

EX-POST EVALUATION OF PROJECT STDF 145

“RWANDA HORTICULTURE EXPORT STANDARDS INITIATIVE (RHESI)

Final Report

Submitted to:
STDF Secretariat

by
Ralf Lopian

January 31st 2012

CONTENTS

Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms	3
Executive Summary	5
1. INTRODUCTION	7
1.1 Background	7
1.2 Objectives of the Evaluation	9
2. METHODOLOGY	9
2.1 Criteria and Phases of the Evaluation	9
2.2 Limitations and Challenges	10
3. MAIN FINDINGS	11
3.1 Relevance	11
3.2. Effectiveness	12
3.2.1 <i>Specific Objective A: Sensitizing/Raising Awareness</i>	13
3.2.2 <i>Specific Objective B: Promotion of Good Practices</i>	13
3.2.3 <i>Specific Objective C: Legal/Regulatory Reform</i>	14
3.2.4 <i>Specific Objective D: Other Institutional Capacity Building in SPS Measures</i>	15
3.2.5 <i>Specific Objective E: Information and Database Development</i>	15
3.2.6 <i>Specific Objective F: Action Plan for Horticulture SPS Standards Compliance</i>	16
3.3 Efficiency	17
3.4 Impacts	18
3.5 Sustainability	18
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19
5. LESSONS LEARNT	20
Annexes	
Annex I Terms of Reference	23
Annex II RHESI Questionnaire Recipients	25
Annex III <i>Questionnaire</i>	27
Annex IV <i>Analysis of the Completed Questionnaires</i>	33

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CPM	Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (of the IPPC)
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
ISAE	Higher Institute of Agriculture and Animal Husbandry
KIST	Kigali Institute for Science and Technology
MINAGRI	Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources of Rwanda
MINICOM	Ministry of Commerce, Industry, Investment Promotion, Tourism and Cooperatives of Rwanda
MSU	Michigan State University
NAEB	National Agriculture Export Development Board (of Rwanda)
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organization
PCE	Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation
RBS	Rwanda Bureau of Standards
RHESI	Rwanda Horticulture Export Standards Initiative
RHODA	Rwanda Horticultural Development Authority
SPS	Sanitary and phytosanitary
SPS Agreement	Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of WTO
STDF	Standards and Trade Development Facility
WTO	World Trade Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is an ex-post evaluation of the STDF project 145 “RWANDA HORTICULTURE EXPORT STANDARDS INITIATIVE (RHESI)” which was carried out between June 2007 and May 2009. The main partners in the project were the Rwanda Horticultural Development Authority (RHODA) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI) of Rwanda and the Michigan State University (MSU). The project evaluation was conducted in line with the “*Guidelines for the evaluation of projects funded by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF)*” and consisted of a desk study of project documentation, a stakeholder and implementer consultation and a study visit to Rwanda. Limitations encountered were mainly connected to the timing of the evaluation process. The long period between the conclusion of the project and the beginning of the evaluation resulted in difficulties of locating and contacting key beneficiaries and stakeholders as well as obtaining reliable information.

The overall objective of the project was to expand Rwanda’s presence in international and regional export markets for fruits, vegetables and flowers by establishing a sound SPS management system with a particular focus on plant health management. This was mainly thought to be achieved through awareness raising activities, the promotion of good practises, assistance in the Rwandan regulatory reform process, institutional capacity building, information and data-base development and the establishment of a horticultural SPS action plan. In this context it can be stated that the project succeed in setting up the basis for a sound SPS management system with regard to plant health. Rwanda’s presence in international and regional export markets may be expanded through this SPS management system.

In general the project was highly relevant and achieved its objectives. Especially the legislative and the infrastructural components were very important and very effective. The project assisted Rwanda in adhering to the IPPC, setting up of a National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) and the development of draft legislation. These are major achievements which also document the effectiveness of the project. Beside the institutional and legislative development of the phytosanitary sector the project also aimed at increasing the knowledge base in the horticultural sector. Activities such as the training of horticultural phytosanitary matters, good agricultural practices, integrated pest management and surveillance are considered important for officials, technicians and private operators. Also in this area the project achieved most of its objectives, although the involvement of private stakeholders such as producers and processors etc. fell short of expectations.

With regard to the efficiency of the project implementation it can be stated that most of the activities of the project were carried out in the time period foreseen in the project proposal. The RHESI project implementers applied to the STDF to extend the timing of the project by 6 months in order to assist Rwandan efforts to implement project recommendations, but this was rejected by the STDF. The implementing agency, the MSU, undertook timely reporting to the STDF on the progress of the project.

The major impacts of the RHESI project have been the adherence of Rwanda to the IPPC, the establishment of a NPPO and the drafting of phytosanitary legislation, which may be adopted very soon. Impacts on the market access of Rwanda, which are usually long-term developments, cannot be observed at this time.

In general, the sustainability of the project is quite good. Institutional structures have been maintained and action plans developed under the RHESI project are still implemented by Rwandan horticultural and phytosanitary authorities. New technical assistance projects are implemented and are building on the developments of the RHESI project. Threats to the sustainability of the project have been identified in the relatively weak public-private partnership and the fact that a relatively high fluctuation of RHESI trained staff occurred; staff leaving responsible government positions after being trained in the RHESI project.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

International trade can stimulate economic growth, and in Africa export of agricultural products is acknowledged as crucial to the continent’s development. Around 40% of Africa’s foreign exchange is earned through agriculture, which provides 60% of all employment, and is the basis for two thirds of manufacturing value addition. In many African countries, exports of agricultural commodities to lucrative export markets, such as Europe, North America and the Far East, have been identified as an important component to increase foreign exchange revenues, to attract foreign investors, to create demand for labour and to improve the agricultural infrastructure. Especially the export of high-value and labour intensive horticultural commodities, such as fruits, vegetables and ornamentals has been considered to play a key role in foreign exchange earnings.

International trade is expanding both within Africa and with other regions, including in particular Europe, Asia and North America. One prerequisite, however, for African nations to fully benefit from these trade opportunities is their conformity with the institutional requirements laid down in the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) as well as their compliance with international phytosanitary standards and the import requirements of the importing countries. A country wishing to overcome phytosanitary import barriers of potential importing countries must effectively apply international phytosanitary standards and must have a phytosanitary infrastructure and management system in place which attaches credibility to its phytosanitary certification activities. Due to a well documented lack of capacity in the phytosanitary field access of African countries to lucrative export markets may not reach its full potential.

As other African countries, especially in east Africa, also Rwanda has prioritised horticultural exports as important for its agricultural and economic development. In 1994, the government of Rwanda developed a strategy to transform agricultural production from subsistence towards a modern, market-oriented rural economy and to enhance productivity in all sub sectors of the agricultural economy. A priority identified in Rwanda was the development of horticulture exports in areas where the country has a comparative advantage (such as fruits, vegetables and ornamentals) including a favourable climate and a low cost labour pool. An important prerequisite to achieve this transformation and increase horticultural exports is, however, the existence of an IPPC compatible phytosanitary inspection and certification system and infrastructure and the compliance with international phytosanitary and sanitary standards.

In 2006, the World Trade Organization (WTO) organized in collaboration with the national Steering Committee for the “Integrated Framework for Trade Related Technical Assistance to Least Developed Countries” a national stakeholder workshop and follow-on fieldwork on Rwanda Horticulture Export Standards. The workshop identified constraints faced by stakeholders in meeting sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) trade requirements and in implementing SPS management functions at all levels in Rwanda. Based on the findings and conclusions of the workshop the Rwanda Horticultural Development Authority (RHODA) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI) of Rwanda and the Michigan State University (MSU) developed the RHESI project and submitted it to the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF). The MSU was contracted by the STDF as the implementation agency for STDF 145 in June 2007. A summary of the RHESI project, as approved by the STDF, can be found in table 1. The World Bank provided the supervision of the project.

Table 1: Summary of the STDF project 145

STDF 145 - Rwanda Horticulture Export Standards Initiative (RHESI)		
Overall Objective		
To expand Rwanda’s presence in international and regional export markets for fruits, vegetables and flowers by establishing a sound SPS management system with a particular focus on plant health management.		
Specific Objectives		
A. Sensitizing/Raising Awareness	C. Legal/Regulatory Reform	E. Information and Database Development
B. Promotion of Good Practices	D. Other Institutional Capacity Building in SPS Measures	F. Action Plan for Horticulture SPS Standards Compliance
General Activities		
Kickoff workshop, Monitoring & Evaluation		
Specific Activities		
A.1 Support to RHODA in the development of horticulture SPS awareness raising materials	B.1 Development of horticulture GAP training materials	C.1 Inter-agency working agreement in place – establishment of a functional institutional set up regarding SPS management
A.2 Implementation of awareness raising activities	B.2 Draft code of Good Practices for horticulture	C.2 TA and training in plant health/pesticides regulations
	B.3 Implementation of GAP training activities	C.3 Draft Rwanda plant health/pesticides legislation
	B.4 Curriculum development at KIST, ISAE and/or NUR	
D.1 Training in plant health, SPS, pest/disease risk assessment and management	E.1 Phytosanitary capacity evaluation support to RHODA	F.1 Establish SPS Horticulture Standards Coordination Committee
D.2 Strengthening the IPPC Focal Point	E.2 Establish horticulture pest list/database in coordination with neighbouring countries	F.2 Draft Action Plan for future SPS compliance
	E.2 3-track study of horticulture exports requirements	F.3 Coordinate with donors on priorities & funding
Outcomes & Indicators for Success		
A.1 RHODA and RBS have received support in the development of plant health and pesticides standards training materials for the horticulture sector and other awareness raising approaches using printed materials, radio broadcasts and website development.	B.1 Good plant health and pesticides management practices have been drafted.	C.1 An inter-agency working agreement on SPS management has been established.
A.2 Training programs have been implemented using materials above and targeting exporters, cooperative managers, extension personnel and other potential “trainers.”	B.2 A draft code of Good Practices for horticulture has been drafted	C.2 Training has been provided in plant health/pesticides regulations to key stakeholders and policy makers
	B.3 Training materials and the code of Good Practise have been disseminated.	C.3 Technical assistance has been provided in plant health/pesticides
	B.4 MINAGRI/RHODA have been strengthened through targeted technical assistance and training	C.4 Plant health/pesticides legislation in other horticulture exporting countries in the region and elsewhere has been reviewed.
	B.5 Training materials for Good Agricultural Practices in meeting horticulture SPS requirements.	C.5 Draft Rwanda legislation has been prepared in the following areas: plant protection, pesticide control; seed and plant variety protection legislation
	B.6 KIST, ISAE and/or NUR have been be strengthened.	
D.1 MINAGRI/RHODA plant protection inspectors, certifiers and laboratory heads and senior technicians will have received targeted training and technical assistance.	E.1 An analysis of the Rwandan phytosanitary system through the PCE is completed.	F.1 An SPS Horticulture Standards Coordination Committee has been established.
D.2 The IPPC Focal Point is strengthened by training in IPM techniques.	E.2 A horticultural pest list database has been established.	F.2 A draft medium- and long-term Action Plan for future SPS compliance has been drafted
D.3 A study tour to introduce key officials to IPPC functioning and procedures has been undertaken.	E.2 A three-track study of horticulture export market requirements has been made,	F.3 Information on phytosanitary export standards/requirements has been compiled.
D.4 Coordination among stakeholders was undertaken to identify needs and concerns regarding IPPC participation.		F.4 Potential donors have been approached to address priority steps and future funding of the plan’s implementation.
D.5 Trust fund resources to participate in IPPC were applied for.		
Outcomes & Indicators for Success		
The main impacts of the project are to improve Rwanda’s horticultural food safety and plant health standards with an eye toward greater access to these growing regional and international markets. The long term impact of the activities proposed under RHESI will be increased incomes to Rwanda’s producers, cooperatives and enterprises and a reduction in the country’s levels of poverty.		
The project also enhances Rwanda's access to these growing regional and international markets by focusing on a small number of horticulture products/subsectors with export potential and building that potential through targeted training and technical assistance in raising awareness, promoting good practices and developing the regulatory framework that will enable horticulture producer groups and agribusinesses to be successful in this competitive arena. Achieving these goals will have a parallel beneficial impact on domestic human and environmental health.		

1.2 Objectives of the Evaluation

The STDF selected Mr Ralf Lopian as the consultant to conduct the ex-post evaluation of the STDF 145 project. Mr Lopian is an employee of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of Finland. He is a phytosanitary expert and has been for many years the Finnish delegate in the IPPC and the SPS Committee of the WTO. Mr Lopian has been the chairman of the governing body of the IPPC and has been involved as a consultant in many projects conducted by the EU Commission, the IPPC, the World Bank and WTO. Mr Lopian is independent from all the parties concerned and has no other conflict of interests which could affect the objective conduct of the project evaluation.

The project evaluation was conducted in line with the “*Guidelines for the evaluation of projects funded by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF)*” According to the terms of reference for the project evaluation (see also Appendix I) the objectives of the evaluation were to:

- verify whether the project achieved the objectives set out in the project document;
- identify if the project has achieved any of the higher level objectives of the Facility, e.g. a measurable impact on market access, an improved domestic, and where applicable regional, SPS situation, and poverty reduction;
- identify key lessons learned for the benefit of both recipients and donors and for future STDF programme development.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Criteria and Phases of the Evaluation

The evaluation of the project STDF 145 examined the implementation and results of the project and was based on the key evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and lessons learned/recommendations as outlined in the “*Guidelines for the evaluation of projects funded by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF)*”.

The evaluation was conducted in three distinct phases:

a) *Desk study of project documentation*

The first phase of the evaluation incorporated a detailed desk study of the documentation provided by the STDF Secretariat to the consultant. This included the review of the review of project application forms, interim reports, final report and other relevant materials provided by the STDF Secretariat. In addition, the project implementers of the MSU were contacted and additional information was requested. The MSU submitted considerable documentation for all aspects of the project which allowed for a detailed study of all project relevant activities. Reviewed were workshop materials, workshop and seminar reports, roadmaps, action plans, legislative proposals as well as details for database developments, website material and other relevant material. Phone interviews with key MSU staff were conducted to obtain further information and clarifications for specific details of the project implementation.

b) *Collection of stakeholder and project implementer opinions and views*

The second phase focussed on the collection of stakeholder and implementers opinions, insights and views concerning the project implementation. In collaboration with the STDF Secretariat two questionnaires were developed in accordance with the evaluation criteria. The first questionnaire was addressed to beneficiaries, government agencies, project partners and implementers. The second questionnaire was addressed to private stakeholders, such as producers, processors or

exporters. A list of 41 project beneficiaries and implementers and 1 private stakeholder were abstracted from the project documentation and submitted to the key staff of the MSU and to the STDF for comments and suggestion. Especially the absence of contact addresses for private stakeholders was noted and MSU was requested to provide additional contacts for private stakeholders. Unfortunately MSU was not able to identify further contact details for private stakeholders and consequently the questionnaires were sent to the 40 project beneficiaries and implementers and the single private stakeholder. Of the 40 questionnaires sent to beneficiaries and implementers 4 were returned duly completed. The private stakeholder questionnaire was not utilized.

In addition to the questionnaires, a mission to Rwanda was undertaken to interview key stakeholders that have been involved in the implementation of the project and collect other information and documentation. The interviews with key stakeholders, beneficiaries and implementers were also utilized to complete a number of questionnaires so that the number of completed questionnaires was raised to 8 for beneficiaries and implementers.

c) Final analysis of data

The results of the desk study and the data collected through the questionnaires and the mission to Rwanda were analysed. Key staff of the implementing agency, MSU, was again interviewed by telephone to obtain additional information open questions resulting from the questionnaire results and the interviews conducted in Rwanda. Based on the data obtained and the interviews conducted a draft final report was prepared. The STDF Secretariat was invited to comment and suggest changes to this draft final report.

2.2 Limitations and Challenges

The challenges encountered in the evaluation of STDF 145 were mainly connected to the timing of the evaluation process. STDF 145 was completed in May 2009 and the ex-post evaluation was commissioned in November 2011. The long period between the conclusion of the project and the beginning of the evaluation resulted in difficulties of locating and contacting key beneficiaries and stakeholders. Of the 40 questionnaires sent by e-mail over 30% were returned because the e-mail addresses were no longer recognized. Due to a change of telephone area codes in Rwanda difficulties were encountered in contacting beneficiaries and stakeholders by telephone; because telephone numbers indicated in the project documentation were no longer valid. Many key stakeholders had changed position and were not working anymore with the organizations or agencies involved in the project and were almost impossible to track down. Several stakeholders interviewed had difficulties in remembering specific activities of the project or confused them with activities undertaken in other projects.

The low numbers of responses to the questionnaires limits the empirical reliability of the results obtained through the questionnaires. In addition, several questions in the questionnaires were not answered by all persons returning a completed questionnaire. To compensate for these limitations extensive background studies were undertaken focussing on the project activities and the materials used in these activities, such as training materials etc. The extensive review of the background documentation also contributed to compensate for possible bias contained in the information obtained by project implementers.

The overall objective of the project “*to expand Rwanda’s presence in international and regional export markets for fruits, vegetables and flowers*” is a valid assumption of the results a sustainable and effective SPS management system will achieve. It is, however, almost impossible to attribute the extension of export presence to a singular component. The increase or decrease of export

activities is dependent on more than the availability of proficient SPS structures. The same limitations apply to the envisaged long term impacts of the activities proposed under RHESI which were assumed to be “*increased incomes to Rwanda’s producers, cooperatives and enterprises and a reduction in the country’s levels of poverty*”. The establishment of tangible links between short term project activities and long term macro-economic developments is very ambitious.

3. MAIN FINDINGS

3.1 Relevance

Rwanda is one of the least developed countries in the world and has after years of post-war and post-genocide rebuilding shifted its focus from a subsistence driven agriculture to a market driven agriculture. This shift to a market driven agriculture and the vision to expand agricultural and horticultural exports, however, necessitated that SPS requirements of importing countries in the region and overseas are complied with. The compliance with SPS requirements itself dictate the availability of institutional and legislative structures which attribute the necessary government responsibility to the regulatory activities.

Rwanda, deeply scarred by war and genocide, did not have appropriate institutional and legislative structures in place to comply with other countries importing requirements in the phytosanitary field. The existing phytosanitary legislation was antiquated and not appropriate to facilitate modern phytosanitary certification requirements and risk analysis undertakings. Rwanda, although a member of FAO, was not a member of the IPPC and therefore isolated in the global phytosanitary community. No national plant protection organization existed which undertook the functions of establishing national certification system and thus fulfilling one of the basic phytosanitary requirements in the trade of commodities of plants and plant products. If Rwanda wanted to change its focus from subsistence agriculture to a market driven and export oriented agriculture the establishment of institutional and legislative phytosanitary structures was not only relevant, but indispensable.

Beside the institutional and legislative development of the phytosanitary sector the project also aimed at increasing the knowledge base in the horticultural sector. Activities such as the training of horticultural phytosanitary matters, good agricultural practices, integrated pest management and surveillance are considered important to set the basic technical phytosanitary activities officials, technicians and private operators would have to conduct for producing and certifying horticultural produce destined for exports. Also these objectives of the project were highly relevant.

The third pillar of the RHESI project focused on the decision making and coordinative processes between government authorities, agencies and stakeholders in order to streamline the intergovernmental policies concerning horticultural exports and to invest in a public – private partnership as the driving force for the public phytosanitary activities. Without doubt also these activities have been identified by international organizations as important development activities and must be considered also as highly relevant for this project.

While all of these activities in themselves have a high relevance, the question arises if the bundling of all these activities into one project of limited time and funding has been relevant and suited the needs and policies of the recipients. The IPPC has over years promoted the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool as the main meter to gauge the development needs of a country. The IPPC has been advocating that countries first undertake a PCE study, develop phytosanitary national strategies based on the PCE analysis and then apply for targeted technical assistance to remove

deficiencies identified in the PCE. In the case of Rwanda and the RHESI project this was not done. The PCE was part of the RHESI project itself and the project design was not based on a PCE analysis. It would have perhaps further increased the project relevance if the project design would have been based on a PCE analysis. This was also pointed out by one response to the questionnaire which specified that the project should have been prepared better to reflect realities and through a pre-project study. A project based on a PCE analysis may have structured the project and concentrated activities in such areas where there was the highest identified need.

3.2 Effectiveness

In order to analyse the effectiveness of the project the specific objectives, their related activities and the envisaged outputs and indicators were examined. Project reports, background materials, questionnaire responses (see Annex IV) and information provided in the interviews were used as the main materials to carry out this examination. Due to the slightly fragmented structure of the project design, some project activities were difficult to clearly attribute to one or the other specific objective. However, especially the analysis of the questionnaire responses gave a relatively clear picture which activities had been carried out and which objectives had been met.

In general the project achieved its objectives. Especially the legislative and the infrastructural components were very important and very effective. The project assisted Rwanda in adhering to the IPPC, setting up of a National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) and the development of draft legislation. These are major achievements which also document the effectiveness of the project. These activities were also chosen by the majority of responses to the questionnaire. On the question, which were the most successful activities under the RHESI project regulatory reform, training activities, NPPO establishment, pest list development and IPPC membership were overwhelmingly mentioned as the most successful activities.

However, beside the very effective and successful activities mentioned in the paragraph above there were also activities which were less successful or not implemented at all. It appears that especially with regard to activities where training or coordination with private stakeholders was involved insufficiencies were identified. In response to question 13 (least successful activities) replies overwhelmingly identified the involvement of private stakeholders in the project activities and training as the least successful activity. In addition to that no evidence was found that the planned activity to draft legislation on the protection of variety rights for seed and propagation material was undertaken.

The overall objective of the project had been to “*expand Rwanda’s presence in international and regional export markets for fruits, vegetables and flowers by establishing a sound SPS management system with a particular focus on plant health management*”. In this context it can be stated that the project succeeded in setting the basis for up a sound SPS management system with regard to plant health, but that this did not translate into expanded presence in international and regional export markets. As indicated in chapter 2.2 the presence of a sound phytosanitary national system is one of the prerequisites for expanding export activities – but not the only one. According to Rwandan export statistics the export of horticultural products such as beans has declined in 2009¹. The export of flowers from Rwanda stopped completely due to global macroeconomic developments.

¹ see also

http://www.rdb.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/Documents/trade_and_manufacturing/Rwanda_EXPORT_PERFORMANCE_2009.pdf

Nevertheless, from a professional phytosanitary perspective the effectiveness of the overall project has been high.

An analysis of the effectiveness of the project in relation to its different sub-objectives can be found in the following chapters.

3.2.1 Specific Objective A: Sensitizing/Raising Awareness

The project envisaged that activities would be undertaken in order to help to raise stakeholder awareness of SPS issues and requirements for trade in plant products. Through RHESI the capacity to raise public and stakeholder awareness at three levels was planned to be developed. These three levels were identified as:

- senior plant health and trade officials responsible for programmatic oversight and public expenditures,
- owners and managers of agribusinesses that are producing, processing and exporting plant products from Rwanda, and
- farmers, cooperatives and farm labourers who produce, process, handle and transport plant products prior to their export.

Objective A: Activities	Outputs & Indicators for Success
A.1 Support to RHODA in the development of horticulture SPS awareness raising materials A.2 Implementation of awareness raising activities	A.1 RHODA and RBS have received support in the development of plant health and pesticides standards training materials for the horticulture sector and other awareness raising approaches using printed materials, radio broadcasts and website development. A.2 Training programs have been implemented using materials above and targeting exporters, cooperative managers, extension personnel and other potential “trainers.”

Assessment & Comments

Objective achieved

Awareness raising activities were among the main activities of the project. The awareness raising was primarily successful for officials who already partly knew about SPS issues. Deducting from answers to the questionnaire (see question 13) it remains, however, doubtful if the awareness of farmers and farm labourers was improved since the project relied on the “train the trainer” approach and had no direct input on how the trainer then disseminated their knowledge.

3.2.2 Specific Objective B: Promotion of Good Practises

This objective of RHESI was to promote the adoption of good practices, such as HACCP and good agricultural practises at the processing and farm levels in order to comply with SPS standards by trading partners. RHESI also envisaged to develop a code of good practices for a small number of targeted supply chains: for example, passion fruit, bird’s eye chillies and roses.

Objective B: Activities	Outputs & Indicators for Success
B.1 Development of horticulture GAP training materials B.2 Draft code of Good Practices for horticulture B.3 Implementation of GAP training activities B.4 Curriculum development at KIST, ISAE and/or	B.1 Good plant health and pesticides management practices have been drafted. B.2 A draft code of Good Practices for horticulture has been drafted B.3 Training materials and the code of Good Practice have

NUR	<p>been disseminated.</p> <p>B.4 MINAGRI/RHODA have been strengthened through targeted technical assistance and training</p> <p>B.5 Training materials for Good Agricultural Practices in meeting horticulture SPS requirements.</p> <p>B.6 KIST, ISAE and/or NUR have been be strengthened.</p>
-----	---

Assessment & Comments

Objective largely achieved

The drafting of horticultural training materials and good agricultural practices as well as the implementation of training activities were carried out under the project.

In how far, however, good agricultural practices lead to changes at farm or processor level remains unclear. Relevant questions 2 and 3 show that the answers to these questions are divided. Also in this aspect the project relied on the “train the trainer” approach and had no direct input on how the trainer then disseminated their knowledge.

3.2.3 Specific Objective C: Legal/Regulatory Reform

RHESI’s objective to assist with the Rwandan legal/regulatory reform process was one of the major objectives of the project. It was envisaged that RHESI will contribute to the legal and regulatory reform process by drafting legislation in the following areas:

- plant protection, including pest control and quarantine,
- pesticide control, and
- specific seed and plant variety protection legislation.

It was thought that this legislation will in turn contribute to the development of a draft Rwandan food law and regulatory framework which are outside the project objectives.

Objective C: Activities	Outputs & Indicators for Success
<p>C.1 Inter-agency working agreement in place – establishment of a functional institutional set up regarding SPS management</p> <p>C.2 TA and training in plant health/pesticides regulations</p> <p>C.3 Draft Rwanda plant health/pesticides legislation</p>	<p>C.1 An inter-agency working agreement on SPS management has been established.</p> <p>C.2 Training has been provided in plant health/pesticides regulations to key stakeholders and policy makers</p> <p>C.3 Technical assistance has been provided in plant health/pesticides</p> <p>C.4 Plant health/pesticides legislation in other horticulture exporting countries in the region and elsewhere has been reviewed.</p> <p>C.5 Draft Rwanda legislation has been prepared in the following areas: plant protection, pesticide control; seed and plant variety protection legislation</p>

Assessment & Comments

Objective partially achieved

According to the assessor, the activities undertaken under this objective belong to the most successful activities undertaken under the RHESI project. The project did draft laws on plant protection and an agrochemical act. These legislative instruments have, however, not been adopted by the Rwandan Parliament, yet. The project did not achieve the drafting of the specific seed and plant variety protection legislation. One of the interviewed persons explained that the reason for this has been that political decision makers in Rwanda believed at the time that such a law would not have any priority.

The questions relevant to this objective are questions 4, 5 and 6. Half of the answers to question 4 (drafting legislation) indicated that this activity was only partially met because the seed legislation was missing.

With regard to the establishment of an institutional set up for SPS matters half of the answers indicated only partial implementation. This partial implementation was attributed to the fact that the SPS Coordination Committee although

proposed in the law had not really been implemented or did not function properly.

All answers to the questionnaire judged that the training for plant health and pesticides was fully implemented.

One very positive achievement of the RHESI project has been that it contributed to the adherence of Rwanda to the IPPC. On the 26th of August 2008 Rwanda officially adhered to the IPPC as the 174th contracting party and being one of the last countries to do so. RHESI’s contribution and achievement in this regard must be highly valued although this was never indicated in the original project plan as an objective of the RHESI project.

3.2.4 Specific Objective D: Other Institutional Capacity Building in SPS Measures

This specific objective was especially designed to strengthen the IPPC Focal Point, as it was specified in the application document. In this context it should be observed that the IPPC does not use the terminology “focal point”, but specifies that each contracting party should nominate an “official contact point”. According to the IPPC, the official contact point does not necessarily have to be the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) of a country. In other words, the official IPPC contact point is usually a contact person or office which receives all IPPC related communications while the NPPO reacts upon them. In many countries the official contact point and the NPPO are the same, but this is not obligatory. In this context the project design was slightly unclear as to what institution was supposed to be strengthened – the official contact point or an NPPO, which was non-existent in Rwanda. The results achieved, however, were very clear: RHESI established an NPPO in Rwanda which is now also the IPPC official contact point.

Objective D: Activities	Outputs & Indicators for Success
<p><i>D.1</i> Training in plant health, SPS, pest/disease risk assessment and management</p> <p><i>D.2</i> Strengthening the IPPC Focal Point</p>	<p><i>D.1</i> MINAGRI/RHODA plant protection inspectors, certifiers and laboratory heads and senior technicians will have received targeted training and technical assistance.</p> <p><i>D.2</i> The IPPC Focal Point is strengthened by training in IPM techniques.</p> <p><i>D.3</i> A study tour to introduce key officials to IPPC functioning and procedures has been undertaken.</p> <p><i>D.4</i> Coordination among stakeholders was undertaken to identify needs and concerns regarding IPPC participation.</p> <p><i>D.5</i> Trust fund resources to participate in IPPC were applied for.</p>

Assessment & Comments

Objective achieved

The activities undertaken under this objective also belong to the most successful of the project. Training activities were regarded by all interviewed persons and responses to the questionnaire as very successful. The establishment of an NPPO for Rwanda (titled in the project documentation “*national plant protection service*”) must be evaluated as a major achievement of the project and enables Rwanda to comply with the infrastructural obligations of the IPPC.

Trust fund resources for the participation of a representative of Rwanda to participate at the sixth meeting of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) of the IPPC were sought and granted in 2009.

3.2.5 Specific Objective E: Information and Database Development

One of the basic prerequisites of an efficient NPPO is the availability of information regarding the country’s phytosanitary status and the import requirements of potential importing countries. The development of information and databases was therefore considered important to address

knowledge gaps essential for the Rwandan horticultural export aspirations. The specific objective included:

- Assistance to RHODA to complete a systematic analysis of its phytosanitary systems, through the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) to assess needs and options for improving these systems.
- Establishing a Horticulture Pest List/Database with particular focus on those pests regulated by key importing countries.
- Knowing Market Requirements, Cost of Compliance and Cost/Benefit Analysis: Undertaking with RHODA (and jointly with RBS under EU funding) a three-track study of horticulture (including floriculture) export requirements, cost of compliance and benefit of compliance.

Objective E: Activities	Outputs & Indicators for Success
<i>E.1</i> Phytosanitary capacity evaluation support to RHODA	<i>E.1</i> An analysis of the Rwandan phytosanitary system through the PCE is completed.
<i>E.2</i> Establish horticulture pest list/database in coordination with neighbouring countries	<i>E.2</i> A horticultural pest list database has been established.
<i>E.2</i> 3-track study of horticulture exports requirements	<i>E.2</i> A three-track study of horticulture export market requirements has been made,
Assessment & Comments	

Objective largely achieved

The activities undertaken under this specific objective delivered to a large degree on the outputs envisaged. The project did assist in the completion of a PCE for Rwanda and importantly called for a national stakeholder workshop to discuss the results of this PCE. Most responses to question 8 indicated that the PCE resulted in the development of an overall phytosanitary strategy for Rwanda.

The project also delivered on the output to produce a horticultural pest list for Rwanda. The responses to question 10 clearly indicate that the overwhelming majority of responses indicated that the activity was a success. More than one reply, however, also indicated that this activity had not been completed. In this context it should, however, be stressed that the establishment of reliable pest lists is a perpetual activity of any NPPO. Pest populations are not static but constantly evolving and changing. Ongoing surveillance to monitor pest status in a country is therefore a basic task of any NPPO and leads to constant changes in a pest list and the declaration of a certain pest status.

With regard to the development of a 3-track study of horticulture exports requirements, this seems to be not fully implemented. Of the eight responses received to question 9 only one did indicate that RHESI successfully undertook a three track study. Most responses did indicate that the project was somewhat successful. One comment specified that this activity may have been the “weak link” in the activities of the project, especially since macro-economical circumstances (credit crisis) made export activities very difficult.

One response indicated that to a large degree this activity has not been carried out, Another comment received indicated that the stakeholder involvement had not been good.

Overall one can conclude that the activity had been undertaken, but that it lacked some depths and elements such as a cost/benefit analysis of complying with phytosanitary standards of importing countries.

3.2.6 Specific Objective F: Action Plan for Horticulture SPS Standards Compliance

This specific objective envisaged the development of a national strategy/action plan for SPS standards compliance in order to identify, prioritize, and facilitate the steps necessary to build an SPS management system that will serve the country’s interests in expanding horticulture and other exports. Beside the development of a horticultural action plan also the establishment of proper SPS coordination structures was envisaged.

Objective F: Activities	Outputs & Indicators for Success
<i>F.1</i> Establish SPS Horticulture Standards Coordination Committee	<i>F.1</i> An SPS Horticulture Standards Coordination Committee has been established.
<i>F.2</i> Draft Action Plan for future SPS compliance	<i>F.2</i> A draft medium- and long-term Action Plan for future

<i>F.3</i> Coordinate with donors on priorities & funding	SPS compliance has been drafted <i>F.3</i> Information on phytosanitary export standards/requirements has been compiled. <i>F.4</i> Potential donors have been approached to address priority steps and future funding of the plan’s implementation.
---	--

Assessment & Comments

Objective achieved

The activities undertaken under this specific objective were achieved. The project succeeded in the development of a SPS horticultural action plan which is still today the basis of NAEB’s horticultural activities. NAEB is the National Agriculture Export Development Board registered under the Ministry of Agriculture of Rwanda. The Rwanda Tea Authority, Rwanda Coffee Authority and RHODA were merged to form the National Agriculture Export Board. Virtually all responses to question 11 of the questionnaire confirmed the successful implementation of this activity.

The other activities under the specific objective were also carried out although they overlapped with some of the other activities in the project.

3.3 Efficiency

RHESI’s efficiency was evaluated in terms of the extent to which funding, staff, regulatory, administrative, time and other resource considerations contributed or hindered the achievements of results. The evaluation was based on the basis of the project reports, background materials, questionnaire responses (see Annex IV) and information provided in the interviews.

With regard to the timeliness of the project implementation it can be stated that most of the activities of the project were carried out in the time period foreseen in the project proposal. The implementing agency, the MSU, undertook most of the foreseen activities (see chapter 3.2) in the designated two year time-frame. Difficulties could, however, be observed in the practical transposition of RHESI proposals. For example the laws on plant protection and agrochemicals were produced by the project in time. Transposition of these laws, however, did not take place, yet. The same applies to a certain degree to SPS coordination activities which were developed and established under the project, while their practical implementation, according to information received, is very slow. One conclusion in regard to the timing efficiency of the project could be that the project should have had provisions to assist the implementation/transposition of its recommendations through the administrations of MINAGRI and the Ministry of Commerce, Industry, Investment Promotion, Tourism and Cooperatives of Rwanda (MINICOM). The RHESI project did realize this and undertook efforts to extend the timing of the project by 6 months. This was, however, rejected by the STDF. In the questionnaire this aspects was also addressed by many responses. Three responses indicated that the project should have lasted longer to ensure the implementation/transposition of project proposals. It was thought that project duration of 3-4 years would have improved the project quality and follow-up considerably including assisting in the implementation of regulatory activities.

Regarding the cost effectiveness of the project implementers were of the opinion that it would have been highly unlikely that such steps forward could have happened on their own, without some level of external investment like this. The assessor also judges the progress made in Rwanda to be most significant with a relatively modest amount of funds.

The implementing agency, the MSU, undertook timely reporting on the progress of the project. Reports were submitted in the form of Inception Report, Mid-term Report and an End of Project Report. In addition two status reports were submitted to the STDF Secretariat. While the timing of

the reporting activities was very appropriate, the quality of the reporting lacked some precision. Especially the compatibility of language used in different reports and the project proposal was lacking. Different language used for the same activities described in different reports and proposals may contribute to misunderstandings in the project achievements.

A final observation should be that many of the participants at training seminar and workshops indicated that the courses and seminars given were of very high quality and well organized.

3.4 Impacts

Although the project aimed to increase Rwanda’s presence on in international and regional export markets for fruits, vegetables and flowers its main impact lies with the establishment of a sound institutional set up for plant protection and plant health in the SPS context.

The major impact of the RHESI project has been the adherence of Rwanda to the IPPC. This has been an unforeseen impact since this was not planned in the project design. Through this adherence Rwanda has become an important part of the international phytosanitary community. With this adherence Rwanda has obliged itself to implement certain obligations stated in the IPPC and through this set the track for an international recognition of its phytosanitary system. Phytosanitary experts from Rwanda will be able to receive funds to attend IPPC meetings and utilize these international meetings to contact importing countries phytosanitary representatives and promote export activities. In fact the adherence of Rwanda to the IPPC removes the countries’ isolation with regard to phytosanitary matters.

Another major impact of the RHESI project is the establishment of the NPPO for Rwanda. The existence of NPPOs is one of the key responsibilities of IPPC contracting parties. NPPOs have, according to the IPPC, a number of responsibilities of which the establishment and operation of a phytosanitary certification system is of paramount importance. The international movement of plants and plant products is based on the issuance of phytosanitary certificates which attest the products phytosanitary safety. A country with no NPPO will have difficulties to export products, since importing countries will not necessarily accept its capacity to issue phytosanitary certificates.

The third major impact the project can be seen in the preparation of legislative proposals for a plant protection and agrochemicals law. According to studies carried out in FAO/IPPC many developing countries have insufficient legislative provisions to effectively control pests and to establish a proper phytosanitary system. Development activities carried out by FAO/IPPC have focussed very much on the establishment of proper legislation to allow countries to establish appropriate phytosanitary structures. The activities of RHESI in this context must be seen as a major contribution to establish a sustainable phytosanitary structure in Rwanda. This is, however, very dependent on the adoption of the said legislation by the Rwanda parliament.

Impacts on market access of Rwanda, which are usually long-term developments were, until now, not possible to observe.

3.5 Sustainability

RHESI was described as project that is aimed at structural change and building institutions which are all activities that have a long-term sustainable impact. This is certainly correct and the institutional and regulatory contributions of RHESI to the phytosanitary sector in Rwanda should be

judged to be sustainable. The establishment of a NPPO, the Rwandan adherence to the IPPC, the contribution to the legislative basis, the development of horticultural SPS action plans and roadmaps are all activities which will be maintained in Rwanda long after the project has been concluded. NAEB for example is today working in the horticultural sector according to the SPS action plan developed under RHESI.

Another parameter to measure the sustainability of the project is the follow up activities undertaken within the country by national authorities and agencies and international donors. According to the information provided in Rwanda NAEB is implementing the horticultural SPS action plan. The proposals for the laws on plant protection and agrochemicals are in the Rwanda Parliament and it is envisaged that they are adopted soon. The NPPO is operational and a new Director for this body has been appointed. Finally, a Rwandan representative has participated at the IPPC CPM after the completion of the project. This continuation of activities is an indication that the institutional activities of the project are sustainable. Beside continuation of activities by national authorities and agencies the activities of international donors has also been continuing in the SPS area. The Belgian Development Agency and the World Bank are supporting further efforts to improve the horticultural sector. Amongst others, the establishment of a phytosanitary laboratory is envisaged under this cooperation.

In its conception RHESI described the stakeholder involvement as a major factor in generating sustainability. The private-public partnership, however, faced some difficulties in the implementation of the project. With regard to question 13 of the questionnaire (least successful activities) four responses indicated that the involvement of the private sector in the implementation of the project was the least successful activity. The assessor received information that the identification of private sector participants for the project proved to be most difficult and that the training activities undertaken focused more on the “train the trainer” approach without the confirmation of when and how trainers “diffused” their knowledge to the private sector. In this context it should be stressed that in a country where subsistence agriculture is predominant private sector involvement may be very difficult to achieve.

Finally, a sustainability problem was identified during the evaluation of the project. Two and a half years after the completion of the project it became very difficult to locate some of the main implementers of the project. Many of the RHESI trained experts had changed positions or were, as indicated by one interviewed person, “sidelined” after the completion of the project. It is clearly a sustainability issue if key personal trained and educated in SPS management systems is not given the possibility to apply their acquired knowledge. This is, however, an issue which the project itself could not have addressed.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation of the RHESI project was commissioned two and a half years after its completion. This provided some challenges to the evaluation. Many key beneficiaries or implementers had left their position or had difficulties in remembering specific activities. Many involved players could not be tracked down.

Recommendation 1: *In order to allow smooth and precise evaluation activities it is recommended that evaluations are commissioned as soon as possible after the completion of the project.*

Rwanda as one of the least developed countries in the world did not have appropriate institutional and legislative structures in place to comply with international phytosanitary requirements and obligations. Rwanda did not have a NPPO and was not a member of the IPPC. In order to allow Rwanda to participate in international trade of agricultural and horticultural products and to protect its own production and environment against the introduction of pests it was indispensable to establish appropriate phytosanitary institutional and legislative structures in the country. RHESI was therefore highly relevant.

Although many of the RHESI activities were highly relevant the design of the project may have been even improved if it would have been based on the findings of a PCE. It would be of advantage if phytosanitary project designs are always based on the findings of a PCE.

Recommendation 2: It is recommended that phytosanitary projects proposed to the STDF and other international donors should be based as much as possible on findings developed through the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation tool of the IPPC.

In general the RHESI project achieved its objectives. The activities concerning the legislative and the infrastructural set-up were very effective and pertinent. The project assisted Rwanda in adhering to the IPPC, setting up of a National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) and the development of draft legislation. These are major achievements which also document the importance and effectiveness of the project. Training activities undertaken under the RHESI project were considered by participants as very successful fully met the expectations of participants and the objectives of the project.

Only a few activities described in the RHESI application form were not carried out or did not meet fully their objectives. The project did not achieve to produce a draft legislation on specific seed and plant variety protection legislation. The involvement of private stakeholders in different project activities was seen as limited by some participants and beneficiaries of the project. Also the cost/benefit analysis of complying with phytosanitary standards was felt to be not achieved.

With regard to the efficiency of the project implementation it can be stated that most of the activities of the project were carried out in the time period foreseen in the project proposal and that the implementing agency, the MSU, undertook most of the foreseen activities in the designated two year time-frame. Difficulties arose with the implementation and transposition of RHESI proposals. To assist with the implementation and transposition it was thought that the project should have been extended by 6 months. Although the validity of this application for an extension has not been evaluated the argumentation to assist in implementation/transposition difficulties after the conclusion of a project is valid and should be addressed for future projects.

The main objective of the RHESI project was to increase Rwanda’s presence on in international and regional export markets for fruits, vegetables and flowers through the establishment of a sound institutional set up for plant protection and plant health in the SPS context. Although the impact on Rwanda’s market access, which is a long-term development process that cannot be fully assessed, yet, the project nevertheless had major impacts on the institutional set up of phytosanitary matters in Rwanda.

In general, the sustainability of the project is quite good. Institutional structures have been maintained and action plans developed under the RHESI project are still implemented by Rwandan horticultural and phytosanitary authorities. New technical assistance projects are implemented and are building on the developments of the RHESI project. Threats to the sustainability of the project have been identified in the relatively weak public-private partnership and the fact that a relatively high fluctuation of RHESI trained staff occurred; staff leaving responsible government positions after being trained in the RHESI project.

5. LESSONS LEARNT

One of the main lessons learnt from this project, but also others like it, is that the establishment of appropriate administrative and legal phytosanitary structures is highly relevant in SPS-related technical assistance activities for least developed countries. The establishment of a legal phytosanitary framework provides least developing countries with the legal justification to build proper phytosanitary structures, such as a national plant protection organization, and raises the awareness on the importance of SPS related activities of officials and private stakeholders. With regard to its legal and institutional components the RHESI project has been remarkable and could serve as a model for similar activities in other countries.

The involvement of private stakeholders in project activities is an essential component in designing sustainable technical cooperation projects. The prerequisite for involving private stakeholders is, however, the existence of a layer of well educated private stakeholders or industry associations. The RHESI project did have a problem of identifying a sufficient number of private stakeholders. In a country where subsistence agriculture is predominant private sector involvement may be very difficult to achieve. This should be taken into account when designing projects and stakeholder involvement in other least developed countries.

Huge efforts had been made in the RHESI project to train staff in Rwanda about phytosanitary matters and SPS affairs. This training has been an essential part of the project. It is, therefore, unfortunate that many of the trained experts and key staff left their positions after the conclusion of the project. This clearly negates the impact and sustainability of the project. Since high staff fluctuations may be a general occurrence future projects may take account of this sustainability problem in their project design.

RHESI addressed to a large degree the legislative and institutional build-up of the phytosanitary sector in Rwanda. RHESI advised the legislative and executive branches in Rwanda what has to be done to be compliant with international SPS related requirements. The implementation and/or transposition of RHESI’s recommendations were, however, dependent on the Rwandan legislative and executive. These implementation activities can be very lengthy. For similar projects, ways to assist in implementation/transposition difficulties after the conclusion of a project should be addressed.

Terms of Reference for the ex-post evaluation of STDF/PG/145

Background

In May 2009, STDF project 145 entitled "Rwanda Horticulture Export Standards Initiative - RHESI" was completed. The overall objective of the project was to establish a sound SPS management system to ensure the application of plant health management protocols and to expand Rwanda's horticultural trade. STDF/PG/145 was implemented by Michigan State University (MSU). Technical support was provided by the World Bank in the form of monitoring services and technical advice.

RHESI activities targeted the regulatory and institutional capacity gaps so that government agencies and the private sector can instil domestic and international confidence that traded fruits, vegetables and flowers from Rwanda are free of pests and diseases, safe for human health and safe for the environment.

Project specific activities were:

- Development of an Awareness Raising Plan.
- Promotion of Good Practices.
- Development of a Plant Pest List Database based on the application of the PCE.
- Assistance in drafting Plant Health and Pesticides Legislation.
- Assistance in developing the Horticulture Export Standards Action Plan.
- Development of training material.

Based on these actions the country would be able to formulate priority actions and generate considerable interest among partners in the public and external sectors to provide further support in the phytosanitary area.

The STDF Working Group instructed the STDF Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements to conduct an ex-post evaluation of this project. Following consultations, *Mr Ralf Lopian*, was selected as the Consultant for this assignment.

Description of tasks

Under the overall supervision of the STDF Secretariat, and in close collaboration with other stakeholders involved, the consultant shall conduct an independent ex-post evaluation of STDF project 145 in accordance with the STDF Evaluation Guidelines ([Appendix 1](#)). In particular, the consultant shall:

- review all available documentation related to the project - to be submitted separately to the consultant by the STDF Secretariat;
- contact relevant stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project to collect other relevant information and documentation as appropriate;
- develop - in collaboration with the STDF Secretariat - a detailed survey questionnaire for this evaluation based on the standard evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and key lessons learned;

- identify and request stakeholders and beneficiaries to complete and return the survey questionnaire, to get their views about the project and follow-up activities conducted or needed;
- interview by phone/Skype key staff from Michigan State University (MSU) and the World Bank involved in the implementation of the project (names to be provided by the STDF Secretariat), to collect relevant information and discuss follow-up actions;
- travel to Rwanda (one week), interview key stakeholders that have been involved in the implementation of the project and collect other information and documentation as appropriate;
- collect information on how the results and data generated by the project have been used and give recommendations on key elements to be considered to replicate the project in other countries/regions; and
- on the basis of the information collected, draft and submit an evaluation report in English in the proper format (see Appendix 1) to the STDF Secretary no later than Tuesday 31 January 2012 close of business.

RHESI Questionnaire Recipients: Partners and Implementers

	<i>Name</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>E-mail</i>
1.	Leon Hakizamungu	RADA	lhakizamungufr@yahoo.fr
2.	Anasitas Harerimana	RHODA	haranast@yahoo.fr
3.	Regina Kayitesi	RHODA	regikaus@yahoo.com
4.	Belline Mukasake	RHODA	bellinein@yahoo.fr
5.	Mushumba Johnson	RHODA	mushumbar@yhoo.com
6.	Emile Mutunzi	RHODA	emile_mutunzi@yahoo.fr
7.	Peter Muvara	RHODA	psmuvara@yahoo.co.uk
8.	Angelique Rutayisire	RHODA	angeruta@yahoo.fr
9.	Victoria Kwakwa	World Bank	Vkwakwa@worldbank.org
10	Tembo Maburuki	World Bank	tmaburuki@worldbank.org
11.	Peter Isabirye	World Bank	pisabirye@worldbank.org
12.	Charles Rutagengwa	RBS	rutacha@yahoo.co.uk
13.	Dr. MUHINDA MUGUNGA Elie	n.a.	muhimelie@gmail.com
14.	GAFARASI NGABO Baptiste	RBS	Ngabo.gafarasi@gmail.com
15.	Anastase HARELIMANA		haranast@yahoo.fr
16.	Jean Baptiste MUHINYUZA		Mujohnbapt25@gmail.com
17.	Joelle KAJUGA		joellekajuga@gmail.com
17.	Chantal NYIRANSENGIYUMVA		nychantal@gmail.com
18.	Joseph T. Katarwa	Ministry of Health	katarwa.theodomily@gmail.com jkatarwa@yahoo.com
19.	Tony Roberto Nsanganira	Rwanda Development Board	tnsanganira@rwandainvest.com nsang@mail.ru
20.	Dr. Anastase KIMONYO	RBS	a.kimonyo@gmx.de kimonyo@rbs.org.rw
21.	Mr Laurent Gashugi	FAO	laurent.gashugi@fao.org
22.	Professor Kato Jonas Njunwa	Kigali Health Institute	knjunwa@yahoo.co.uk
23.	Dr. Hilda Vasathakaalam	Kigali Institute of Science and Technology (KIST)	hfst@kist.ac.rw h.vasanthak@kist.ac.rw
24.	Ms. Aimée Mpambara	Rwanda (Biosafety national focal point)	ampambara@yahoo.fr
25.	UWAMARIYA Pélagie	RHODA	puwamariya@yahoo.fr
26.	Beatrice UWUMUKIZA	NUR	buwumukiza@yahoo.fr

27.	IRAKABAHO Jean-Marie	Spread/USAID Project	Jmirakabaho@yahoo.fr Jmirakabaho@spread.org.rw
28.	TUMUSHIME Ignacie	RSSP	b_ignacie@yahoo.fr
29.	Donatille NIBAGWIRE	FLORIS	florisrwanda@yahoo.fr
30.	NAHAYO Goretti	RRA/Customs department	rracomcustom@rwanda1.com
31.	MUSIIME U. Florence	RBS	umurungip@yahoo.com
32.	NIWENKUNDA Eugenia	RBS	eunik_k@yahoo.com
33.	Toshikazu Mito	UNDP	Toshikazu.mito@undp.org
34.	Anushuka Karunarathe	World Bank	akarunarathe@worldbank.org
35.	GAFARASI Isidore	RARDA	igafarasi@yahoo.fr
36.	BAMBARA Sylvie	RIEPA	sbambara@rwandainvest.com
37.	MURANGIRA Arthur.LANI	MINICOM	laniziarthur@yahoo.com
38.	Daniel Clay	MSU	clay@anr.msu.edu
39.	Luis Flores	MSU	floreslg@anr.msu.edu
40.	Martha BYANYIMA	MSU	byany38@yahoo.com
41.	Lorraine Ronchi	World Bank	lronchi@worldbank.org

Questionnaire Recipients: Stakeholders

	<i>Name</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>E-mail</i>
1.	P. Damien Mbatezimana	Shekina enterprises	sheki05@yahoo.fr

Highlighted persons responded to the questionnaire.

Annex III

Questionnaire for Involved Beneficiaries, Government Agencies, Project Partners and Implementers

**EVALUATION OF THE RWANDA HORTICULTURE EXPORT STANDARDS INITIATIVE (RHESI)
STDF PROJECT 145**

This questionnaire is intended to evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the STDF project 145 (Rwanda Horticultural Export Standards Initiative). The information requested from you will be very valuable for improving future activities funded by the STDF. We would very much appreciate if you could provide your inputs and return the completed questionnaire to the address indicated below by January 3, 2012. We will greatly value your inputs and treat them with the strictest confidentiality. We will only present consolidated results in the final report without identifying responses by individuals or agencies. Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire!

Please return the completed questionnaire via e-mail to:

Ralf LOPIAN WTO/STDF Consultant

E-mail: ralf.lopian@mmm.fi or ralf.lopian@myllylanmylly.inet.fi

PART 1. PERSONAL DATA

Name	
E-mail	
Telephone	
Institution	

PART 2. PROJECT RELATED QUESTIONS

1. *How did you hear from or were involved in the RHESI project?*

Comments:

2. *To what extend did the RHESI project sensitize you or raise your awareness about SPS issues in relation to trade of horticultural products from Rwanda?*

Large extend _____ Medium extend _____ None at all _____

Comments:

3. *By which means were you made aware about SPS issues in relation to trade of horticultural products from Rwanda? (Please tick the appropriate)*

Information and/or pamphlets on horticultural SPS matters

Instructional guides for standard implementation

Internet sites

Training programmes

If none of the above, please specify:

4. *In your opinion, to what extend was the RHESI project successful in promoting the adoption of good practices at processing and farm levels to comply with SPS standards?*

Successful _____ Somewhat successful _____ Not successful _____

Please explain:

5. *In your judgement, have RHESIs activities with regard to the promotion of good practices lead to changes in processing and production at farm levels?*

Yes _____ No _____ I don't know _____

If yes, please specify in which horticultural areas the changes took place:

6. *From your perspective, to what extend was the RHESI project successful in contributing to the legal/regulatory reform process?*

Successful _____ Somewhat successful _____ Not successful _____ I don't know _____

Please explain:

7. *From your perspective, to what extent was the RHESI project successful in establishing a functional institutional set up regarding SPS management?*

Successful _____ Somewhat successful _____ Not successful _____

Please explain:

8. *In your opinion, to what extent was the RHESI project successful in delivering targeted training in plant health and pesticide management?*

Successful _____ Somewhat successful _____ Not successful _____

Please explain:

9. *In your opinion, to what extent was the RHESI project successful in strengthening Rwanda's IPPC focal point?*

Successful _____ Somewhat successful _____ Not successful _____

Please explain:

10. *To your knowledge, did the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation, undertaken under the RHESI project, result in the development of an overall (not just horticultural) phytosanitary strategy for Rwanda?*

Yes _____ No _____ I don't know _____

Comments:

11. *In your opinion, to what extent was the RHESI project successful in undertaking a three track study on horticultural market requirements, cost of compliance and cost/benefit analysis for selected export commodities?*

Successful _____ Somewhat successful _____ Not successful _____

Please explain:

12. *To your knowledge, did the RHESI project succeed in developing a reliable horticultural pest list?*

Yes _____ No _____ I don't know _____

Comments:

13. In your opinion, to what extent was the RHESI project successful in developing a national action plan for horticultural SPS standards compliance?

Successful _____ Somewhat successful _____ Not successful _____

Please explain:

14. In your view, which were the most successful activities undertaken under the RHEIS project?

Please specify the most successful activities:

15. In your view, which were the least successful activities undertaken under the RHEIS project?

Please specify the least successful activities:

16. In your view, could further efforts have been made to improve the quality, timeliness and effectiveness of the project?

Yes _____ No _____ I don't know _____

If yes, please explain:

17. In your opinion, was the involvement of stakeholders, such as producers, processors and exporters in the project satisfactory?

Yes _____ No _____ I don't know _____

Please explain:

18. From your perspective, did the project succeed in the establishment of a sustainable institutional horticultural SPS management system?

Yes _____ No _____ I don't know _____

If no, please explain:

19. To your knowledge, has the RHESI project helped Rwanda to increase its access to markets for fruits, vegetables and flowers?

Yes _____ No _____ I don't know _____

If yes, please provide more information:

20. *In your view, was the project design and implementation the most cost-effective way to establish a phytosanitary SPS management system in Rwanda and to improve the countries access to international export markets?*

Yes _____

No _____

I don't know _____

If no, please explain:

21. *To your knowledge, were/are there any follow-up activities undertaken or planned by beneficiaries since the completion of the project?*

Yes _____

No _____

I don't know _____

If yes, please specify:

22. *What are the main lessons from the implementation of the project that will enhance your future work?*

23. *What lessons can be learned from the project that may be of importance to practitioners and development partners and which should be disseminated more broadly?*

24. *Please provide any additional comment:*

Thank you for your kind collaboration














Please return the completed questionnaire via e-mail to:

Ralf LOPIAN WTO/STDF Consultant

E-mail: ralf.lopian@mmm.fi or ralf.lopian@myllylanmylly.inet.fi

The consultant will be visiting Kigali in early January 2012. If you wish to discuss the RHESI project in person please indicate this in your reply.










Analysis of the Completed Questionnaires for Involved Beneficiaries, Government Agencies, Project Partners and Implementers

Question	Answers	Comments
1. To what extent did the RHESI project sensitize you or raise your awareness about SPS issues in relation to trade of horticultural products from Rwanda?	<p>Large extent = 3 </p> <p>Medium extent = 0</p> <p>None at all = 2 </p> <p>N.a. = 2 </p>	Seven questionnaire replies addressed this question. Most of the answers specified that they had previous knowledge about SPS issues. This applied especially in relation to the “None at all” answers.
2. In your opinion, to what extent was the RHESI project successful in promoting the adoption of good practices at processing and farm levels to comply with SPS standards?	<p>Successful = 4 </p> <p>Somewhat successful = 4 </p> <p>Not successful = 0</p>	Eight responses to this question were received. In general comments specified that the training provided was organized in a “train the trainer” approach with no direct training of producers. The reasons specified for a lower success rate were that there have been organizational problems and a lack of time that GAP practises were implemented at a producer level. Some responses, however, specified that more recent developments show that more and more producers adopt and register for GLOBALGAP and or Fairtrade.
3. In your judgement, have RHESI’s activities with regard to the promotion of good practices lead to changes in processing and production at farm levels?	<p>Yes = 7 </p> <p>No = 1 </p> <p>I don’t know = 0</p>	<p>Of the eight answers received with regard to this question most believe that a dissemination of information has led to changes in processing and production, and that this affected especially horticultural crops and fruit production.</p> <p>While one response qualified that the changes were only partially achieved another response clearly stressed that it has not led to changes in processing and production since the trainers did not disseminate their knowledge to processors and producers.</p>
4. From your perspective, to what extent was the RHESI project successful in contributing to the legal/regulatory reform process?	<p>Successful = 4 </p> <p>Somewhat successful = 4 </p> <p>Not successful = 0</p> <p>I don’t know = 0</p>	<p>Of the 8 answers received most were very pleased with the regulatory activities of RHESI in drafting the law on plant health and plant protection products. Unfortunately most respondents indicated that the laws have not been adopted by the Rwandan Parliament, yet.</p> <p>The four responses indicating that RHESI was only somewhat successful in this activity specified that the law on varietal protection of seed and propagation material has not been drafted by RHESI. One response indicated that this law had been drafted indeed, but that political decision makers had decided that it would not be needed.</p>
5. From your perspective, to what extent was the RHESI project successful in establishing a functional institutional set up regarding SPS management?	<p>Successful = 4 </p> <p>Somewhat successful = 4 </p> <p>Not successful = 0</p>	<p>In general the eight responses to this question highlighted the value of RHESI in promoting Rwanda’s adherence to the IPPC and in establishing a National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) as required by the IPPC.</p> <p>Responses indicating that this activity was only somewhat successful focussed mainly on the fact that the SPS Coordination committee although proposed in the law had not really been implemented or did not function properly.</p> <p>One response specified that the idea to set up a Biosafety working group has not to been well adopted by the parties involved.</p>
6. In your opinion, to what extent was the RHESI project successful in delivering targeted training in plant health and pesticide management?	<p>Successful = 8 </p> <p>Somewhat successful = 0</p> <p>Not successful = 0</p>	All eight responses indicated that the RHESI project successfully delivered training in plant health and pesticide management. One response qualified that plant health outweighed the pesticide management training.
7. In your opinion, to what extent was the	<p>Successful = 7 </p>	Overall the eight responses were very positive

EX-POST EVALUATION OF PROJECT STDF 145: “RWANDA HORTICULTURE EXPORT STANDARDS INITIATIVE (RHESI)”

<p><i>RHESI project successful in strengthening Rwanda’s IPPC focal point?</i></p>	<p><i>Somewhat successful</i> = 1  <i>Not successful</i> = 0</p>	<p>about the strengthening of the IPPC focal point in Rwanda. Only one response qualified the success of the project in this regard by pointing out that the process has started but was not completed due to a short project lifetime.</p>
<p><i>8. To your knowledge, did the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation, undertaken under the RHESI project, result in the development of an overall (not just horticultural) phytosanitary strategy for Rwanda?</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i> = 5  <i>No</i> = 1  <i>I don’t know</i> = 2 </p>	<p>Of the eight responses received most indicated that the project was successful in developing an overall phytosanitary strategy for Rwanda. It was pointed out that activities in relation to surveillance and Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) are horizontal activities and not limited to horticulture. One response criticized that the recommendations contained in the horticultural action plan (biosafety structure) were not adopted.</p>
<p><i>9. In your opinion, to what extent was the RHESI project successful in undertaking a three track study on horticultural market requirements, cost of compliance and cost/benefit analysis for selected export commodities?</i></p>	<p><i>Successful</i> = 1  <i>Somewhat successful</i> = 5  <i>Not successful</i> = 0 <i>I don’t know</i> = 2 </p>	<p>Of the eight responses received only one did indicate that RHESI successfully undertook a three track study. Most responses did indicate that the project was somewhat successful. One comment specified that this activity may have been the “weak link” in the activities of the project, especially since macro economical circumstances (credit crisis) made export activities very difficult.</p> <p>One response indicated that to a large degree this activity has not been carried out, Another comment received indicated that the stakeholder involvement had not been good.</p>
<p><i>10. To your knowledge, did the RHESI project succeed in developing a reliable horticultural pest list?</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i> = 7  <i>No</i> = 1  <i>I don’t know</i> = 0</p>	<p>The majority of responses indicated that RHESI had been successful in developing a pest list database for Rwanda. The question of the completeness of this pest list was, however, discussed. Two of the YES answers qualified that the work done by RHESI was incomplete. One questionnaire answer clearly indicated that RHESI was not successful because it didn’t complete the activity.</p> <p>Several comments were made to the effect that pest lists cannot be complete because they have to be regularly up-dated based on surveillance.</p>
<p><i>11. In your opinion, to what extent was the RHESI project successful in developing a national action plan for horticultural SPS standards compliance?</i></p>	<p><i>Successful</i> = 7  <i>Somewhat successful</i> = 1  <i>Not successful</i> = 0</p>	<p>In general most of the participants believed that the project was very successful in developing a national action plan and that this action plan was implemented and is still implemented by NAEB.</p> <p>Only one response qualified the activity as somewhat successful without giving specifications.</p>
<p><i>12. In your view, which where the most successful activities undertaken under the RHESI project?</i></p>	<p><i>Regulatory Reform</i> = 6  <i>Training Activities</i> = 6  <i>NPPO establishment</i> = 4  <i>Pest list development</i> = 3  <i>IPPC membership</i> = 2  <i>Raising SPS Awareness</i> = 2  <i>SPS Hortic. Action Plan</i> = 1  <i>SPS management Structure</i> = 1 </p>	<p>Multiple nominations possible.</p>
<p><i>13. In your view, which where the least successful activities undertaken under the RHESI project?</i></p>	<p><i>Private sector involvement & training</i> = 4  <i>Cost/benefit analysis for standard impl.</i> = 1  <i>Biosecurity structure</i> = 1  <i>Pesticide legislation</i> = 1  <i>None at all</i> = 1 </p>	<p>Multiple nominations possible.</p>
<p><i>14. In your view, could further efforts have been made to improve the quality, timeliness and effectiveness of the project?</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i> = 5  <i>No</i> = 1  <i>I don’t know</i> = 1 </p>	<p>Seven replies were received to this question. Five of the responses indicated that further efforts could have been made to improve the quality, timeliness and effectiveness of the project. Three of these five answers referred to</p>

EX-POST EVALUATION OF PROJECT STDF 145: “RWANDA HORTICULTURE EXPORT STANDARDS INITIATIVE (RHESI)

		<p>the possibility of a project time extension. It was thought that project duration of 3-4 years would have improved the project quality and follow-up considerably including assisting in the implementation of regulatory activities. One of these five “yes” answers specified that the activities were not in time and that some activities were not concluded, such as training of farmers, pest listing and seed legislation. One comment specified that the project should have been prepared better to reflect realities and through a pre-project study. More time to do all activities required (flexible in implementation time) should have been allocated and the private stakeholder participation improved (ask the farmers what they need really and help them accomplish what they need).</p>
<p>15. In your opinion, was the involvement of stakeholders, such as producers, processors and exporters in the project satisfactory?</p>	<p>Yes = 7 </p> <p>No = 1 </p> <p>I don't know = 0</p>	<p>It is interesting that seven of the eight answers to this question judge the stakeholder participation as satisfactory. Especially, since in the answers to question 13 (least successful activities) stakeholder involvement was overwhelmingly chosen as the least successful activity of the project.</p>
<p>16. From your perspective, did the project succeed in the establishment of a sustainable institutional horticultural SPS management system?</p>	<p>Yes = 7 </p> <p>No = 0</p> <p>I don't know = 0</p>	<p>All seven responses given believed that the project succeeded in establishing a sustainable institutional SPS management system. One comment, however, questioned the sustainability with the information that RHESI trained personnel was sidelined after the conclusion of RHESI.</p>
<p>17. To your knowledge, has the RHESI project helped Rwanda to increase its access to markets for fruits, vegetables and flowers?</p>	<p>Yes = 3 </p> <p>No = 4 </p> <p>I don't know = 0</p>	<p>A majority of the seven answers given specified that the project had not increased the market access of Rwandan horticultural products. It was however, admitted that the are long-term aspects and that the RHESI activities may bear fruits at later stages. One of the answers provided specified that the export of cassava flour was facilitated through the project.</p>
<p>18. In your view, was the project design and implementation the most cost-effective way to establish a phytosanitary SPS management system in Rwanda and to improve the countries access to international export markets?</p>	<p>Yes = 7 </p> <p>No = 0</p> <p>I don't know = 1 </p>	<p>The answers specified that it would have been highly unlikely that such steps forward could have happened on their own, without some level of external investment like this. Furthermore it was specified that the time-frame of the project could have been longer to assist with the implementation of the several activities.</p>
<p>19. To your knowledge, were/are there any follow-up activities undertaken or planned by beneficiaries since the completion of the project?</p>	<p>Yes = 5 </p> <p>No = 0</p> <p>I don't know = 2 </p>	<p>Follow-up activities mentioned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of action plan • The focal point meets regularly and exchanges information regularly. • Phytoregulation continues • Pest list development continues • Establishment of a phyto laboratory <p>Follow up made by Rwanda Agriculture Development Board</p>
<p>20. What are the main lessons from the implementation of the project that will enhance your future work?</p>	<p>Knowledge about international plant health; SPS; IPPC</p> <p>Such projects should have a 3-4 year duration instead of 2 years.</p> <p>A country like Rwanda can develop itself to an export oriented country with the necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>Promoting exports without SPS is not possible</p> <p>Knowledge of standards and cooperation with other institutions for coordination</p> <p>Cross-cutting collaboration between agencies</p>	<p>Six answers were given to this question.</p>

EX-POST EVALUATION OF PROJECT STDF 145: “RWANDA HORTICULTURE EXPORT STANDARDS INITIATIVE (RHESI)”

<p>21. What lessons can be learned from the project that may be of importance to practitioners and development partners and which should be disseminated more broadly?</p>	<p>The need to comply with SPS standards. The way how international standards impact on export activities and production methods. To consider stakeholders views</p>	<p>Three answers were given.</p>
<p>22. Other comments</p>	<p>Training courses were well organized with highly skilled trainers. There should be a similar project to build up on the RHESI achievements. The training courses were generally well organized. The language was not a problem.</p>	<p>Two answers were given.</p>