (Coffee Farmers Alliance support project) the EC supported the competitiveness of the whole coffee value chain from producers (higher yields, higher productivity, improved quality) to exporters (economies of scale in the coffee commercialization process)

The EC support to the PMA implementation aimed at strengthening the link between research and extension and at reinforcing the extension system. However results didn't meet expectations.

EQ 4 On the Commission's support in terms of competitiveness of agricultural commodity chains (2)

Judgement criteria:

- **Commission's support has contributed to improve the capacity of producers to respond to commodity market requirements**

Through the Coffee Farmers Alliance support project the EC supported the establishment at village, parish and national level of farmer organizations which enhanced the capacity of the coffee sector to meet the market requirements in terms of quality and quantity.

Research and extension, supported by the EC, only contribute to a better response to market requirements if there is a demand from the farmers. There are such examples for bananas and cassava.

- **Incomes of producers, sector and countries have improved as a result of Commission's support to the implementation of commodity chain strategies**

Farmers participating in the Coffee Farmers Alliance support project enjoyed a large increase of their in cash income (multiplied by 2.9 and potentially by 6) thanks to higher yields, better quality and higher selling prices.

The benefits of the project extend beyond direct beneficiaries. Rural communities also benefit of it through jobs creation, development of the finance sector, development of the building sector, improvement of the education level, etc.

But the limited size of the project (35,000 coffee farmers out of 1.3 million) did not allow for an impact at the national level.

EQ 5 on the Commission's support to risk management (1)

Judgment criteria

- **Commission's support has contributed to the development and implementation of risk management and compensatory tools**

The EC (and the WFP for the investment costs) supported the establishment of warehouses combined with a system of tradable delivery receipts and a Commodity Exchange Board. Currently, five warehouses are operational. MAAIF is not committed to develop this system but the Ministry of Trade would be more interested.

An attempt was made to put in place a risk management system in the cotton sector, which however did not materialise because of divergences between the Government and the private sector.

- **Commission's support to agricultural commodities in CDDCs has included safety net issues in complement to commodity chain issues**

No attempt was made to establish a safety net.

EQ 5 on the Commission's support to risk management (2)

Judgment criteria

■ ***Income variability and vulnerability to price fluctuations of producers, sector and countries has declined as a result of improved risk management***

The in cash income of the farmers involved in the Coffee Farmers Alliance support project remains dependent on coffee price fluctuations, but has increased to the point where they are able to invest in their farm (seedlings, fertilisers, etc.) and make some savings. Their vulnerability to price fluctuations is thus reduced.

As regards farmers' income and vulnerability, one should note that:

- Staple crops also cash crops; some part of the production is marketed
- The revenue derived from cash crops contributes to reducing food insecurity (which is less a problem in Uganda than in other countries).
- There is a minimum income level under which price decreases may lead to food insecurity. Above this minimum income level farmers can cope with price fluctuations. The main objective of the Coffee Farmers Alliance support project is to bring the farmers' income beyond this threshold.

EQ 6 on the Commission's support to diversification (1)

Judgement criteria

■ ***The Commission's support has facilitated the analysis of Government's policy choices aiming for diversification and growth***

In the 2nd half the 90s, EC made a major contribution to the rehabilitation of the tea sector.

The EC with other donors supported the design by the government of its agricultural sector strategy (PMA) which aimed at promoting a zonal level enterprises well adapted to the agro-ecological conditions

■ ***The Commission has encouraged the diversification of sources of livelihoods of traditional commodity producers through the adoption and implementation of rural growth strategies***

■ ***The income vulnerability of producers, sector and countries has declined as a result of the implementation of diversification strategies***

The Coffee Farmers Alliance support project has contributed to diversifying and improving the sources of farmers' income that mainly relied on staple crops through the improvement of the productivity, yields and competitiveness of coffee production

There is evidence that in the pilot regions NAADS extension services, supported by the EC, led farmers to grow new crops. But this may have not taken place at national level after the roll-over of NAADS.

EQ 6 on the Commission's support to diversification (2)

Judgement criteria:

- ***The Commission has facilitated knowledge of and access to support instruments for private sector development***

EC is considering the establishment of an equity fund, which would invest in SMEs active in the processing and marketing of agricultural products.

Danida has established a trust fund whose revenues shall be used to support the development of agri-businesses (e.g. Through the provision of guarantees to bank loans)

EQ 7 on the Commission's support in the wider context of EC policies (1)

Judgment criteria

- ***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 into account their potential impact upon agricultural commodities***

Uganda didn't benefit from the banana and sugar support programmes which aimed at alleviating the impact on producing countries of changes in the EU policy concerning these products.

There is no evidence of EU policies having a negative impact of the Ugandan agricultural sector.

- ***Commission's support in other areas has achieved synergies with Commission support to agricultural commodities***

The EC provided technical assistance to help Uganda meeting the EU regulations related to the trade of agricultural commodities and fisheries products

EQ 7 on the Commission's support in the wider context of EC policies (2)

Judgment criteria

- ***Commission's support to agricultural commodities has taken into account Commission transversal policies regarding gender, environment protection, human rights, corporate responsibility (including child labour and other social rights) and HIV/AIDS in CDDCs***

Gender and environment (climate change) are given an increasing attention in the implementation of the Coffee Farmers Alliance support project.

According to some studies, the climate change is major threat on coffee production in Uganda. Farmers shall have to invest in irrigation systems.

EQ 8 on the use made of different financing instruments in support of agricultural commodities (1)

Judgment criteria

- ***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***

The EDF supported the government overall agricultural development strategy (PMA), that has mainly a functional character, while Stabex funds were mainly used to support specific commodity chains in particular coffee.

But the main difference is the following: EDF is used to implement interventions; Stabex could be used to implement projects but also to identify and formulate interventions, support the design of policy documents, bridge the gap between two interventions, etc.

These two instruments were clearly complementing each other.

Currently the Delegation doesn't have available an instrument replacing the Stabex funds.

Regional programmes devoted to agricultural research (e.g. Asareca) complemented the EC support to NARO.

EQ 8 on the use made of different financing instruments in support of agricultural commodities (2)

Judgment criteria

- ***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***

Stabex is viewed by the Delegation as a flexible instrument, which besides its utilisation in support of the coffee sector, was broadly used to finance studies, bridge the gap between two phases of a project, implement micro-projects, support microfinance, etc.

- ***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***

The provision of budget support to the PMA implementation relied on the assumption that the government had the adequate implementation capacity. This assumption was not fully verified notably as regards inter-agencies cooperation. EC support to the PMA secretariat was meant to address this issue.

A key component of the Coffee Farmers Alliance support project was the constitution of producer organisations at village, parish and national level.

EQ 9 on the relevance of the two COMs (1)

Judgment criteria:

- ***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***

The PMA was considered by the EC and other donors as a well designed, although over-ambitious, strategy for the development of the agricultural sector. Joint evaluations of the PMA took place between 2002 and 2008.

At commodity level, the lack of reliable statistical data is an impediment to an identification of the country's needs, problems and issues. However some donors (e.g. USDA) carry out reviews of value chains and the coffee organisation (UCDA) is producing monthly reports.

- ***The choice of interventions is aligned with the policy objectives and priorities of the beneficiary country's national strategy***

The EC programmable aid devoted to agriculture has been aligned with the government PMA strategy.

EC support to the coffee sector did not rely on a national strategy for the sector. However coffee development was addressed by the PMA in the framework of the enterprise priorities defined at zonal level.

EQ 9 on the relevance of the two COMs (2)

Judgment criteria:

- ***Over the period 2004-2010, the choice of interventions supported in the field of agricultural commodities is aligned with the objectives of the two Communications and has helped their achievement***

COM(2004) 89 is not currently a reference document for the Delegation. However, EC cooperation activities in the agriculture sector did not contradict the COM objectives:

- Importance given to exports commodities (tea, coffee)
- Improvement of productivity and quality as a response to the declining price trend in the coffee sector
- Diversification of income sources of the farmers
- Attempt to develop risk management instruments
- Organization of the coffee marketing chain in order to better respond to international market requirements

Evaluation thématique des interventions de la Commission Européenne en appui aux produits de base agricoles

Mission au Vanuatu

Débriefing à la Délégation de l'UE

Port Vila, 1 juillet 2011



Ce document est destiné à servir de support à une présentation orale et n'a pas vocation à être diffusé

Objet, objectifs et champ de l'évaluation

Objet	<p>Appuis de la Commission aux produits de base agricoles dans le contexte des politiques et approches définies par les deux Communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• COM(2004)89 Filières agricoles, dépendance et pauvreté• COM(2004)87 Proposition d'un partenariat UE-Afrique en appui au développement du secteur cotonnier <p>→ C'est une évaluation thématique, ni une évaluation de projets ou évaluation pays et encore moins un audit administratif ou de gestion</p>
Objectifs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fournir une appréciation indépendante de la coopération passée et présente de la Commission en appui aux produits de base agricoles• En dégager des enseignements visant à améliorer les futurs stratégies et programmes de la Commission
Champ	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Période 2000-2010• Tous pays ACP• Tous instruments de financement: FED, Stabex et Flex, lignes budgétaires (Programme Sucre, Programme Banane, Food Facility, etc.)

Les neuf questions d'évaluation

#	Objet de la question	Critères d'évaluation
EQ 1	Contexte des deux communications	Pertinence
EQ 2	Appuis de la Commission en termes de stratégie	Efficacité, Impact, Durabilité, Valeur Ajoutée de la Commission
EQ 3	Coordination avec les institutions internationales	Efficacité, Cohérence, Valeur Ajoutée de la Commission
EQ 4	Appuis de la Commission en termes de compétitivité	Efficacité, Impact, Durabilité, Valeur Ajoutée de la Commission
EQ 5	Appuis de la Commission à la gestion du risque	Efficacité, Impact, Durabilité
EQ 6	Appuis de la Commission en termes de diversification	Efficacité, Impact, Durabilité, Valeur Ajoutée de la Commission
EQ 7	Appuis de la Commission dans le contexte des politiques communautaires	Cohérence
EQ 8	Utilisation de différents instruments de financement	Pertinence, Efficacité, Efficience, Cohérence
EQ 9	Pertinence des deux communications	Tous critères

QE 1 : Dans son aide aux pays dépendants des produits de base agricoles, de quelle manière la Commission a-t-elle réagi au déclin tendanciel et à la volatilité des prix des produits de base agricoles?

- Alors que les principaux revenus du pays proviennent du tourisme, l'économie du Vanuatu est peu dépendante de ses exportations agricoles. Très peu d'exportations de vanille, café et cacao. Principales exportations agricoles (en VATU, année 2011)
 - Huile de coco: 33% des revenus d'exportations
 - Copra: 27% des revenus d'exportations
 - Kava: 9% des revenus d'exportations
- Volatilité des cours confirmée pour la période 2000-2010 et baisse des prix importante pour le cacao en 1998
- Un instrument spécifique a été mis en œuvre pour adresser la tendance baissière du prix du cacao: STABEX 1998 Cacao en fèves: réhabilitation de la *Big Bay Road* à Santo (157.090 €, plus intérêts)
- Autres interventions de la Commission:
 - POPACA/ POP 2
 - Programme Tous ACP (FAO): Improving Farmer-Buyer Linkages for the fruits and vegetables sector (Vanuatu, Samoa and Fiji – 2008/2009), Pacific Fruit and Vegetables Strategy (Samoa, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands – 2010/2011)
 - Capacity building in support of preparation of Economic Partnership Agreements
 - Primary Sector Growth Support Programme – Phase 1 (pas encore commencé)
 - Facilitating Agricultural Commodity Trade -Pacific Regional Indicative Programme
 - Prochainement: appui à la Chambre d'Agriculture?

QE 2: Dans quelle mesure l'appui de la Commission a permis dans les pays dépendants des produits de base agricoles la formulation de stratégies relatives à ces produits?

- L'agriculture n'est pas un secteur de concentration au Vanuatu (ni 2002-2007 ni 2008-2013)
- La Commission n'a pas promu les filières de produits de base agricoles et la situation de dépendance comme priorités des stratégies nationales au Vanuatu
- Il n'y a pas de stratégie de développement agricole au Vanuatu. Seul le PAA 2006-2015 (document des priorités du Gouvernement) mentionne l'agriculture comme une priorité
- Pas de dialogue spécifique en agriculture sur la période 2004-2010; ces derniers mois, le dialogue politique reste difficile vu la situation politique
- L'appui de la Commission – à travers le POPACA/ POP2 mis en œuvre avec le soutien de la France – a permis de mettre en œuvre des études de filière et d'obtenir les informations de base sur chacune de ses filières (par exemple, coprah)
- La France à travers son assistant technique basé au niveau du Département de l'Agriculture a développé quelques stratégies pour le développement des filières agricoles, de manière participative (workshop): café, épices et noix, cultures vivrières (fruits et légumes en cours)

QE 3: Dans quelle mesure la Commission a-t-elle encouragé les autres institutions internationales, incluant les organisations internationales de produits, à adopter l'approche des Communications visant les produits de base agricoles?

- Suite à l'adoption des plans d'action issus des deux Communications (2004), la coordination avec les organisations internationales (FAO principalement) au Vanuatu ne s'est pas renforcée dans le domaine des produits de base agricoles
- LA CE et la France ont été les deux principaux PTFs ayant supporté le domaine agricole au Vanuatu durant la période 2000-2010
- Intervention commune entre la CE et la France: POPACA/ POP2; mais manque de coordination et modalités de mise en œuvre différentes
- Pour les interventions du Programme Tous ACP au Vanuatu:
 - Il n'y a pas de cadre de concertation/ coordination, incluant la Délégation, avec la FAO (agence d'exécution du programme active au Vanuatu)
 - La coordination est faite au niveau de l'Unité de coordination du Programme à Bruxelles
 - La FAO travaille directement avec la *Farm Support Association* (FSA) du Vanuatu

QE 4: Dans quelle mesure l'appui de la Commission a-t-il contribué à l'amélioration de la compétitivité des filières de produits de base agricoles dans les pays dépendants de ces produits?

- Durant la période 2000-2010, la Commission n'a pas supporté l'environnement global du Vanuatu directement en lien avec les produits de base agricoles
 - L'accès à la terre reste un problème fondamental (culturel), et limite les possibilités de crédit au secteur rural
 - Fiscalité défavorable: taxe sur les exportations des produits agricoles
- Connaissance du helpdesk (tarifs/ règles d'origine) et le plus souvent utile pour le secteur privé
- Pas d'avancées concrètes en termes d'APEs et d'accès à l'OMC (en débat); les capacités du Gouvernement restent très faibles
- **Suite à l'appui de la Commission, il n'y a pas eu d'accroissement significatif et durable de la production de produits de base agricoles et il n'y a pas d'évidences que les coûts de production et de transformation des produits de base agricoles ont diminué**
 - POPACA (fini en 2007): mise en place d'un *revolving fund*, organisation des producteurs, infrastructures, techniques de production; mais peu de durabilité des résultats obtenus
 - Programme Tous ACP (FAO): résultats au niveau local en termes de meilleures techniques de culture/ récolte/ transformation (exemple: vanille, fruits et légumes)
- L'appui de la Commission a contribué à améliorer la capacité des producteurs à répondre aux demandes du marché (POPACA/Programme Tous ACP). Les services de vulgarisation agricole ont vu leur capacités améliorées (vanille); mais résultats obtenus à petite échelle
- Pas d'accroissement des exportations en lien avec les interventions de la Commission; pas de mesure de l'impact sur les revenus

QE 5: Dans quelle mesure l'appui de la Commission a-t-il contribué, par des dispositifs de gestion du risque et/ou protection sociale, à protéger le revenu des producteurs de produits de base agricoles des effets de la variabilité des prix?

- L'appui de la Commission a contribué au développement et à la mise en œuvre d'un mécanisme de compensation: STABEX
 - STABEX 1998 Cacao en fèves: réhabilitation de la *Big Bay Road* à Santo (157,090 €, plus intérêts)
- Le POPACA/ POP2 a mis en place un *revolving fund*; un rôle central pour les producteurs mais intérêt de poursuivre très faible
- Il n'y a pas de système de protection sociale soutenu par la CE au Vanuatu
- Il n'y pas d'évidence que les interventions STABEX ont permis de réduire la variabilité des revenus et la vulnérabilité des producteurs, des secteurs agricoles ou du pays

QE 6: Dans quelle mesure l'appui de la Commission a-t-il aidé les producteurs, le secteur agricole et les pays ACP dépendants des produits de base agricoles à diversifier leur sources de revenus hors produits de base agricoles ?

- La Commission n'a pas promu la diversification des revenus hors produits de base agricoles au Vanuatu

QE 7: Dans quelle mesure la mise en œuvre d'autres politiques communautaires a-t-elle contribué positivement ou négativement à la poursuite des objectifs des deux Communications ?

- Pas d'évidence de la prise en compte des questions genre/ environnement/ corporate social responsibility dans les interventions de la CE au Vanuatu

QE 8: Dans quelle mesure différents instruments de financement et modalités de mise en œuvre ont-ils été utilisés pour permettre d'atteindre les objectifs des Communications de manière efficiente et en respectant les calendriers d'exécution des interventions ?

- LA CE a utilisé différents instruments de financement dans le cadre de son support aux produits de base agricole au Vanuatu:
 - FED-STABEX: infrastructures
 - FED: POPACA/ POP2, Renforcement des capacités APEs, Primary Sector Growth Support Programme – Phase 1, Programme Tous ACP
 - PIR-Pacifique: FACT
- Au Vanuatu: principalement une approche projet/ programme et un appui budgétaire général
- Des retards de mise en œuvre ont été notés dans la plupart des interventions
 - STABEX: infrastructures
 - POPACA/POP 2: problème de conception, cadre logique, approche « top down »
 - Primary Sector Growth Support Programme: pas encore signé après un an
- Diverses raisons pour les retards: manque de capacités du Gouvernement, instabilité politique (problème récent), procédures administratives de la CE compliquées (Vanuatu-PNG-Bruxelles), manque de personnel à la Délégation (une seule personne responsable de toutes les opérations)

QE 9: Dans quelle mesure l'appui de la Commission aux produits de base agricoles a-t-il:
1) répondu aux besoins et problèmes des pays ACP dépendants des produits de base agricoles ?
2) été aligné sur les obj. politiques et les priorités des pays bénéficiaires et contribué à leur réalisation?
3) été cohérent avec les obj. des deux Communications et contribué à la réalisation de leurs objectifs ?

- Le Gouvernement n'ayant pas de stratégie agricole, il n'a pas été possible de s'aligner sur cette stratégie. Mais, le plus souvent, les interventions ont été décidées en consultation avec le Gouvernement mais pas forcément toutes les parties prenantes du secteur agricole
 - L'intervention POPACA/ POP 2 a été financée sur demande de la France (qui avait déjà mis en œuvre une première phase du projet); **approche « top down » et corrections apportées en cours de mise en œuvre (EQ8)**
 - Concertation avec la *Farm Support Association* pour le Programme Tous ACP (fruits et légumes FAO) et le FACT
- Pas de connaissance des Communications (au niveau de la Délégation), mais cependant alignement implicite des interventions de la Commission dans le domaine des produits de base agricoles en réponse aux objectifs des deux Communications (par exemple: POPACA/POP 2)

Annex 8: List of persons met

Brussels – European Commission

Surname, name	Institution/Organisation/ Unit/Department	Function
Willem OLTHOF	DG DEV	Policy Advisor
Gosia LACHUT	DG DEV Unit 1	Relations with the countries and the region of the Pacific Title Desk Officer : Kiribati, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands
Alina-Mihaela STANCIULESCU	DG DEV Unit 2	Relations with the countries and the region of West Africa Title Desk Officer GHANA
Heike SCHNEIDER	DG DEV Unit 2	Relations with the countries and the regions of the Horn of Africa, Eastern Africa and Indian Ocean Title Chargé de relations internationales - Desk Officer: Uganda
Joan-Maria PIJUAN CANADELL	DG DEV Unit 2	Relations with the countries and the regions of the Horn of Africa, Eastern Africa and Indian Ocean Title Chargé de relations internationales - Desk Officer: Comoros and Madagascar
Laurent SILLANO	DG DEV Unit 2	Desk officer BURKINA FASO, Desk officer for economic regional integration issues and preparation of EPAs in West Africa
Linda HALES	DG DEV Unit 2	Relations with the countries and the regions of the Horn of Africa, Eastern Africa and Indian Ocean Title Chargé de relations internationales - Desk Officer: Tanzania
Marina RAFTI	DG DEV Unit 2	Relations with the countries and the regions of the Horn of Africa, Eastern Africa and Indian Ocean Title Chargé de relations internationales - Desk Officer: Kenya
Mats LILJEFELT	DG DEV Unit 2	Relations with the countries and the region of West Africa Title Desk officer CÔTE D'IVOIRE
Roberto RENSI	DG DEV Unit 2	Relations with the countries and the region of West Africa Title Desk officer MALI et SIERRA LEONE
Thomas VON HANDEL	DG DEV Unit 2	Relations with the countries and the regions of the Horn of Africa, Eastern Africa and Indian Ocean Title Chargé de relations internationales - Desk Officer: Ethiopia

Ulrike BRAUN	DG DEV Unit 3	Relations with the countries and the region of Southern Africa Title Desk Officer: Malawi
Liselotte ISAKSSON	Economic Development: infrastructure networks, Trade and Regional Integration DG DEV B1	Policy Officer
Arend BIESEBROEK	EuropeAid Geographical coordination and supervision for ACPs Title Head of sector - Caribbean	Chargé d'aide et de coopération internationales - International Aid/Cooperation Office
Aude SAUVAGET	EuropeAid Co-Operation Office	Programme Manager – Natural Resources and Infrastructure
Grazyna BOGUSZ	EuropeAid Co-Operation Office	Project Officer – Economics and Trade sector. Centralised operations for the ACP countries.
Layla EL KHADRAOUI	EuropeAid Co-Operation Office	Secrétaire chef d'unité
Patricia LARBOURET	EuropeAid Co-Operation Office Unit C4	Expert national détaché, Gestionnaire de programmes, opérations centralisées pour les pays ACP
Yves LEENAERTS	EuropeAid Co-Operation Office Unit 6	Responsable de la gestion de la qualité - Agricultural commodities & diversification (essentially non sugar)(soil conservation and fertility)
Ann-Charlotte SALLMANN	Geographical coordination and supervision for ACPs International Aid DG DEV	Cooperation Officer - International Aid/Cooperation Officer for Cameroun and Congo-Brazaville
Clodagh O'BRIEN	Relations with the countries and the region of Central Africa and the Great Lake DG DEV	International Relations Officer - Desk Officer Cameroon and coordinator on EPA negotiations

Brussels – At Intervention level

Surname, name	Institution/Organisation/Unit/Department	Function
Guy STINGLHAMBER	Comité de Liaison Europe-Afrique- Caraïbes-Pacifique (COLEACP)	Director
Pierre BERTHELOT	Emerging Markets Group	Director
Laurence GUIGOU	Emerging Markets Group, The AAACP Programme	Administrative and Financial expert
Mariane TAMBWE	Emerging Markets Group, The AAACP Programme	Information and communication expert
Morag WEBB	Programme Initiative Pesticides (PIP)	Policy Advisor

Burkina Faso

Surname, name	Institution/Organisation/ Unit/Department	Function
Philippe DIERICKX	Agence Française de Développement	Chargé de mission Eau et assainissement & Développement rural
Soumaïla SANOU	CICB - Comité interprofessionnel des filières céréales et niébé du Burkina	Président CICB
Sibiri PARKOUDA	CSPA - Secrétariat Permanent/ Coordination des Politiques sectorielles agricoles	Chargé de la politique sectorielle agricole
Anne HOJMARK ANDERSEN	DANIDA – Danish International Development Agency	Conseillère en Développement – agriculture et développement rural
Dadou P. KONTONGOMDE	FAO	Assistant du Représentant de la FAO
Jean-Pierre RENSON	FAO	Représentant de la FAO
Kouméné SANOU	GPC Kopena	Président
Kabé SANOU	GPC Kopena	Membre
Daoda SANOU	GPC Kopena	Membre
Kalo SANOU	GPC Kopena	Membre
Fako SANOU	GPC Kopena	Membre
Florent Dirk THIES	GIZ – Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit	CTP, Programme Développement Agriculture
Jules SOME	GIZ – Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit	Conseiller technique senior
Honoré MOYENGA	IFDC - Centre international pour la Fertilité des sols et le Développement agricole	Coordonateur National PPCC/ Burkina Faso
Robert M. OUÉDRAOGO	Ministère de l'Agriculture, Direction Générale des Produits Végétales	Directeur général des Productions Végétales
Janvier SAWADOGO	Ministère du Commerce, de l'Industrie et de l'Artisanat	Directeur par interim du Commerce extérieur
Leidi ZONGO	Ministère du Commerce, de l'Industrie et de l'Artisanat	Services d'échanges commerciaux et de statistiques
Thao SANIBÉ	Ministère du Commerce, de l'Industrie et de l'Artisanat	Services de la coopération commerciale
Bouréma NABA	Ministère du Commerce, de l'Industrie et de l'Artisanat	Commerce
Diallo HASSANE	Ministère du Commerce, de l'Industrie et de l'Artisanat	Commerce intérieur prix et concurrence

Wilfried YAMEOGO	Ministère du Commerce, de la Promotion de l'entreprise et de l'artisanat, Secrétariat Permanent de la filière cotonnière libéralisée	Secrétaire Permanent, Filière cotonnière libéralisée
Athanase YARA	UNPCB - Union Nationale des Producteurs de Coton du Burkina Faso	Chef de service Agroéconomie de l'UNPCB, Coordonateur du Programme coton-bio et Equitable
Abel GOUBA	UNPCB - Union Nationale des Producteurs de Coton du Burkina Faso	Assistant technique HELVETAS, association suisse pour la coopération internationale - Programme coton-bio et Equitable
Idrissa SINOU	UNPCB - Union Nationale des Producteurs de Coton du Burkina Faso	UNPCB, Chef de service suivi-évaluation
Georges GUÉBRÉ	UNPCB Union Nationale des Producteurs de Coton du Burkina Faso	Chargé de Programme du Programme coton-bio et Equitable

Cameroon

Surname, name	Institution/Organisation/Unit/Department	Function
Matthieu LE GRIX	AfD – Agence française de Développement	Chargé de mission
M. OWONA	Assobacam	Représentant
Paul JEANGILLE	Indépendant travaillant au service de l'Assobacam	Assistant technique des programmes ATF
Mohamadou BAYERO	CAON - Cellule d'Appui à l'PON-FED	Chargé de programmes développement rural & environnement
Pierre Michel LOUBANA	CARBAP – Centre Africain de Recherche sur les Bananiers et Plantains	Nématologiste – Chercheur et directeur
André Marie LEMA	Conseil Interprofessionnel du Cacao et du Café	Chef de Projet, PACICC
Omer Gatien MALEDY	ONCC - Office National du Cacao et du Café	Conseiller technique n°1
André BELEBENIE	ANCC - Association Nationale des Producteurs du Cacao/Café	Président de l'ANCC et du CPM FODECC
David NKUE	CONAPROCAM (Confédération Nationale des Producteurs de Cacao et Café)	Vice-Président National
Wim IMPENS	EU DEL	chef de la section Développement rural, Environnement et Société Civile
Nicolas BERLANGA MARTINEZ	EU DEL	chef des Operations de Coopération
Michel SCHLEIFFER	EU DEL	chargé des programmes section DR, Environnement et Société Civile

François KWONGANG	EU DEL	
Frédérique SAME DUE	EU DEL	CP/Section Economie, Commerce & Gouvernance
Marie Janine ATANGA NKODO	MINADER – Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Développement Rural	sous directrice
LAOUMAYE MERHOYE	MINADER – Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Développement Rural	point focal coton du MINADER
Hamadou NOUHO	CNPC - Confédération nationale des producteurs de coton du Cameroun	Représentant
Ombe LAMBERT	MINADER – Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Développement Rural	Cadre MINADER
Antoine TIMENE	MINADER – Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Développement Rural	Coordonnateur national du PSCC
Enoch Chancelord MVELE MVELE	MINADER – Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Développement Rural	suivi et évaluation du PSCC
BARGA	MINCOMMERCE – Ministère du Commerce	chef de la coopération commerciale
Bate MOSES AYUK	MINEPAT – Ministère de l'Economie, de la Planification et de l'Aménagement du Territoire	Direction cooperation, sous-direction UE du MINEPAT
Chantal ELOMBAT MBEDY	MINEPAT – Ministère de l'Economie, de la Planification et de l'Aménagement du Territoire	directrice de l'intégration régionale
Frank VAN ROMPAEY	ONUDI – Organisation des Nations Unies pour le Développement Industriel	Représentant de l'ONUDI au Cameroun, pour les pays d'Afrique Centrale
BENTATA	PHP	directeur général adjoint de la PHP
Pierre FORET	PHP	directeur financier de la PHP
Eric FORCE	SCAC – Service de Coopération et d'Action Culturelle	Attaché de Coopération Développement durable et environnement
Maniével Emmanuel SÈNE	World Bank	Agribusiness Specialist
Amadou NCHARE	World Bank	Agricultural Economist

Côte d'Ivoire

Surname, name	Institution/Organisation/Unit/Department	Function
Jean-Marie NÉE,	EU DEL	Premier Secrétaire Développement rural et Ressources naturelles

Ghana

Surname, name	Institution/Organisation/ Unit/Department	Function
Thomas De GUBERNATIS	AfD – Agence française de Développement	Senior Project Officer, Private Sector & Rural Development
Martin ASIAMAH	CRIG – Cocoa Research Institute of Ghana	deputy account manager and subalternate officer on the project
Stephen OPOKU	CRIG – Cocoa Research Institute of Ghana	Scientist (works on the project)
Jannik VAA	EU DEL	Head of Infrastructure and Sustainable Development Section, Delegation of the European Union to Ghana
Emmanuel ANSONG	EU DEL	
David DOMES	EU DEL	Head of Operations 2 -Trade and Economic Section
Kurt CORNELIS	EU DEL	Head of Co-Operation, Delegation of the European Union to Ghana
Xavier PINSOLLE	EU DEL	Trade, Economic and Political Officer
Cedric MEREL	EUDEL	
Emmanuel ANSONG	EUDEL	
Unknown	Farmers association from Nyinatise	
E. Tei QUARTEY	GH Cocobod	Deputy Director (M&E)
Ruediger BEHRENS	GIZ-KfW (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH)	Deputy Team Leader, Market Oriented Agriculture Programme (MOAP) Ghana, GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH)
Kofi Atta AGYEPONG	GIZ-KfW (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH)	Programme Manager, kfw Bankengruppe, German Development Cooperation House
Hélène MOQUET	GIZ-KfW (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH)	Advisor, kfw Bankengruppe, German Development Cooperation House
Isaac K. GYAMFI	IITA (International Institute for Tropical Agriculture)	
Emmanuel N.K. ASHONG & colleagues	Ministry of transports, feeder roads department	
Joe TACKIE	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Coordinator of the PSTEP, Private Sector Development Strategy
Ebo QUAISON	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Multilateral, Regional & Bilateral Trade Division
Eugene ADARKWA-ADDAE	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Standards (SBS & TBT division)
James Adomako ADDAI	National Authorising Officer – Ministry of Finance	EU Desk officer, ACP-EU Unit

Edward BORTEYE	National Authorising Officer – Ministry of Finance	EU Desk officer, ACP-EU Unit
George ASANTE	Seed Production Unit, COCOBOD	Assistant Director
Peter Okyere BOATENG	Seed Production Unit, COCOBOD	Technical manager and representative for the EU project
Jan J. NIJHOFF	World Bank	Senior agricultural economist

Madagascar

Surname, name	Institution/Organisation/ Unit/Department	Function
Christophe ANDREAS		Directeur Exécutif du CTHT
Fanja RALAMBORANTO	AFDI - CSA de Soanierana	
Julie LECOMTE	AFDI - CSA de Soanierana	Cellule de Coordination AFDI Madagascar
Lina TAHARISOAVEL OHANRA	AIM - Association Intercoopération Madagascar	Directeur Exécutif
Christiane ANDRAIMANANJARA	AIM - Association Intercoopération Madagascar	Chargée de programme
Riba RAMANANA	Bénéficiaires du projet Stabex AIM	Collecteur de vanille et girofle
Mme MAZOLINE	Bénéficiaires du projet Stabex AIM	agriculteurs et présidents d'OP
Jean-Jacques HOUSSEIN	Bénéficiaires du projet Stabex AIM	agriculteurs et présidents d'OP
Roger BEKAMISY	Bénéficiaires du projet Stabex AIM	agriculteurs et présidents d'OP
Regis DIDA	Bénéficiaires du projet Stabex AIM	agriculteurs et présidents d'OP
M. RAVINTSARA	Bénéficiaires du projet Stabex AIM	coordonnateur du projet AIM
Mathieu WEIL	CIRAD	expert auprès du CTHT
Richard RAHARIZAKA	CNCC - Comité National de Commercialisation du Café	Directeur
Mme MIRANA	CNCC - Comité National de Commercialisation du Café	
Mme ESTERINE	CSA	Coordonatrice du CSA du district de Soanierana Ivongo
M. SIMON	CSA	Directeur de la Circonscription de Développement Rural (CDR)
Mme MARIE	CSA	adjointe au maire
Ms.RACHEL	CSA - Centre de Services Agricoles	Secrétaire administrative et comptable du CSA
Naram RAFIDIMANANA	CTHT - Centre Technique Horticole de Tamatave	Président du CTHT et Président du Groupement des Exportateurs de Litchis (GEL)

Tsiory RAKOTOMAVO	EU DEL	Chargée de programme développement rural
Aymeric ROUSSEL	EU DEL	Chargé de programme Agriculture, Elevage, Pêche
Joelle RAJAONARISON	EU DEL	chargée de programmes commerce, secteur privé, intégration régionale
Jacqueline UWAMWIZA	EU DEL	Chargé d'aide et de coopération internationales développement rural et sécurité alimentaire
Désiré RAMANANTSOA	DRDR - Direction Régionale du Développement Rural	Chef de Service
Emilson RAKOTONDRAIN ISE	DRDR - Direction Régionale du Développement Rural	Chef du service de coopération et d'appui aux filières de la DRDR
Haingo RAKOTONDRATS IMA	FIDA (Fonds International de Développement Agricole)	Chargé des opérations
Lucien Fanomezantsoa RANARIVELO	FIDA (Fonds International de Développement Agricole)	Coordinateur national
David SOLOFOHERY RASON	FIDA (Fonds International de Développement Agricole)	Coordinateur Interrégional Zone Centre AROPA
Sola SEZY	FIDA (Fonds International de Développement Agricole)	Coordinateur de programme PPRR
Guynemer RASOLOFONIAIN A	OTIV (Micro-crédit)	Responsable administratif et financier
M. HERITIANA	PSDR - Programme Sectoriel de Développement Rural	Directeur financier et comptable
Stefano LINGUANOTTO	Secrétariat Multi-Bailleurs en Développement Rural	Coordonateur
Mireille RAHAINGOVOLO LONA	UPDR, Ministère de l'Agriculture	Chef de l'Unité de Politique de Développement Rural
Elias RANDRIANARISOA	UPDR, Ministère de l'Agriculture	Coordinateur du Programme CSA/FRDA

Uganda

Surname, name	Institution/Organisation/ Unit/Department	Function
Africano KANGIRE	COREC - Coffee Research Centre	Head of Corec
Unkown	COREC - Coffee Research Centre	10 members: scientists, technicians, support staff and project staff
Warwick THOMSON	DANIDA – Danish International Development Agency	Programme Coordinator
William MUGERWA	DANIDA – Danish International Development Agency	Programme Officer
Jean-Louis VEAUX	EU DEL	Programme Officer - Rural Development
Bernard CRABBÉ	EU DEL	Second Secretary – Head of Agriculture and Rural Development
Alex NAKAJJO	EU DEL	Operations Officer for Trade and Regional Integration
James OKOTH	FAO	National Programme Manager
Kennedy IGBOWKE	FAO	Project manager
Martin AMEU	FAO	Programme Assistant
Stefan COGNIGNI,	Kaweri Coffee Farmers Alliance Support Project	General Manager
M. DAVID	Kaweri Coffee Farmers Alliance Support Project	Local Coordinator
M. KENNEDY	Kaweri Coffee Farmers Alliance Support Project	Project agent
Unknown	Kaweri Coffee Farmers Alliance Support Project	Local demonstration coffee farmer, leader of a coffee organization
Unknown	Kaweri Coffee Farmers Alliance Support Project	Two coffee farmers members of a coffee organization
Unknown	Kaweri Coffee Farmers Alliance Support Project	Around ten members of the Nabumbugu coffee growers Company Limited
David J. BARRY	Kyagalanyi Coffee Ltd - UCTF (Uganda Coffee Trade Federation)	UCTF chairman and export company managing director
Samuel SEMANDA	MAAIF - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Commissioner Agricultural Planning + heads of the crop and of the animal production units + general secretary of UCDA
Geresom OKECHO-OCHWO	NAADS - National Agricultural Advisory Services	NAADS Secretariat, PM&E Officer
Sylvester DICKSON BAGULA	NARO - National Agricultural Research Organisation	Director quality assurance
Tom KAKUBA	PMA - Plan for Modernization of Agriculture	Programme Officer (PMA Secretariat)
Henry NGABIRANO	UCDA - Uganda Coffee Development Authority	Managing Director
Unknown	World Food Programme	Contact person

Tanzania

Surname, name	Institution/Organisation/ Unit/Department	Function
Christian SHOO	Coffee extension services	Department Technical services, Technical expert to coffee cooperatives
Violette KISANGA	Coffee extension services	District Council, Extension Government services
Anne-Claire LEON	EU DEL	First secretary, Natural Resources
Ana Margarida	EU DEL	Officer, Agriculture
Riikka TORPPA	EU DEL	Trade issues/ Market access
Ana Margarida MARIGUESA	EU DEL	Natural Resources section
Raimondo BUSSY	EU DEL	Head of Finance and Contract Section (STABEX issues, all finance issues)
Mr. SANTINO	Focus Group tea sector – Mkonge Block Farm	Farmer, Chairman of the association
Mr. CHRISTIAN	Focus Group tea sector – Mkonge Block Farm	Farmer, vice chairman of the association
Mr. BENADAI	Focus Group tea sector – Mkonge Block Farm	Extension services
Mr. BASSAMO TESSA BASSOLUWA	Focus Group tea sector – Mkonge Block Farm	Inspector, representative of the district tea board
Ibrahim SEUSHI	Gatsby Trust	Tanzanian Cotton Board Policy advisor
Vincent AKULUMUKA	Irish Embassy	Irish Aid, Agriculture Advisor
Ivan Crowley	Irish Embassy	Irish Aid, Development Advisor
Geoffrey KIRENGA	Ministry of Agriculture	Food security and Cooperatives, Director Crop Development
Mr MSUYA	Ministry of Agriculture – ASDP, evaluation unit	Economist M&E and Statistics section of MoA
Mr CHACHA	Ministry of Agriculture – ASDP, evaluation unit	Economist M&E and Statistics section of MoA
James FOSTER	Ministry of Finance	Chai Project, Director
Leopold K. LWAJABE	Ministry of Finance, NAO	Programme officer Infrastructure
Mr. MAWAYA	Ministry of Finance, NAO	Head of Programmes
Edward Mathew SUNGULA	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Policy section, Policy and planning, Director
Mr. BERRI	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Policy section, Policy and planning
Annette MATHANIA	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Marketing Department
Kassim Mbufu	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Marketing Department
Mananunbu CHIBOLE	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Marketing Department
Kigahe EXAUD	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Policy and planning, Director
Elisabeth W.Z.MSENGI	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Senior Economist

Michael BONIFACIO	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Department Strategy
Victoria MWANUKUZI	NAO	Programme officer Rural Devt
Appolinary KISANGA	Sugar Board of Tanzania	Head of Finance and Administration
Mkula NEPHAT	Sugar Board of Tanzania	National Coordinator of Sugarcane Outgrowers scheme
James TERI	TACRI - Tanzanian Coffee Research Institute	Chief Executive Director
Pulkeria SHIRIMA	TACRI - Tanzanian Coffee Research Institute	Financial services
Jeremiah MAGESA	TACRI - Tanzanian Coffee Research Institute	Programme manager of technology transfer
Deusdedit KILAMBO	TACRI - Tanzanian Coffee Research Institute	Programme manager Result II
Hubert LEMA	TACRI - Tanzanian Coffee Research Institute	Programme manager, Administrative support unit
Godsteven MARO	TACRI - Tanzanian Coffee Research Institute	Programme manager Result III
Marco C. MTUNGA	Tanzania Cotton Board	General Director
George Owen KYEJO	TASTGA - Tanzania Smallholder Tea Growers Association	Chairman
Jones M. SIKIRA	TAT - Tea Association of Tanzania	Executive Director
Charles M. EKELEGE	TBS - Tanzania Bureau of Standards	Director General
Dominic H. MWAKANGALE	TBS - Tanzania Bureau of Standards	Director, Testing, Calibration and Packaging Services
Mathias ASSENGA BENEDICT	TBT - Tea Board Tanzania	General Director
C.M NDUNGURU	TBT - Tea Board Tanzania	Planning and Promotion Manager
Adolph A. KUMBURU	TCB - Tanzanian Coffee Board	General Director
Bruno J. NDUNGURU	Tea Research Institute of Tanzania	Executive Director
Emmanuel F. SIMBUA	Tea Research Institute of Tanzania	Research Director
Mustafa H. UMANDE	TSHTDA - Tanzania Smallholders Tea Development Agency	Chairman

Vanuatu

Surname, name	Institution/Organisation/ Unit/Department	Function
Anne-Sophie VIVIER	Ambassade de France	Chargée de mission
Adrien MOURGES	EU DEL	Attaché (Coopération) - Programme Officer
Johnson NAVITI	DESPAC	Deputy NAO
Charles ROGERS	Farm Support Association	Farmer and Associated Director of the Association
François JAPIOT	Ministry of Agriculture	Technical Assistant at the Ministry of Agriculture (paid by the French cooperation)
Ruben Bakeo MARKWARD	Ministry of Agriculture	Director, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture Quarantine Forestry and Fisheries Government of the Republic of Vanuatu
Jimmy RANTES	Ministry of Trade	Acting Director
Wensie Wesley NAKI	Ministry of Trade	Industry Development Officer, Provincial Industries, Extension services Division

Annex 9: Bibliography

Documents consulted at Desk level

Written documents

"Agriculture and Preferential Trade Relations with ACP Countries": Commodities – Rice, Oct 2008

"Agriculture and Preferential Trade Relations with ACP Countries": Commodities – Sugar, Oct 2008

ACP-EC Council of Ministers: Decision no 1/2008, 13 June 2008

ACP-EC Council of Ministers: Decision No 6/2005 concerning the use of the remaining EUR 482 000 000 of the conditional EUR 1 000 000 000 under the ninth EDF for cooperation with ACP countries, 22 November 2005

ACP-EC Partnership Agreement, Article 68 and Annex II, Articles 8-11 revised by Decision No 2/2004 of the ACP-EC Council of Ministers, 30 June 2004

Agritrade : Flex Definition Mecanism, Cacao, Note de Synthèse, mai 2008

Cogea : Évaluation de l'Organisation Commune de Marché (OCM) dans le secteur de la banane, Rapport Final, Volume II, juillet 2005.

Cogea : Évaluation de l'Organisation Commune de Marché (OCM) dans le secteur de la banane, Rapport Final, Volume I, juillet 2005.

Cogea: Evaluation de l'impact des mesures de la PAC sur les secteurs bénéficiant ou ayant bénéficié d'aides directes - LOT 6: Riz et tabac - Évaluation des mesures de la Politique Agricole Commune relatives au secteur du riz, Executive Summary, Nov.2009

Commission, Policy Coherence for Development Work Programme 2010-2013, Commission Staff Working document (SEC(2010) 421 final, 21-4-2010

Commission, Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the EESCCR on Policy Coherence for Development- Establishing the policy framework for a whole-of-the-Union approach, 15 September 2009

Commission of the European Communities: Commission Staff Working Paper - Document Accompanying The Proposal For A Council Regulation Amending Regulations (Eec) No 404/93, (Ec) No 1782/2003 And (Ec) No 247/2006 As Regards The Banana Sector - Towards Reform Of The Aid Scheme For Community Banana Producers - Impact Analysis Summary, 20 September 2006

Commission of the European Communities: Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development Working Document - Complementary data to the report from the Commission to the Council on the operation of the agreements concluded in the framework of the GATT Article XXVIII procedure in the rice sector, 30 June 2009

Commission of the European Communities: Proposal for a Council Regulation amending Regulations (EEC) No 404/93, (EC) No 1782/2003 and (EC) No 247/2006 as regards the banana sector, 20 September 2006

DRN-ADE-ECO-ECORYS-NCG, Evaluation of the Commission's support to Southern African Development Community – SADC, Regional Level Evaluation, Synthesis Report, October 2007

DRN-ADE-ECO-NCG, Evaluation of the Commission's regional strategy for the Caribbean, Final Report, April 2005

DRN-ADE-ECO-NCG-ECORYS, Evaluation de la stratégie régionale de la CE en Afrique de l'Ouest, Rapport final de synthèse, Mai 2008

DRN-ADE-ECO-NCG-ECORYS, Evaluation of the Commission's support to the region of Eastern and Southern Africa and the Indian Ocean, Regional Level Evaluation, Final Report, December 2008

DRN-ADE-ECO-NCG-ECORYS, Evaluation of the Commission's support to the ACP Pacific region, Final Report, September 2007

EC Council, Council Regulation (EC) No 1637/98 amending Regulation (EEC) No 404/93 on the common organization of the market in bananas, 20 July 1998

EC Council, Council Regulation (EC) No 1637/98 amending Regulation (EEC) No 404/93 on the common organisation of the market in bananas, 20 July 1998

EC Council: Commission Staff Working Paper - Agricultural Commodity Trade, Dependence and Poverty: An Analysis of Challenges facing Developing Countries, 2 sept 2003

EC Council: Conclusions of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting within the Council, EU Strategy on Aid for Trade: Enhancing EU support for trade-related needs in developing countries, 29 October 2007 (14470/07 of 29 October 2007)

EC Council: Council Conclusions on Agricultural Commodity Chains, Dependence and Poverty and an EU-Africa Partnership in Support of Cotton Sector Development, 27 April 2004

EC Council: Council conclusions, 18 May 2009 (10018/09 of May 18, 2009, paragraph 21).

EC Council: Council Regulation 2686/94, 31 October 1994

EC Council: Council Regulation No 1528/2007 applying the arrangements for products originating in certain states which are part of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group

of States provided for in agreements establishing, or leading to the establishment of, Economic Partnership Agreements, 20 December 2007

EC Council: Council Regulation No 856/1999, setting up a Special Assistance Framework (SAF), 22 April 1999

EC Council: Working Party on Commodities, Draft Council Conclusions on the EU Action Plan on Agricultural Commodity Chains, Dependence and Poverty and the EU-Africa Partnership in support of Cotton Sector Development, 14 May 2008

EC Regulation 404/93

EC Regulation No 266/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing accompanying measures for Sugar Protocol countries affected by the reform of the EU sugar regime, 15 February 2006

EC Regulation No1337/2008 (OJ L354, 31.12.2008 page 62), 16 December 2008

ECO Consult – AGE – APRI – Euronet – IRAM – NCG, Country Level Evaluation Uganda, Final Report, November 2009

ECO Consult – AGE – APRI – Euronet – IRAM – NCG, Evaluation de la coopération de l'Union européenne avec le Burkina Faso, Evaluation de niveau national, Rapport final, mai 2010

ECORYS Nederland BV, Evaluation of European Commission's Support to Kenya, Final Report, June 2008

EGEVAL – EDI, Evaluation of the European Commission's support to the United Republic of Tanzania, April 2006

EGEVAL – SOFRECO, Evaluation Stratégie Pays Mali, Rapport Final, Septembre 2006

EGEVAL, Ghana – Country Strategy Evaluation, Final Report, April 2005

EU 2009, Report on Policy Coherence for Development, (COM 2009 461 final) Commission Staff Working document, 17 September 2009

EU- African Partnership on infrastructure, Ethiopia, 2007

EU-ACP, Comité d'orientation et de suivi du Partenariat UE-Afrique sur le coton, Mise à jour relative au Partenariat Union européenne – Afrique sur le Coton, Mai 2009

European Commission, Agriculture Directorate-General: A description of the Common Organisation of the Market in Sugar, September 2004

European Commission, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, Banana Accompanying Measures: Supporting the Sustainable Adjustment of the Main ACP Banana-Exporting Countries to New Trade Realities, 2010, (COM(2010)101 final)

European Commission, Directorate-general for Agriculture and Rural Development: "Agriculture and Preferential Trade Relations with ACP Countries": Commodities – Bananas, Oct 2008

European Commission, Directorate-general for Agriculture and Rural Development "Agriculture and Preferential Trade Relations with ACP Countries" (10/2008) and Council Regulation (EC) No 1528/2007, (OJ L 348, 31.12.2007), 20 December 2007

European Commission: Commission Regulation No 1609/1999, 22 July 1999

European Commission: Communication From The Commission To The Council And The European Parliament - Proposal for an EU-Africa partnership in support of cotton sector development, 2004, (COM(2004)87 final)

European Commission: Communication From The Commission To The Council And The European Parliament - Agricultural Commodity Chains, Dependence and Poverty - A proposal for an EU Action Plan, 2004, (COM(2004)89 final)

European Commission, Economic Partnership Agreements, Means and Objectives

European Commission, EU Agriculture Policy Reform, Impact of CAP reform on developing countries

European Commission, Europeaid Cooperation Office, Final report - Inventorisation of the utilisation of the 7th and 8th EDF STABEX transfers, 30th September 2004

FAO 2004, The State of Agricultural Commodity Markets 2004

FAO, Consultation on agricultural commodity price problems, December 8 2010

Flex Guidelines, Annexe 1 – Fr: Financement en cas de Fluctuations des Recettes d'exportation

Glenys Kinnock (PSE) to the Commission: Flex Instrument, Written Question (E-1601/04), 2004

Glenys Kinnock (PSE), Flex Instrument: Reply to Written Question (E-1601/04), 2004

IMF, Guide on resource revenue transparency/Fiscal Affairs Dept., International Monetary Fund, 2007.

Implementation of and follow-up to commitments and agreements made at the International Conference on Financing for Development, UN General Assembly, 58th session, 5th August 2003.

Investissement Développement Conseil, Evaluation de la Stratégie-Pays de la CE : Burkina Faso 1996-2000, Avril 2001

Investment Development Consultancy, Evaluation of EC Country Strategy: Uganda 1996-2000, February 2001

Meridiean – Bananes: La banane ACP résiste, 6 octobre 2009

MWH – ECDPM – ODI, Evaluation of the European Commission’s Country Strategy for Ethiopia, Final Report May 2004

Note from General Secretariat on « Council Conclusions on Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) », 18 November 2009

Overseas Development Institute, Une Arrivée et un Nouveau Départ: Partenariats au Cameroun après le Point d’Achèvement PPTE, Rapport Final de la Mission Indépendante de Suivi, Juillet 2006

Press Release IP/09/1920: Commission approves € 230 million to cushion the impact of the economic crisis in 13 African and Caribbean countries, 15 Déc 2009

Press Release: The EU-Latin America Bananas Agreement – Questions and Answers, 15 December 2009

Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation ACP-EU: European Union-Africa Cotton Forum, Summary of Proceedings, Paris 5 and 6 July 2004

The European Union’s Programme for ACP Countries: Impact Evaluation of the Special Framework of Assistance for Traditional ACP Suppliers of Bananas, Global Report – Version 1

Sanoussi Bilal, Redefining ACP-EU Trade relations: Economic Partnership Agreements, Background Paper for Working Group 3, ECDPM Seminar: The Cotonou Partnership Agreement: What role in a changing world? Maastricht, 18-19 December 2006

UNCTAD International Trade Statistics

World Bank, Global Economic Prospects, Commodities at the crossroads, WB 2009

Websites

<http://blogs.worldbank.org/prospects/placing-the-200608-commodity-price-boom-into-perspective> online December 8 2010, World Bank

<http://comtrade.un.org/db/>(United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics Database).

http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/agrista/index_en.htm

http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/external/index_en.htm

http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/markets/index_en.htm

http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/tradepol/commodityprices/index_en.htm

http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/capreform/bananas/index_en.htm

http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/eval/reports/bananas/index_fr.htm

http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/eval/reports/rice/index_fr.htm

http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/external/dev/commodities/index_en.htm

http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/external/dev/index_en.htm
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/external/wto/index_en.htm
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/foodprices/index_en.htm
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets/rice/index_en.htm
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets/sugar/index_en.htm
<http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/minco/manco/cmo/index.htm>
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/simplification/cmo/index_en.htm
http://ec.europa.eu/development/how/development_programmes/devprog_sugar_en.cfm
<http://ec.europa.eu/trade/wider-agenda/development/aid-for-trade/>
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/legis/20090601/chap036058.htm>
<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/06/335&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>
<http://www.coton-acp.org/documents.htm>
<http://www.unctad.org/infocomm>
<http://www.africa-union.org/root/AU/Conferences/2007/october/IE/EU/iE/ie.htm>
Site internet du COS-coton : <http://www.coton-acp.org/>
Site Internet du Programme AAACP : All ACP Agricultural Commodities Programme : <http://www.euacpcommodities.eu/>

Documents consulted at field level

Burkina Faso

AIDCO-C7-Comptabilité administrative Stabex Haricots 1999, Burkina Faso, 2000

All ACP agricultural commodities programme: bi-annual report for the period from July to December 2010. Annotated report of World Bank agricultural risk management team (wb-armt)

All ACP agricultural commodities programme: bi-annual report for the period from July to December 2010. Report of the World Bank – sustainable development network (WB-SDN)

All ACP agricultural commodities programme: bi-annual report for the period from July to December 2010. Report of the World Bank – sustainable development network (WB-SDN)

All ACP agricultural commodities programme: bi-annual report for the period from July to December 2010 and programme operational activity report. International trade centre – (ITC)

All ACP agricultural commodities programme: 6 monthly progress report for the period from 1 July to 31 December 2010, UNCTAD annotated report

All ACP agricultural commodities programme: 6 monthly progress report for the period from 1 July to 31 December 2010. Common fund for commodities (cfc°

All ACP agricultural commodities programme: 6 monthly progress report for the period from 1st July to 30 December 2010. Food and agriculture organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Analyse diagnostique du secteur de l'agriculture et propositions d'options d'investissements, 2009.

Appui à la valorisation des ressources agricoles locales : filières anacarde et sésame. Annexe 1 ; Description de l'action.

Burkina Faso Brochure 1. Revue des efforts de développement agricole au Burkina Faso.

Burkina Faso Brochure 2 : Performances récentes et perspectives de croissance agricole, de réduction de la pauvreté et de la faim.

Burkina Faso Brochure 3. Options stratégiques et sources de croissance agricole, de réduction de la pauvreté et de renforcement de la sécurité alimentaire.

Burkina Faso Brochure 5. Système national d'analyse stratégique et de gestion des connaissances pour informer et guider le processus de mise en œuvre PNIA/PDDAA.

Burkina Faso. Cadre stratégique de lutte contre la pauvreté, 2004.

Burkina Faso. Stratégie de croissance accélérée et de développement durable, 2011-2015.

Cadre d'Action pour le Partenariat UE-Afrique sur le coton. Ver février 2010.

COM STABEX 1994-1995, Liste des actions non clôturées au 31/07/2007

Consultation sectorielle sur le développement rural et l'Agriculture irriguée. Document de synthèse, Diagnostic et stratégies, mars 2006.

Deuxième rapport sur l'état de l'environnement au Burkina Faso.

Diagnostic de la filière coton et identification d'axes stratégiques. Rapport final, 2007.

Diagnostic du développement rural 2000-2009. Situation et défis du développement rural au Burkina Faso, Stratégie de croissance accélérée et de développement durable (SCADD) 2010-2015.

Document de stratégie de croissance accélérée et de développement durable : 2010-2015. Note conceptuelle, 2009.

Document de stratégie de développement rural, A l'horizon 2015, Janvier 2001.

Etat des transactions effectuées sur le Stabex, année 2006.

Etude de la faisabilité d'un programme d'aménagement de bas-fonds et de suivi de la filière riz au Burkina Faso, 2007.

Etude de marché des produits forestiers non ligneux et dérivés suivant la démarche ADM dans la ville de Ouagadougou, 2005.

Etude pour l'identification et la formulation d'un programme d'appui au développement du secteur privé du Burkina Faso financé par la Commission européenne dans le cadre des ressources du 10^{ème} FED, 2010.

Etude pour la formulation d'un programme d'appui au développement du secteur privé du Burkina Faso – phase 2, rapport final, 2011.

Etude prospective sur la filière coton au Burkina Faso. Rapport sur la vision prospective et les stratégies, 2010.

Etude prospective sur la filière coton au Burkina Faso. Rapport général, 2010.

Etude sur la compétitivité des filières agricoles dans l'espace UEMOA – rapport principal, 2006

Evaluation de la coopération de l'Union européenne avec le Burkina Faso. Rapport final, 2010.

Evaluation du plan d'actions pour l'organisation du secteur agricole (PAOSA). Rapport final. Octobre 2007.

Evaluation finale du projet de renforcement des capacités des entreprises (PRCE), Rapport final, 2008.

Fiche action pour le Burkina/Faso / Appui au Secteur privé.

Filière coton au Burkina Faso. Stratégie commune de sortie de crise. ETAT – Association Interprofessionnelle du Coton au Burkina (AICB). Etat des lieux de mise en œuvre au 19/03/2008, 2008.

Mise à jour relative au partenariat Union européenne – Afrique sur le coton, juin 2010

Mise à jour relative au partenariat Union européenne – Afrique sur le coton, mai 2011

Note de cadrage pour l'élaboration du programme national du secteur rural, 2010.

Pacte pour l'élaboration et la mise en œuvre du programme national du secteur rural, 2010.

Perspectives d'une promotion durable de l'économie agricole au Burkina Faso, 2008.

Plan d'actions pour le développement de la filière de l'aviculture traditionnelle au Burkina Faso. Rapport provisoire, 2007.

Plan stratégique de développement de la filière karité 2006-2009, 2005.

Planning de mise en œuvre des activités de la feuille de route du PNSR (2011).

Planning de mise en œuvre des activités de la feuille de route du PNSR (2012).

Plans d'actions pour le développement de la filière bétail-viande. Rapport final, 2007.

Plans d'actions pour le développement de la filière petits ruminants. Rapport final, 2007.

PNIA/SDR/PDDAA/-Programme 3 : Développement durable des exploitations agricoles.

PNIA/SDR/PDDAA/-Programme 5 : Développement des filières agricoles et la promotion des marchés.

PNIA/SDR/PDDAA/-Programme 7 : Renforcement institutionnel.

Première revue conjointe du secteur agricole. Thème : Harmonisation-alignement des interventions sectorielles de filières, 2009.

Programme d'amélioration de la fertilité des sols dans les exploitations biologiques de la zone cotonnière du Burkina Faso. Rapport narratif de l'année 2009.

Programme décennal d'action du secteur de l'environnement et du cadre de vie à l'horizon 2015. PDA/ECV – Cadre opérationnel.

Programme national pour la sécurité alimentaire (PNSA). Rapport provisoire février 2008.

Rapport de monitoring. Appui à la valorisation des ressources agricoles locales : filières anacarde et sésame, 2010.

Rapport de synthèse du groupe technique interministériel sur la relance des productions agropastorales, 2009.

RONGEAD/INADES Formation Burkina Faso. Rapport final. Analyse des potentialités de la filière anacarde dans la région des Hauts Bassins : Production, transformation, commercialisation, 2006.

Situation de référence des performances du secteur rural au Burkina Faso, 2009.

Stratégies de développement durable de la filière coton au Burkina Faso. Rapport amendé, 2007.

Union nationale des producteurs de coton du Burkina. Plan stratégique quinquennal d'activités (juillet 2007-juin 2012), 2007.

Volet de développement rural. 1. Appui aux filières de l'agriculture et de l'élevage.

Cameroon

ADE, Evaluation du Projet d'Entretien et d'Amélioration des Pistes Rurales et Routes de Collecte et de Desserte en Zone de Production Café Cacao, Octobre 1999

Agritrade, EU, Colombia and Peru sign free-trade agreement focusing on fisheries, 12 May 2011

Agritrade, EPA negotiations between Central Africa and the EU, Executive brief: Update, March 2010

AVFP: Projet Pilote pour la Mise en Place de Pépinières Villageoises Privées de Palmier à Huile Protocole Particulier N°41 Rapport de Fin d'Exécution, Mars 2003

- Banque européenne d'investissement, Pays d'Afrique, des Caraïbes et du Pacifique, Pays et territoires d'outre-mer, Facilité d'investissement – Opérations de la BEI, Rapport annuel 2010
- CNSC-APE, L'impact des APE sur les secteurs en Afrique Centrale, 2011
- Confédération Nationale des Producteurs de Cacao et Café du Cameroun, La solidarité pour une autonomie durable, Août 2006
- Coopération Cameroun-Union européenne, Protocole d'accord particulier N°14 Programme Développement Rural Participatif dans le Département du Logone-et-Chari Délégation de la CE au Cameroun, Rapport Final, Février 2007
- Courier, Dossier: EPAs New Year to bring fresh trade talks, January 2011
- Danish Agricultural Advisory Service, Evaluation Finale du Programme Développement Rural Participatif dans le Département du Logone-et-Chari Délégation de la CE au Cameroun, Rapport Final, Février 2007
- European Commission, DG Trade civil society dialogue, Civil society meeting, Bilateral Trade Negotiations: State of Play, 14 April 2010
- Focarfe Consult, Etude sur la diversification des marchés d'exportation de la banana dans la sous-région CEMAC plus le Nigeria Rapport Définitif, Décembre 2010
- Focarfe Consult, Stratégie actualisée de la filière bananière camerounaise pour une amélioration de sa compétitivité (2010-2019), Avril 2010
- FODECC, Fonds de développement des filières cacao et café – brochure, 2011
- GFA, Evaluation de la Contribution des Fonds Stabex – Cameroun aux Programmes de Recherches Agronomiques et Projet Semencier Café-Cacao Rapport Définitif, Mars 1996
- Gouvernement de la République du Cameroun, Stratégie de la filière bananière camerounaise pour une amélioration de sa compétitivité, Février 1999
- Italtrend, Evaluation intégrée, objective et critique, qualitative et quantitative de l'impact à court et plus long terme du Programme ATF depuis son démarrage effectif au Cameroun Rapport Final, Juin 2008
- Jacques Legros, Rapport de fin d'activité de la cellule stabex au Cameroun, Novembre 2002
- Ministère de l'agriculture et du développement rural de la République du Cameroun, Stratégie de Développement du Secteur Rural, Synthèse du Volet Agriculture et Développement Rural Document de Travail, janvier 2006
- Office national du cacao et du café (ONCC), Textes Campagne Cacaoyère 2010-2011
- Office national du cacao et du café (ONCC), Textes Campagne Cafetière 2007-2008
- UE-République du Cameroun, Convention de financement Dispositions techniques et administrative d'exécution, (année inconnue)

UE-République du Cameroun, Convention de financement du programme d'assistance technique et financière au secteur bananier, phase II, 2000

UE-République du Cameroun, Convention de financement du programme d'assistance technique et financière au secteur bananier, phase III, 2001

UE-République du Cameroun, Convention de financement du programme d'assistance technique et financière au secteur bananier, 2002

UE-République du Cameroun, Convention de financement du programme d'assistance technique et financière au secteur bananier, 2003

UE-République du Cameroun, Convention de financement du programme d'assistance technique et financière au secteur bananier, 2004

UE-République du Cameroun, Convention de financement du programme d'assistance technique et financière au secteur bananier, 2005

UE-République du Cameroun, Convention de financement du programme d'assistance technique et financière au secteur bananier, 2006

UE-République du Cameroun, Convention de Financement du Programme pour l'Amélioration de la Programmation des Dépenses Publiques, Août 2007

UE-République du Cameroun, Convention de financement pour le Programme d'Amélioration de la Productivité Agricole (PAPA), Février 2011

UE-République du Cameroun, Proposition de Financement du Programme pour l'Amélioration de la Programmation des Dépenses Publiques, Février 2007

Unite the Union, Union for Life, Colombia: Commissioner De Gucht's view

Côte d'Ivoire

Adoption d'une nouvelle stratégie pour le secteur coton. Communication en Conseil des Ministres. République de Côte d'Ivoire.

COM 99/2 : Transferts Stabex année d'application 1999/2 + Avenant n°1 COM 99/2

Diagnostic des prélèvements obligatoires sur la filière coton et révision du mécanisme de fixation du prix du coton-graine. Rapport Final. Mars 2009

Elaboration d'une stratégie sectorielle coton : perspectives à moyen et long terme. Diagnostics et propositions d'orientations. Novembre 2006 (+ Annexes)

Evaluation des programmes STABEX 99/1 et 99/2. Cote d'ivoire - Commission européenne. Rapport de démarrage. Janvier 2009

Evaluation des programmes STABEX 99/1 et 99/2. Cote d'ivoire - Commission européenne. Rapport final provisoire. Mars 2009

Evaluation des programmes STABEX 99/1 et 99/2. Cote d'ivoire - Commission européenne. Rapport Final. Juillet 2009 (+ Annexes)

Faisabilité d'une nouvelle organisation du financement de l'approvisionnement en intrants de la filière coton en côte d'ivoire, rapport définitif. Mars 2009.

Plan d'action pour la mise en œuvre de la stratégie de relance de la filière coton. Version du 15/11/07. République de côte d'ivoire.

Projet de relance de la culture attelée dans le bassin cotonnier de cote d'ivoire. Rapport narratif final du 1^{er} mars 2009 au 31 décembre 2010.

Ghana

ACET & Agulhas, Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy Mid-Term Review, November 2009

ADE , Specific Contract N°: 2009/221632, Framework Contract Europe Aid: 127054/C/SER/multi - Lot 10, Trade, Standards and Private Sector Formulation of the 2nd phase of the private sector and trade enabling programme (PSTEP II), Final Report, June 2010

AGRIFOR CONSULT (2005): Final Evaluation of the Cocoa Sector Support Programme. Final Report August 2005 to the European Commission

Agrisystems, Support to the Cocoa Sector Ghana, Final Report, February 1999

CIRAD / University of Ghana, The new Ghana Cocoa Boom in the 2000s From forest clearing to Green revolution, August 2007

COCOA RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF GHANA (1995): Final report on research activities under CSSP

COCOA RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF GHANA (2005): Ghana/EU Cocoa Sector Support Programme, Final Report April 2000 – December 2004. January 2005

Comptran, Technical Final Audit Report of the Feeder Road Improvement Project (FRIP) and Stabex (Phase 3), December 2010

Consortium STDE, Feeder Roads Improvement Project (FRIP) Mid-Term Evaluation Final Report, December 2008

EC, Terms of Reference Formulation study for the Cocoa Sector Support Programme Phase 2 Ghana, (year unknown)

ECAM (2004): Study to Elaborate the Formulation of a Possible 2nd Phase of the Ghana/EU Cocoa Sector Programme. Ghana/EU Cocoa Sector Support Programme. 2 Volumes, Accra, June 2004

EURATA (2004): Mid-Term Evaluation of the Cocoa Sector Support Programme. Final Report January 2005 to the European Commission

EU-Republic of Ghana, PSTEP Financing Agreement and contracting addendum

EUROPEAN COMMISSION - EUROPEAID CO-OPERATION OFFICE (2005): Cocoa Swollen Shoot Project – Phase 3. Financing Proposal

Ghana Ministry of Food and Agriculture Policy Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate, Strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation Capacities in the Decentralized Ministry of Food and Agriculture Final Progress Report, December 2007

Ghana Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy (FASDEP II), August 2007

Ghana Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Medium Term Agriculture Sector Investment Plan (METASIP) 2009-2015 Vol 3: Commodity Programmes, August 2009

Ghana Statistical Service, Ghana Living Standards Survey 4, 1999

Ghana Statistical Service, Ghana Living Standards Survey 5, 2008

HTSPE, Final Evaluation of Project 9 ACP GH 008 – CRIS 017 – 384 Final Report, November 2009

Hubconsult, Mid-term evaluation of the Ghana Cocoa Sector Support Programme Final Report, February 2011

IITA, Sustainable Tree Crop Programme, Pilot Phase, Project Status, October 2005.

International Development Association, Program Document For A Proposed Credit In The Amount Of Equivalent To (Sdrxx) Million (US\$ 50 Million Equivalent) To Republic Of Ghana For A Third Agriculture Development Policy Operation, March 2011

MCM Associates, Synthesis of Government of Ghana and Development Partner Strategies and Plans and Sector and DP Engagement, March 2011

Mid term evaluation of the Cocoa Sector Support Programme, Stabex Transfer Agreements 15/92/GH and 13/93/GH, Framework contract AMS 451/Lot 1, Final Report, January 2004

Ministry of Finance, Feasibility study for the establishment of an autonomous commercial entity for the production of cocoa planting materials, July, 1999.

RoM 894045, Monitoring Report, 22/10/2010

ROM894048 Private Sector And Trade Enabling Programme (PSTEP) Synopsis

Sappor & Agyekwena, Association of Church Development Projects Financial Statements, December 2008

Transtec, Formulation Study for the Cocoa Sector Support Programme Phase 2 Ghana Final Report, July 2006

Madagascar

030309 ONG carte programme filières Stabex

110519 Réunion CN-FDA Presentation SMB-DR

110526 Réunion GBF-DR_Presentation SMB-DR

AIM SOAVA MNN évaluation finale v définitive 15 04 11

AIM SOAVA S IV RAP évaluation finale v définitive 15 04 11

Analyse financière et économique du programme d'intensification et de structuration des principales filières d'exportation Rapport final Novembre 2008 (Rapport final Madagascar YD 11-05-2009

AT marchés, Welby, Rapport final provisoire : Assistance technique à la mise en œuvre du programme d'intensification et de structuration des principales filières d'exportation de produits agricoles à Madagascar : missions 1, 2, 3, 4 et rapport final

AUDIT STABEX 2006 AIDE MEMOIRE 21 SEP 2007 : Audit financier des programmes financés par les ressources STABEX pour la période du 01/01/2006 au 31/12/2006 et complément d'investigations sur la période précédente de 01/01/2003 au 31/12/2005 7e et 8e FED

BTGFA AUDIT STABEX Madagascar - rapport final: audit financier des programmes finances par les ressources stabex 7e et 8e fed pour la période du 01/01/2003 au 31/12/2005

COM 91 92 93 : tranches 1, 2, 3 + avenant

COM 96-99(3 parties) + annexes + avenants

CR réunion suivi Programmes financés par UE 220208 (version papier)

CR réunion suivi Stabex 220908 (version papier)

CR réunion suivi Stabex 230404

CR réunion suivi Stabex 240108 (version papier)

CR réunion suivi Stabex 260107 (version papier)

Etude d'impacts des APE pour Madagascar Rapport provisoire Juin 2004 MDP – JEXCO

Evaluation Finale du Programme de diversification horticole dans la région de Tamatave

Evaluation technique et de performance du Programme d'Appui à la Sécurité Alimentaire PASA 99 (version papier)

Exécution 9199 31_12_10

Justification du maintien d'interventions CTHT Fenerive Est filière girofle (version papier)

La filière café septembre 2008 (Délégation UE)

La filière sucre à Madagascar

Le prix du riz : facteur de richesse ou de pauvreté ? Diagnostic du marché du riz à Madagascar en 2004 et début 2005 : commercialisation, importation et distribution Rapport d'expertise pour la Banque Mondiale Version finale, Mai 2005

Liste Décisions FED, Madagascar

Liste Décisions, tous instruments

Madagascar PRSP Juillet 2003

MAP 2006

MR - CTHT-FNR - Appui à l'amélioration de la qualité et à la commercialisation du girofle SUB24-128061.01 25/12/2009

MR- AIM-IVG Projet d'appui aux filières d'exportation - SUB16-128040.01 25/12/2009

Note filières, Girofle, juin 2010 (Délégation UE)

Note filières, Vanille, juin 2010 (Délégation UE)

Organisation des marchés (bourses) de produits agricoles des principales filières d'exportation à Madagascar (Rapport final reçu 20/10/09)

PNDR 2008

Politique_ Rizicole MAEP 2004

Politiques et stratégies sectorielles SMB

PRDR Analanjifofo tomes 1 et 2

Présentation du programme CSA : Réunion nationale de lancement des projets d'appui à la mise en place des CSA (11 Mars 2008)

PS - CTHT-FNR - Appui à l'amélioration de la qualité et à la commercialisation du girofle SUB24-128061.01 25/12/2009

PS- AIM-IVG Projet d'appui aux filières d'exportation - SUB16-128040.01 25/12/2009

PSA 2008 (2 documents)

Rapport annuel sur l'utilisation des ressources STABEX - Année 2004 (version papier)

Rapport annuel sur l'utilisation des ressources STABEX - Année 2005 (version papier)

Rapport annuel sur l'utilisation des ressources STABEX - Année 2006

Rapport annuel sur l'utilisation des ressources STABEX - Année 2007

Rapport annuel sur l'utilisation des ressources STABEX - Année 2008

Rapport annuel sur l'utilisation des ressources STABEX - Année 2009

Rapport annuel sur l'utilisation des ressources STABEX - Année 2010

Rapport définitif STABEX-CTHT Fenerive Est Girofle 18/03/11 (version papier)

Rapport définitif STABEX-CTHT Fenerive Est Vanille 21/03/11 (version papier)
Rapport évaluation SMB 2007
Rapport Resume Exec Afaka – Mahanoro
Rapport Resume Exec Afaka – Vatomandry
Rapport sur les exportations du secteur agriculture – élevage - pêche en 2009 (Délégation UE)
Références Contrats STABEX
Retraite GBF-DR 2010 Présentation SMB-DR
SNDR 08 avril 2010 : stratégie nationale du développement rizicole, Unité de politique du développement rural (UPDR)
STABEX - Rapport Annuel - Spreadsheets 2010
Sucre, PIP 2011-2013, annexes
Sucre, PIP 2011-2013, annexes

Tanzania

Action Fiche for General Budget Support, MDG contract 2009/2015, Tanzania
Annual Action Programme Accompanying Measures for Sugar Protocol Countries – Allocation 2008 for Tanzania Programme Estimate, operational period, from 1st May 2011 to 30th April 2012
Annual Performance report for 2009/2010 Financial Year, Monitoring & Evaluation and Statistics section, MoAFSC (Tanzania)
Annual Report Stabex Programmes 2009, EU Desk Ministry of Finance, March 2009
Annual Report Stabex Programmes 2010, EU Desk Ministry of Finance, 2010
Assessment of the Importance of TASP II Pre-Selected Sub-Sectors to Tanzania's Economic and Poverty Alleviation Goals, May 2010
Evaluation of activities funded by Stabex Transfers, Draft Report, HTSPE Ltd, January 2007
Feasibility Study Report, June 2007, Studies for EU Sugar Reform Accompanying Measures for Tanzania, Period 2007-2010, Specific Contract 2007/136536, Danish Agricultural Advisory Services
Financing Agreement Trade and Agriculture Support Programme, EDF 10
Financing Agreement, Accompanying Measures 2006 for the Sugar Producing Countries.
Financing Agreement, Accompanying Measures 2007 for the Sugar Producing Countries.
Financing Agreement: General Budget Support, MDG contract 2009/2015, Tanzania

Framework of Mutual Obligations concerning the utilisation of the Stabex transfers for Coffee for the years 1994 and 1999 and balances of Stabex transfers for Coffee for 1990, 1991, 1992 and 1993, February 2003.

Identification fiche for General Budget Support, MDG contract 2009/2015, Tanzania

MoAFSC, Agricultural Sector Review and Public Expenditure Review 2010/2011, Final Report, November 2010.

MoAFSC, Annual Performance Report for 2009/2010 Financial Year, M&E&Statistics Section, MoAFSC, October 2010.

MoAFSC: Ministry of Agriculture Food Security and Cooperatives

Riders (4) to the Framework of Mutual Obligations concerning the utilisation of the Stabex transfers for Coffee for the years 1994 and 1999 and balances of Stabex transfers for Coffee for 1990, 1991, 1992 and 1993 (Rider 1 – November 2005; Rider 2 – June 2007; Rider 3, December 2008; Rider 4 – August 2010).

United Republic of Tanzania, Agricultural Sector Development Programme, Support through Basket Fund, Government Programme Document (no year)

URT, National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty II, Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, July 2010.

Uganda

12 posters regarding coffee production training

AAACP – FAO contribution : FAO / EC Partnership :An Integrated Approach towards Value Chain Development

AAACP : Terms of reference : Impact assessment of alternative approaches to mitigating trade related risk exposure in ESA grains markets

Africa Fine Coffees Review Magazine :

<http://www.eafca.org/downloads/coffeereview/EAFCA%20E-Mag2.pdf>

CFC Reports; <http://www.eafca.org/our%20services/index.asp>

Country Level Evaluation Uganda, volume 1: main report, 20th November 2009, Evaluation carried out on behalf of the European Commission

Development and implementation of a National Good Agriculture Practices (GAP) Programme in Uganda, National workshop results, Kampala, Uganda, 23-25 January, 2007

Development and Implementation of a National Good Agriculture Practice in Uganda. A national Consultation. Final report, april 2007

EAFCA Annual Conference <http://www.eafca.org/afcc8/>

EAFCA Newsletters <http://www.eafca.org/about%20us/newsletters.asp>

Evaluation of the Farmer Field School Approach in Uganda Emergency Relief and Rehabilitation Coordination Unit, FAO Uganda July 2008

Farmer Field Schools as an Excellent Platform for Reducing Gender Based Violence. A Case of Northern Uganda 16 – 18 June 2010 (Scientific paper)

Final Evaluation of EU Support to the Uganda Commodities Exchange and Warehouse Receipt System (UCE/WRS) Final Report Project No. 2011/258021 May 2011

Final Evaluation of the Kaweri Coffee Farmers' Alliance Support Project final report July 2010

Final Impact Assessment Study of NARO Technologies since 1992 November 2009

General description of the Eastern African Fine Coffees Association (EAFCA)

General presentation Kyagalanyi Coffee LTD

Impact of farmer field schools on agricultural productivity, Poverty, and farmer empowerment in east africa 6 january 2010

Kaweri coffee farmers alliance support project, Establishment of the “Uganda Coffee Farmers Alliance” End of Project Report February 2005 – February 2010

Kyagalanyi coffee ltd

Mail explicatif FAO

NAADS IA final report. Quantifying the impact of the national agricultural advisory services in the Uganda rural livelihoods. September 30, 2005.

Performance Evaluation of National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) final report 1st June 2008

Presentation of the NKG Coffee Alliance Trust Kaweri Coffee Farmers Alliance Support Project Stefan Cognigni June, 2011

Report of the Regional Workshop on Good Agriculture Practices in Eastern & Southern Africa: Practices and Policies, 6-9 March 2007, KEPHIS, Nairobi, Kenya

Report on the Results Assessment of the Farmer Field School Approach in Uganda June – July 2010

Scenario impact analysis for \$80m investment in the Ugandan coffee sector. Report for the National Steering Committee of the Uganda Coffee Platform. April 2011. Café Africa Uganda.

STABEX Tracking table transferred 15 05 2009

TOH : <http://www.eafca.org/atoh/index.asp>

Vanuatu

Addendum to the Regional Strategy Paper and Regional Indicative Programme 2002-2007, 23 March 2006

European Community-Pacific Region, 2008-2013 Regional Strategy Paper and Regional Indicative Programme

Framework of Mutual Obligations for the use of STABEX funds for the application year 2008 between the Government of Vanuatu and the European Commission, May 2001

Government of the Republic of Vanuatu, Priorities and action agenda 2006-2015, "An Educated, Healthy and Wealthy Vanuatu", June 2006

La Chambre d'Agriculture du Vanuatu (CAV) : Création, mise en place et perspectives, MAEQFP¹ & CAV, juin 2011

Letter of 21 March 2000, Stabex in Vanuatu – Application year 1999 – collection of statistical data

Letter of 5 January 2001, Vanuatu Stabex Report for 2000

MAEQFP, Cocoa Development Program (CCDP) 2010-2014, Incorporating Private Sector – Led Development and Privatization of the Extension Programme, December 2009

MAEQFP, Food Crops Development Program (FCDP) 2010-2014, Food Security, a National priority, August 2009

MAEQFP, Spices & Nuts Development Programme (S&NDP) 2009-2013, Incorporating Private Sector – Led Development and Privatization of the Extension Programme, July 2009

MAQFF, Sectorial Development Programs 2010-2014, Janvier 2010

Vanuatu Statistics Office, Overseas Trade 2011, 16 May 2011

Vanuatu, Diagnostic Trade Integration Study, Draft Report, Volume I, September 2007

Vanuatu, Planification à long terme, Exécution à court terme : Plan d'action pour 2009-2012

¹ Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Élevage, de la Quarantaine, de la Forêt et des Pêches