

***EX-POST* EVALUATION OF PROJECT  
STDF/PG/287**

**"INFORMATION-SHARING, DIALOGUE AND COORDINATION  
INITIATIVE ON THE PROBLEM OF FRUIT FLY  
CONTROL IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA"**

**Final Report**

Final Version

Submitted to  
the STDF Secretariat

by  
Christian TAUPIAC  
Independent Expert

September 2016

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AFD	French Development Agency
CA	Competent authority
CIRAD	Centre for Agricultural Research for Development
COLEACP	Europe-Africa-Caribbean-Pacific Liaison Committee
DPV	Plant Protection Directorate
EC	European Commission
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FF	Fruit fly
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IITA	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture
IPM	Integrated pest management
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
MS	Member States
PCDA	Competitiveness and Agricultural Diversification Programme
PLMF	Fruit Fly Control Project (ECOWAS/EU/AFD)
REC	Regional Economic Community
RSA	Republic of South Africa
SPS	Sanitary and phytosanitary
STDF	Standards and Trade Development Facility
WAEMU	West African Economic and Monetary Union
WAFFI	West Africa Fruit Fly Initiative
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organization

## CONTENTS

List of abbreviations and acronyms	2
Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Background	5
1.2 Objectives of the evaluation	6
1.3 Overview of the project, including objectives, activities, budget and outputs	6
2. Methodology	7
2.1 Criteria and phases of evaluation	7
2.2 Limitations and challenges	8
3. Main findings	8
3.1 Relevance	9
3.2. Effectiveness	9
3.3 Efficiency	10
3.4 Effects/impact	11
3.5 Sustainability	12
<b>4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5. LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>13</b>
Annexes	
Annex I – Terms of reference	
Annex II - List of contacts	
Annex III - Questionnaire	
Annex IV – Analysis of questionnaires returned	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the *ex-post* evaluation of project **STDF/PG/287, entitled "Information-sharing, dialogue and coordination initiative on the problem of fruit fly control in Sub-Saharan Africa"**, which was implemented between 1 June 2009 and 30 June 2011.

The background is the outbreak of fruit fly that has badly affected the production and export of fruit (mostly mangoes and citrus fruit) in West Africa, with a highly negative impact on (i) the populations' food and income and (ii) the economies of the countries affected (including least developed countries/LDCs).

The major beneficiaries of this project were the group of stakeholders working in the horticultural sector (mainly mangoes and citrus fruit).

The project was implemented by the Europe-Africa-Caribbean-Pacific Liaison Committee/COLEACP, in collaboration with the Centre for Agricultural Research for Development/CIRAD.

Although the aim of the project was to aid trade and help to lessen poverty by maintaining access to international markets for fruit grown in African countries, its specific objectives were (i) promotion of coordinated, tested, economically accessible responses to an urgent phytosanitary problem of key economic importance affecting Sub-Saharan Africa as a whole, i.e. fruit fly, and (ii) information and dialogue between the public and private actors concerned at the national, regional and international levels, especially the most vulnerable (small producers, small enterprises, local consumers).

The project's major achievement was the preparation, publication and dissemination of **18 electronic newsletters** between June 2009 and January 2011 entitled "Control of fruit and vegetable fly in Sub-Saharan Africa". These newsletters were sent by email in French and English to **1,300 recipients in 59 countries** (57% of them in Africa), 42% of which were economic actors and 33% authorities.

The evaluation of the project was conducted according to the "Guidelines for the evaluation of STDF-funded projects" and consisted of an analysis of reports, consultations with partners and beneficiaries and two field trips (Senegal and Mali).

The limitations encountered were related to the time that elapsed (five years) between the completion of the evaluation (May 2016) and the end of the project's activities (June 2011), as well as problems in contacting the main beneficiaries.

The project responded to a genuine demand, was in line with the STDF's rationale for intervention and was highly relevant. The fact that it was carried out within the allotted time using the resources provided for its specific tasks proved its effectiveness and efficiency.

On the other hand, the major impact expected, namely, to contribute towards the effectiveness of a regional FF control programme by creating a platform for exchanges among stakeholders, did not come up to expectations. Responsibility for this does not lie with the project itself, but with external conditions: the inability of donors and the Economic Community of West African States/ECOWAS to put into effect a regional programme, identified in June 2008, put before donors in September 2009, only becoming definitive in 2015 and actually implemented in 2016. It would appear that one crucial element was lacking in order to ensure that the regional programme became effective, namely, genuine political will on the part of the requesting countries.

Lastly, the sustainability aspect does not appear to have been envisaged when the project was designed and no proposal was made on making this newsletter a permanent feature after the project came to an end or on making it self-financing.

Moreover, the evaluator regretted (i) **the absence of a logical framework** for the project; (ii) no provision being made in the project for **a survey of readers** in order to assess the level of

satisfaction with the newsletter; and (iii) **the lack of a mid-term review** in order to remedy these lacunae.

The evaluation makes three recommendations with the aim of (1) making any future such initiative conditional upon genuine political will on the part of governments; (2) making good the lack of evaluation; (3) placing such action on a permanent basis.

Finally, the evaluation considers as a valuable practice to be repeated the information-sharing platform between the COLEACP (the result of a largely private initiative) and the CIRAD (mostly supported by government financing), which was established at the beginning of the project and which greatly facilitated its management. **Such collaboration is likely** to have a positive impact on attitudes within national committees, which should bring together public and private sectors. It helps to ensure that the research meets the real needs of the sector concerned.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Project STDF/PG/287 entitled "Information-sharing, dialogue and coordination initiative on the problem of fruit fly control in Sub-Saharan Africa" was implemented between 1 June 2009 and 30 June 2011. An independent end-of-project evaluation was provided for in the budget in the amount of US\$15,000. This report presents that evaluation.

### 1.1 Background

In 2003 already, extremely rapidly invading flies (*Bactrocera invadens*) had been identified in Sub-Saharan Africa. A new species originating in Asia, it attacked African fruit and vegetable production, endangering the harvest of fruit and vegetables for local consumption, for regional markets or for export to Europe. The strong growth potential of the export market for garden produce was thus in jeopardy if the phytosanitary risks were not controlled. The situation became increasingly serious for African producers because of the danger that their produce would be stopped when entering Europe as a result of the infestation of quarantine flies (103 times between 2005 and 2007 – source STDF Newsletter Vol.1/No.3).

There was no single, immediate and economical solution to reduce the fly population in the African continent as a whole, particularly as not much was known about the new highly phytophagous species (*B. invadens*). Producers lacked effective and efficient solutions to hand and turned towards local authorities and international donors in order to resolve the problem.

To meet such a long-term challenge, significant scientific, technical, commercial and financial resources would have to be mobilized, which no organization alone could provide. This is why, following a study of the economic damage inflicted on fruit and vegetable production in eight West African countries, carried out in 2008 with EU financing, a regional action plan was adopted by ECOWAS and WAEMU and presented in Bamako in July 2008. Its financing relied on additional efforts by donors, coordinated by the STDF at a conference held in mid-2009.

The STDF accordingly agreed to finance several operations with different but complementary objectives. Some had an essentially institutional or technical objective. For example, the aim of project STDF/PG/255 (followed by STDF/PG/313) – part of the WAFFI initiative already launched with World Bank financing – was to identify technical responses to the problems caused by FF. Project STDF/PG/287 is the subject of this evaluation, focusing on a communication objective through the dissemination of monthly newsletters on the FF problem.

More precisely, the aim of these newsletters was to keep up this mobilization of professionals and institutions concerned in West Africa (producers, professional organizations, NGOs, research bodies, government institutions, donors, etc.), and to share what was being done with their counterparts in other Sub-Saharan African regions also affected or concerned by the FF.

It should also be borne in mind that this newsletter represented an extension of the initiative (COLEACP newsletter) supported financially by French cooperation and carried out in close collaboration with the CIRAD in 2007 and 2008. It was because it could not see clearly how it could continue financing the COLEACP newsletter in 2009 that the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs encouraged the COLEACP to work together with the STDF with a view to pursuing this information and specific coordination effort in relation to FF.

## 1.2 Objectives of the evaluation

The STDF Secretariat chose Christian Taupiac as independent consultant for the *ex-post* evaluation of project STDF/PG/287. Mr Taupiac is an expert in international development, specializing in rural development and the environment. He has worked in France, but mostly abroad for the French Government (Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), for the World Bank and for ECOWAS. He has implemented or led several projects, has participated in drawing up sectoral policies and conducted numerous evaluations in Europe, in South America, and above all in Africa, in relation to capacity building in developing countries. Mr Taupiac is independent of all the parties concerned and has no conflict of interest that could affect the evaluation.

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the "Guidelines for the evaluation of projects funded by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF)". In line with the terms of reference for this evaluation (see Annex I), the objectives were the following:

- to verify whether the project achieved the objectives set out in the project document;
- to identify whether the project had helped to achieve a higher level in terms of objectives, i.e. a measurable/quantifiable impact on market access, an improvement in the domestic market and, if possible, at the regional level, in the health situation and poverty reduction;
- to identify the key lessons learned by beneficiaries and donors for future STDF programme development.

## 1.3 Overview of the project

Table 1: Overview of Project STDF/PG/287

<b>General objectives</b>
The purpose of this project was trade assistance and poverty reduction by helping to maintain access to international markets for garden produce from African countries (especially from LDCs).
<b>Specific objectives</b>
The specific objectives were: A: Promotion of coordinated, scientifically based and economically accessible responses to an urgent phytosanitary problem of key economic importance affecting Sub-Saharan Africa as a whole. B: Information and dialogue between public and private actors involved at the national, regional and international levels, particularly the most vulnerable (small producers, small enterprises, local consumers).
<b>Dates</b>
Beginning: 01/04/2009                      End: 30/06/2011
<b>Implementation</b>
COLEACP in collaboration with CIRAD (Dir SysHort)
<b>Activities</b>
Preparation, translation and dissemination of a <b>monthly electronic newsletter</b> (in English and French) on the FF problem in Sub-Saharan Africa.
<b>Results expected and indicators of success</b>
The project's specific activities were intended to help in promoting (i) an understanding of the issues in FF control and mobilization of stakeholders; (ii) the positive aspect of exchanges of knowledge and experience; (iii) the transparency of initiatives by the actors involved and their coordination; (iv) mobilization of the scientific, technical and financial resources needed to meet the challenges; (v) maintaining the most vulnerable actors in horticultural sectors that provide the most jobs and economic well-being; and (vi) protection of the food resources essential for diversified and balanced nutrition in fresh fruit and vegetables for local and international consumers. The identification did not contain specific indicators of success and no impact study was undertaken.
<b>Main achievements</b>
The project's main achievement was the preparation, publication and dissemination of 18 monthly electronic newsletters between June 2009 and January 2011, entitled "Control of fruit and vegetable flies in Sub-Saharan Africa". These newsletters were sent by email, in English and French, to targeted recipients (1,300 <u>recipients</u> when the project ended in 2011), in 59 countries, according to a <u>geographical distribution</u> in which Africa accounted for 57% of recipients, notably West Africa. A <u>breakdown of recipients by type of activity</u> shows that economic actors (African producers and exporters, European importers, professional organizations) occupied first place (42%), followed by national authorities and international organizations in second place (33%), while research institutes/universities/experts accounted for 15% and other recipients for close to 10%.

<b>Budget:</b>				
Total cost of the project:	budgeted:	US\$151,500	disbursed:	US\$136,500
STDF contribution:	budgeted:	US\$97,800	disbursed:	US\$82,800

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Criteria and phases of evaluation

The project evaluation focused on implementation of the project and its outcomes. For this purpose, it based itself on the following criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and lessons learned/recommendations to be made, thus following the evaluation guidelines defined by the STDF.

The evaluation was conducted in three separate phases:

- (a) Study of the project documentation ("desk study")

The first phase of the evaluation consisted of a detailed study of the documentation provided by the STDF Secretariat and that resulting from the evaluator's research (documents identifying the project, mid-term reports, final report). The person responsible for the project within the implementing agency (COLEACP) was contacted but did not provide the information requested.<sup>1</sup>

- (b) Gathering the views and opinions of the beneficiaries and those responsible for the project

The second phase focused on gathering the views and opinions of the beneficiaries. This was done through (i) replies to a questionnaire; (ii) telephone calls; (iii) visits to partners (in France); (iv) two field trips to Mali and Senegal; and (v) emails.

**Questionnaire:** In collaboration with the STDF Secretariat, a questionnaire<sup>2</sup> was drawn up in French for the six French-speaking countries (Mali, Senegal, Côte d'Ivoire, Burkina Faso, Guinea, Benin) and in English for the two English-speaking countries (Gambia, Ghana). It was prepared taking into account both the evaluation criteria and the project objectives.

The problem raised by the questionnaire was not so much its preparation but the identification of recipients (see section 2.2, Limitations and challenges). This questionnaire was sent to:

- "country contact persons" identified when implementing STDF projects in the eight countries;
- the presidents and secretaries of national committees (NC) for the FF control project, meeting in Dakar during a workshop to launch the project. The rationale for the questionnaire and issues relating to the evaluation were also presented by the evaluating consultant on this occasion.

*The first two groups of recipients were asked to disseminate the questionnaire to at least ten actors in their own countries, actors likely to have been concerned by STDF projects. The aim was to obtain at least five replies per country.*

- officials in ECOWAS and in authorities in member States;
- technical and financial partners (particularly USAID, WB, EC, EIF);
- important private operators (particularly exporters).

Around **140 persons were therefore contacted**, either directly or via the national committees. With **18 replies**<sup>3</sup>, response to the questionnaire was disappointing (see the analysis in section 2.2, Limitations and challenges).

<sup>1</sup> Mrs Guichard no longer works for COLEACP.

<sup>2</sup> This questionnaire was not specific to the STDF/PG/287 project alone, but also concerned the STDF/PG/255 and 313 projects as it was a *meta* evaluation with the necessary changes.

<sup>3</sup> Including Côte d'Ivoire: 1; Senegal: 3; Mali: 3; Burkina Faso: 5; Ghana: 0; Gambia: 1; Benin: 0; Guinea: 2; other (TDPs): 3.

(c) Analysis of the information gathered and completion

The findings in the reports, all the information gathered when reviewing the questionnaires, together with the information/explanations collected during the two field trips were all examined. In the course of the on-site visits, targeted persons were interviewed so as to understand outstanding issues better, and other interviews were conducted by telephone in order to obtain further replies to remaining questions raised by replies to the questionnaire and the interviews conducted in the two countries. Based on the data obtained (questionnaires/interviews/meetings), a draft final report was prepared. The STDF Secretariat was asked to comment on the draft.

## 2.2 Limitations and challenges

The evaluation was planned in the timetable of activities for 2011 (see project identification report), i.e. immediately after the project was completed, but was in fact conducted in early 2016, in other words, five years after the planned date. This delay in undertaking the evaluation led to many difficulties in contacting, locating and finding all the main beneficiaries, notably those receiving the newsletter and actors in the sector. Many email addresses in the lists of recipients were no longer valid. Or the recipients, particularly those in the government sector, no longer occupied the post they had held when the project was under way and did not reply. Ultimately, 25 questionnaires were received and analysed. Although the number of questionnaires sent back was very small in comparison with the number of persons contacted (130/140 persons) and despite two reminders, the information and views gathered from these questionnaires enabled pertinent opinions to be obtained regarding the newsletters as shown in Annex IV.

## 3. MAIN FINDINGS

The implementation of this project involved the following monitoring activities:

Date	Action	Remarks
April 2009	STDF project document (identification)	STDF following a COLEACP proposal
December 2009	Follow-up report No. 1	COLEACP
June 2010	Follow-up report No. 2	COLEACP
April 2011	Final report	COLEACP
May 2016	Evaluation	Independent consultant

The evaluation noted **the absence of a logical framework** and thus of indicators or hypotheses in the project document (identification). In its follow-up reports, the COLEACP attempted to provide a logical framework without specifying any indicators.

It should be recalled that the newsletter had been drawn up by the COLEACP in collaboration with the CIRAD. Originally with the support of French cooperation (2007-2008), the STDF then assumed responsibility for financing its publication in 2009 and 2010, a total of 18 newsletters consisting of 9 free monthly newsletters in French and English, respectively, during each annual season (excluding August). It was envisaged that it would contain technical and economic information on the problem of fly control in Sub-Saharan Africa and worldwide. Space was to be set aside for brief articles by scientists, professional organizations, regulatory authorities, donors and all other actors involved specifically in FF control.

Direct contact with the COLEACP (Denis Félicité-Zulma) and the CIRAD (Rémy Hugon) shows that, rather than an exchange of technical information, the purpose of this newsletter was to **continue making the various stakeholders aware of the issues and raise their levels of information, exchange of experience and mutual understanding** in order to provide the greatest number with coherent, scientifically based and economically accessible solutions for confronting an urgent phytosanitary problem of key economic importance affecting Sub-Saharan Africa as a whole.

This newsletter was intended to **"constitute a platform for exchanges among actors concerned by the FF in order, on the one hand, to highlight the need for contacts among actors and to prepare them for implementation of the regional control programme,**



***whose principle had been decided by ECOWAS member States at their Bamako meeting (August 2008)***".

Target population: producers, professional organizations, NGOs, research bodies, government institutions, donors, etc.

### **3.1 Relevance**

Firstly, it is important to emphasize that this project is consistent with the fundamental objectives of the STDF (contributing to a market access strategy; conformity with international standards and requirements in importing countries; tangible results in the countries concerned and taking into account the problems of the most vulnerable economic operators).

It was complementary and virtually simultaneous to projects STDF/PG/255 and 313, contributing towards preparation of the implementation of the regional programme decided by ECOWAS member States (Bamako, August 2008).

The topic covered was crucial, involving substantial losses in terms of tonnage (unspecified but universally recognized among the population investigated – some countries even mentioning up to 80% losses as a result of the effects of the FF).

This project may thus be considered as particularly relevant.

### **3.2 Effectiveness**

As far as recipients, periodicity and content are concerned, the contractor abided by the terms of the project document (identification).

In accordance with the provisions, 18 newsletters were prepared, published and sent by email, in French and in English, from June 2009 to January 2011 to over 1,300 recipients from October 2010 onwards (see table below). The 18<sup>th</sup> electronic newsletter was published in January 2011.

*Number of recipients of the FF newsletter*

Date	French text	English text	Total
Estimates	n.a.	n.a.	1,000
June 2009	597	464	1,061
December 2009	692	454	1,146
January 2011	760	540	1,300

The letter was sent out in 59 countries, including 37 ACP countries (63%), according to geographical distribution in which Africa accounted for almost 57% of readers, particularly West Africa where the most damage has been caused by FF (Senegal, 9%; Burkina Faso, 6%; Côte d'Ivoire, 5%; Ghana and Mali, 4%), with 25% of the readers in Europe, which is directly facing the problem of preventing infested tropical fruit from entering EU territory (France, 13%; Belgium, 6%; Netherlands, 3%; United Kingdom and Spain, 2%). Among the other recipients, over 10% were in the United States, Central America, the Caribbean and Turkey.

This dissemination led to the establishment of two lists of addressees (English- and French-speaking), copies of which were forwarded to the STDF.

The breakdown of recipients by type of activity shows in first place economic operators (African producers and exporters, European importers, professional organizations) (42%), followed by national authorities and international organizations (33%), while research institutions/universities/experts accounted for 15% and other recipients for close to 10%.

As regards content, the newsletter enabled the circulation of technical and economic information on the problem of fly control in Sub-Saharan Africa and in the world. Space was set aside for contributions from scientists, professional organizations, regulatory authorities and donors involved specifically in FF control.

**Conclusions: This newsletter was prepared and sent out in accordance with the provisions in the project document (identification) and in this sense it can be stated that the project was wholly effective.**

**Nevertheless, it will be seen that, in the absence of any survey of recipients (this subject is covered in section 5), the evaluator turned to the replies to the questionnaire and the interviews during field trips in order to assess – as far as possible – the level of response to the expectations of persons who had received this newsletter.**

### 3.3 Efficiency

The efficiency of this project was evaluated in terms of the timetable for its implementation and the resources mobilized (budget and human resources), as well as the methods used to achieve results.

The timetable for the project's implementation was essentially respected: the project should originally have begun in June 2009 (done) and end in April 2011 (11 months). A postponement of the closing date to 30 June 2011 was requested and granted. The project therefore lasted 13 months.

In terms of cost, the following budget aspects should be taken into account: the STDF was asked to bear around 65% of the cost, equivalent to US\$98,000, the remaining amount of around 35% to be borne by the two implementing organizations – COLEACP and CIRAD – in the amount of US\$54,000 (contribution in kind by partly assuming responsibility for the work of the permanent officials, technical support and coordination/management).

(US\$)	STDF contribution	Other co-financing contributions	Total	Percentage of total cost of the project
Total estimated budget	97,800	53,700	151,500	100
Total expenditure at the end of implementation (January 2011)	82,800	53,700	136,500	90
Amount not disbursed (evaluation)	15,000	-	15,000	10

As regards this project's cost/effectiveness ratio, the total cost of the project (including the cost of this evaluation) amounts to US\$151,000 and the cost of each issue of the newsletter to US\$8,416. As there were 1,300 recipients, the cost of each copy distributed was less than US\$6.5 per recipient. At first sight, this sum appears low enough not to eliminate the principle of financing the continuation of such an activity through subscriptions.

The absence of a survey of readers by the contractor, however, makes it impossible to move further ahead with this hypothesis.

As far as the method is concerned, implementation involved:

- the definition of a methodology to facilitate collaboration between two sites (COLEACP Paris and CIRAD Montpellier) and the introduction of a tool (QuickR);
- scientific monitoring of the FF problem (HSS follow-up, automatic monitoring of sites ...);
- the search for evidence (economic operators) and information data (scientific, regulatory and trade);
- special mobilization of partners in the future regional programme to control fruit and vegetable flies in West Africa;
- replying to questions from readers<sup>4</sup>;
- updating the "recipients" database;
- drafting, illustrating and layout for publication.

**In conclusion, *a posteriori*, this project was successful in terms of efficiency.**

<sup>4</sup> The evaluator received from the COLEACP (telephone call) assurance that this had been done. He did not, however, find any trace of a list of information requirements. Reason: the time that elapsed between the evaluation and the implementation of the project.

### 3.4 Impact

In order to assess the impact of the project, the evaluator took into account the project's purpose, namely **"to constitute a platform for exchanges among actors concerned by the FF in order, on the one hand, to highlight the need for contacts among actors and to prepare them for implementation of the regional control programme, whose principle had been decided by ECOWAS member States at their Bamako meeting (August 2008)".**

Because there was no provision for them, there were no organized exchanges between the COLEACP-CIRAD team responsible for preparing the newsletter and its recipients. First of all, it is not known how many recipients were readers and, among these, which directly or indirectly contributed towards the effective implementation of the regional FF control programme.

One thing is clear, namely, this regional programme, identified by the ITALTREND study (June 2008), endorsed by ECOWAS members in August 2008, with a budget drawn up in August 2009 (COLEACP complementary study), and approved by the donors' conference (Bamako, September 2009), did not come into effect until 2015!!! In such a context, it is difficult to speak of the project's immediate positive impact.

On the other hand, the monthly newsletter proved to be a valuable channel for information when important information had to be conveyed, for example:

- data on the presence of invasive FF in various African countries, when scientifically proven both to the north and south of the Equator, as well as the efforts made to prevent infestation in regions thus far unaffected, particularly the RSA;
- development of techniques and strategies to control this pest, both as regards research in stations and practical applications of their findings by producers and enterprises at the production and post-harvest stages.

Furthermore, it made decision-makers aware of the economic loss (destruction of goods, loss of access to international markets, shorter export seasons, loss of income for growers) and the negative nutritional, social and environmental consequences in Africa as a whole.

It also contributed towards:

- greater use of biological control techniques;
- underlining the importance of research on *B. invadens* communicated at several international meetings;
- the holding of the conference on invasive FF in East and Southern Africa in 2011;
- increased activity by national FF control committees in West Africa;
- warning of the arrival of new plant diseases in West Africa such as mango bacterial disease (see LE No. 10/2010).

One impact of the newsletter that received less emphasis was the creation of the information-sharing platform between the COLEACP (a private sector institution) and the CIRAD (mostly supported by government financing). In this connection, the initiative provided an opportunity to facilitate "public-private" partnership and, through such a partnership, a means of bringing together research and practical needs.

Lastly, it also enabled **the web of encounters to be expanded**, notably by establishing connections with:

- the entomology laboratory of the joint FAO/IAEA project of the IAEA's Division of Nuclear Techniques (see Newsletter No. 5 – September 2009);
- researchers and those responsible for plant protection services in a large number of countries (Belgium, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, France, Kenya, Mali, Mauritius, Niger, Réunion, Senegal, Tanzania, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States), as well as those in international organizations such as the IAEA and especially the Tephritid Workers Group, the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO).

On the other hand, the newsletter did not suffice to:

- prevent the tightening of phytosanitary measures, particularly in Europe;
- lessen the number of seizures of mangoes upon entry into EU territory, which continued (see evaluation reports for projects STDF/PG/255-313).

**In conclusion, in terms of impact, although the project alone was not enough to ensure the effectiveness of the regional FF control programme, it served as a platform, covering the world as a whole, for actors affected by the pest. At least, it enabled the creation of momentum and the establishment of inter-professional links, particularly between the public and private sectors.**

### 3.5 Sustainability

Replies to the questionnaire, together with direct contacts, show that **the sustainability of the project was the only truly negative aspect**. The end of the project meant the end of the newsletter. No steps were taken to ensure that it would continue after the project ended.

As the contractor itself (COLEACP) acknowledged, this aspect of the project was not envisaged when it was identified. Fortunately, because of its interest, publication of the electronic newsletter in 2011/2012 remained an activity within the FF control project.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a response to real demand, in accordance with STDF's rationale for intervention, this project was totally relevant. It was implemented within the allotted time and using the resources provided for the tasks fixed, and its effectiveness and its efficiency were satisfactory.

All the components were in place to make this regional programme a success, but it was necessary to wait until 2015 to see the project launched at the institutional level, and 2016 at the budgetary level.

It would appear that one crucial element was lacking for this regional programme to be effective, namely, genuine political will on the part of the requesting countries.

**Recommendation No. 1: In a regional context, the success of a federating project requires mobilization and "leading" countries showing a common political will.**

Findings	Proposal
Although all the components were in place for it to come into effect in 2009, it was necessary to wait until 2016 before the regional FF control programme was established.	The success of a regional programme requires <b><u>the existence of countries showing a common regional political will</u></b> . The REC only have limited power at the political level, particularly <i>vis-à-vis</i> donors, which were, and essentially still are, bound by agreements with governments.

Furthermore, the evaluator regretted that no survey of readers was envisaged in the project in order to assess the level of satisfaction with the newsletter. Those responsible for implementation indicated that "*no subscriptions were cancelled*" in order to explain the lack of a survey, which appears to be an unsatisfactory argument to justify the absence of a survey.

**Recommendation No. 2:**

Findings	Proposal
The project did not provide for a survey of readers' satisfaction with the newsletter.	<b>As from its identification</b> , such a project involving the preparation of this type of newsletter should have: 1= made provision for a scientific committee to support the implementation team; 2= provided for a survey of readers mid-term and at the end of the project. A <b><u>mid-term review</u></b> would undoubtedly have enabled this omission to be remedied.

Lastly in connection with sustainability, the evaluation considers that the sustainability aspect was not envisaged. In other words, the project did not endeavour to ascertain how the information activity could be continued when project financing ended. Those responsible for implementation acknowledge that they did not consider this aspect (believing that a regional programme would take over and thus continue the information activity). A self-financing initiative based on paid subscriptions should have been envisaged so as to make publication of the newsletter independent of political uncertainties (whether or not there was a programme to support it).

**Recommendation No. 3: The concept of permanence should be taken into account as of identification of the project.**

Findings	Proposal
The newsletter ceased to appear after the project ended.	When developing an information activity, it is necessary – subject to proper consideration of the information sent in by recipients (see recommendation above) - to envisage turning the newsletter into a permanent feature by making recipients responsible for its financing (paid subscription) or their representatives (subsidy from the OPA or REC).

**5. LESSONS LEARNED**

The information-sharing platform between the COLEACP (the result of a largely private initiative) and the CIRAD (mostly supported by government financing), created at the beginning of the project greatly facilitated the management of the content and form of the 18 monthly newsletters published from June 2009 to January 2011 on the topic of FF control in Sub-Saharan Africa. **Such collaboration is likely to be beneficial in future public-private partnerships in sectors** such as that covered by this project. This type of platform when implementing a project can have a positive impact on attitudes within national committees, which should of course bring together public and private sectors.

The evaluator underlines **the interest which a mid-term review could have had** in order to make good any lacunae (proved in the case of this project) when identifying the project.

Lastly, it was noted that pertinent notes could have been attached to the electronic newsletter in order to **make clear the assistance provided by the STDF**. The STDF should consider preparing special notes to be used by implementing agencies making this clear.