

**TERMINAL REPORT**

(MAY 1997 – DECEMBER 2000)

FAO/AusAID/UNDP/SPC  
Project RAS/97/331 on:

**REGIONAL MANAGEMENT OF FRUIT FLIES  
IN THE PACIFIC****Part 5: PROJECT ASSESSMENT****PART I: NUMERICAL RATING**

Rate the relevance and performance of the programme or project using the following scale:

1 - Highly satisfactory

2 – Satisfactory

3 – Unsatisfactory, with some positive elements

4 - Unsatisfactory

X - Not applicable

Place your answers in the column that corresponds to your role in the programme or project.

<b>SUBSTANTIVE FOCUS</b>	<b>Target group (s)</b>	<b>Programme or project manager</b>	<b>Government</b>	<b>UN DP</b>
<b>A. RELEVANCE</b>				
1. How relevant is the programme or project to the development priorities of the country?		<b>1</b>	<b>1</b> Identified as a priority by PHALPS <sup>1</sup> and RTMPP <sup>2</sup>	
2. How relevant is the programme or project to the promotion of sustainable human development? Indicate your rating on the thematic focus which the programme or project was designed to address.				
Poverty eradication and sustainable livelihoods		<b>1</b>		
Protection and regeneration of the environment		<b>1</b>		
Gender in development		<b>2</b>		
Promoting an enabling environment for SHD, including governance		<b>2</b>		

<p>3. How relevant is the programme or project to the promotion of sustainable human development? Indicate your rating on the thematic focus which the programme or project was designed to address.</p> <p>Poverty eradication and sustainable livelihoods</p> <p>Protection and regeneration of the environment</p> <p>Gender in development</p> <p>Promoting an enabling environment for SHD, including governance</p>		<p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>2</b></p>		
<p>4. To what extent are appropriate beneficiary groups being targeted by the programme or project, based on the following considerations?</p> <p>(a) Gender</p> <p>(b) Socio-economic factors</p> <p>(c) Geographic location</p>		<p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>1 (c.f. McGregor, 1997, 2000)</b></p> <p><b>1 (all 22 PICTs in project)</b></p>		
<p>5. Given the objectives of the programme or project, are the appropriate institutions being assisted?</p>		<p><b>1</b></p>		

PHALPS: Permanent Heads of Agriculture and Livestock Production Services

RTMPP: Regional Technical Meeting on Plant Protection

PICTs: Pacific Island Countries and Territories

<b>B. PERFORMANCE</b>				
1. Using the following indicators, rate the contribution of the outputs to the achievement of the immediate objectives: <sup>a/</sup>				
<b>OBJECTIVE 1: To overcome constraints on production and export of fresh fruits and vegetables in FSM, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu caused by the presence of damaging fruit fly species.</b>				
User friendly database containing information on species, host range, seasonal abundances, geographic distributions, parasitoids lodged with SPC, FAO and the countries;		<b>1</b>		
Increased confidence in discussing quarantine issues related to fruit fly host commodities with trading partners;		<b>1</b>		
Operational quarantine surveillance system (early warning system) for introductions of exotic fruit fly species, funded by Governments;		<b>1 (Vanuatu) 3 (SI, FSM)</b>		
Improved preparedness to cope with outbreaks of exotic fruit fly species;		<b>1</b>		
ERP agreed to and financially supported (or at least in part) by Governments;		<b>1 (Vanuatu) 2 (SI, FSM)</b>		
Techniques for area control of fruit fly, resulting in increased production of fresh fruits and vegetables;		<b>1 (Vanuatu) 3 (SI, FSM)</b>		
Biological control agents established in Solomon Islands and FSM as part of integrated pest management;		<b>1</b>		
Data on heat tolerances of immature stages of 4-5 species of fruit flies, resulting in a secure quarantine treatment based on forced hot air;		<b>1 (Vanuatu) 4 (SI, FSM)</b>		
Removal of constraints on export markets for squash, pineapple, limes, Yapese lemon, and other fruits; and		<b>1 (Vanuatu) 3 (SI, FSM)</b>		
Increased technical capacity of national staff on fruit fly identification, control techniques and quarantine treatment development in FSM, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.		<b>1 (Vanuatu) 2 (SI, FSM)</b>		

<b>OBJECTIVE 2: To improve substantially the quarantine preparedness of PICTs to cope with inevitable outbreaks of exotic fruit flies regionally.</b>				
Permanent operational quarantine surveillance systems for fruit flies on a regional basis, funded by the Governments;		<b>1</b>		
Increased capacity to respond to outbreaks of an exotic fruit fly species, including ERPs accepted by Governments and ready accessibility to supplies required to run eradication programmes;		<b>2</b>		
Successful eradication of Oriental fruit fly and melon fly from Nauru, together with an upgraded quarantine capability in Nauru;		<b>1</b>		
Greater awareness by the public and private sectors of the problems caused by fruit flies to production, trade, and the livelihood of people;		<b>1-2</b>		
Pacific Fruit Fly Database lodged at SPC and covering data on fruit flies in all PICTs.		<b>1-2</b>		

<b>OBJECTIVE 3: To enhance the production and export of fresh fruits and vegetables regionally in order to increase farmers' incomes and to assist in providing food security, particularly in those countries not included in the previous fruit fly projects</b>				
Report on the benefits of the adoption of field control techniques on the production of fresh fruits and vegetables at all levels of production.		<b>1</b>		
Staff from about 21 PICTs participating in monthly sessions of PEACESAT 'FLYNET';		<b>5</b>		
Manual on Fruit Flies in the Pacific completed;		<b>3</b>		
Improved information transfer on fruit flies and their control to Governments and the private sector at all levels, through producing advisory leaflets, publishing scientific papers and transferring technology via sub-regional workshops;		<b>1</b>		
Home Page for Internet on the project and fruit flies;		<b>1</b>		
Reduced losses to fruits and vegetables caused by fruit flies by adoption of an integrated pest management approach;		<b>1-3</b> (varies with countries)		
Local protein source available for protein bait spraying by modifying waste yeast from breweries in Fiji, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, PNG and other countries;		<b>1</b> (Vanuatu) <b>3</b> (others)		
Database on the heat tolerances of immature stages of at least 10 species of fruit flies in the PICTs.		<b>2-3</b> (varies with countries)		

<b>OBJECTIVE 4: In cooperation with ACIAR, to develop a separate multi-disciplinary fruit fly programme to address the enormous risk of fruit fly spread through and from PNG into the rest of the region.</b>				
Recruitment of Junior Scientific Officers to execute the Project;		<b>1</b>		
Increased knowledge on the species of fruit flies present in PNG, including the eastern islands, and their biology and ecology;		<b>1</b>		
Suitable laboratories in Bubia and Kerevat for fruit fly activities;		<b>1</b>		
Adoption of the protein bait spray technology by farmers;		<b>2</b>		
Established laboratory colonies of major fruit fly species;		<b>2</b>		
Initiation of the generation of heat tolerance data;		<b>3</b>		
Completion of biological studies on life cycles and rate of development of fruit flies on artificial diets;		<b>3</b>		
Staff who have received intensive training on fruit fly identification, fruit fly surveillance, laboratory rearing, field control methods, and generation of data on heat tolerance;		<b>1</b>		
Production of a video on the fruit fly problem in the Pacific, posters for ports of entry, and other materials to increase public awareness of the fruit fly problem.		<b>2-3</b>		

<b>OBJECTIVE 5: To ensure sustainable technical capacity for coordination of future activities on fruit flies within the Region.</b>				
Entomologist (Fruit Flies) to be trained for regional coordination of fruit fly activities appointed into the SPC Plant Protection Service;		<b>1</b>		
Approval for core funding for this position;		<b>2</b>		
Awarding of two post-graduate scholarships for a Masters Degree, on a cost-sharing basis, during the next three years to national plant protection staff based on merit and contribution to the project.		<b>2-3</b>		

<b>OBJECTIVE 6: To promote private sector involvement in sustaining quarantine surveillance and research into fruit fly control and quarantine treatments for commodities destined for export.</b>				
System for using industry funds provided by a levy on exportable commodities to support quarantine surveillance and research (Applicable only to countries that export fresh commodities);		<b>2-3</b>		
Private sector and Government advisory group to identify high priority fruit fly activities for funding.		<b>2</b>		

2. Rate the production of target outputs.		<b>1-2</b>		
---	--	------------	--	--

3. Are the management arrangements of the programme or project appropriate?		<b>1</b> steering committees and JSOs		
---	--	--	--	--

4. Are programme or project resources (financial, physical and manpower) adequate in terms of: a) Quality? b) Quantity?		<b>1-2</b> Some countries don't have sufficient staff ; many have dual responsibilities with other projects <b>2</b> eg. 41 staff from 19 PICTs and SPC have received training in eradication techniques in Nauru		
---	--	--	--	--

5. Are programme or project resources being used efficiently to produce planned results?		<b>2</b>		
--	--	----------	--	--

6. Is the programme or project cost-effective compared to similar interventions?		<b>1</b>		
--	--	----------	--	--

7. Based on its work plan, how would you rate the timeliness of the programme or project in terms of: a) Production of outputs and initial results? b) Inputs delivery?		<b>2</b> <b>2-3</b>		
---	--	------------------------	--	--

Please indicate your overall rating of the programme or project:

	<b>Target group(s)</b>	<b>Programme or project manager</b>	<b>Government</b>	<b>UNDP</b>
<b>OVERALL RATING OF THE PROGRAMME OR PROJECT</b>		<b>1-2</b> refer to progress report		

Explain the basis of your rating, which need not be limited to, or which may be different from, the relevance and performance criteria rated above. For the last year of the programme or project, the overall rating should include an assessment of the potential success of the programme or project as well as its relevance and performance.

A detailed assessment of the results and impact of the Project are presented in annex in the Technical Report and the progress reports of achievements against objectives. Overall, the Project has delivered satisfactorily most of its objectives. Only the programmes in Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands are somewhat behind schedule. The reasons are the uncontrollable delays in initiating activities in PNG and the Parallel Project implemented by ACIAR. In Solomon Islands, activities have been scaled down to essential duties because of the political crisis, but there have not been plans to stop project involvement in the country.

## **PART II: TEXTUAL ASSESSMENT**

1. What are the major achievements of the programme or project *vis-à-vis* the expected results? Please explain them in detail in terms of potential impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development.

These are covered in the final report presented separately.

2. What factors affected the achievement of programme or project results?

Positive factors: Fruit flies are regarded by most PICTs as top priority agricultural pests to be managed in the Pacific. This has been confirmed during regional meetings of PHALPS [Permanent Heads of Agriculture and Livestock Production] and RTMPP [Regional Technical Meeting on Plant Protection], and by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.

Negative factors: The programme component in Papua New Guinea was very slow in getting started, compared to other countries, even though the United Nations Volunteers was already in place in August 1997. This was caused by delays in recruitment of national counterpart staff (Junior Scientific Officers funded by RMFFP): the JSOs based in East New Britain and in Morobe did not start until April 1998 while the one based in Port Moresby started only in June 1999. These delays in initiating the program reflect in significant portion of unspent funds in the budget. Furthermore, the parallel project in PNG, executed by Griffith University under ACIAR, scheduled to start at the same time as RMFFP, did not start until late 1998.

The deteriorating political situation in Solomon Islands affected considerably the implementation of the Project. All equipment and staff eventually had to be moved away from Dodo Creek Research Station and relocated to a temporary small facility in Honiara. The national counterpart entomologist notified his resignation and the United Nations Volunteer was pulled out of the country and relocated to Fiji Is in May 2000. The programme is now maintained at a minimum level by a casual labourer and a part-time consultant entomologist on a retainer fund who looks after project activities coordination. Activities are maintained to a minimum level. The breakdown of quarantine surveillance resulting from the crisis and massive relocation of staff by Solomon Is government is a great quarantine concern to other PICTs.

The low level of funding contribution to fruit fly activities by national governments due to limited resources or political instability (such as recent crisis in Fiji Islands) is also a negative factor that can potentially affect long term sustainability of the national execution of the Project.

3. What lessons (both positive and negative) can be drawn from the experience of the programme or project?
  - a) It is essential to obtain assurance of national and regional priority from governments and regional organisations, such as SPC and Pacific Forum.
  - b) Fruit fly project must occupy a high priority in National development plans, as directly relating to increased food security, increased farmer's incomes from sustainable agriculture, development of export markets, reduced insecticide usage, etc.
  - c) The Project must provide improved technical and management capacity, with high prospect of sustainability, such as the use of National Junior Scientific Officers and placement or attachment training as done in Nauru.
  - d) The Project must target grass roots with simple, sustainable technology.
  - e) National feeling of project ownership is necessary for sustainability.

- f) The use of Steering Committee system is appropriate as a method of management and guidance, to encourage communication, and enhance regional and national ownership of the Project.
  - g) The close collaboration and linkages with overseas institutions, groups and private sector allowed access to the best fruit fly expertise in the world, such as at Griffith University, USDA Pacific Basin Agriculture Research Centre, Aventis CropScience.
  - h) The value of carrying out benefit:cost or economic impact studies to demonstrate the value of donor organisations funds spent for beneficiary countries. McGregor (2000) has concluded that a 19% return on investment has been achieved by RMFFP.
  - i) The need to maintain flexibility in project activities and a capacity to respond quickly to countries needs.
  - j) The value in having independent technical organisations, such as FAO, involved.
  - k) The use of multi-donnors to ensure funding availability and flexibility.
4. What are the views of the target groups with regard to the programme or project? Please note any significant gender-based differences in their views.

In general the target groups (PICTs Departments of Agriculture and divisions or institutions responsible for Research and Quarantine) are quite satisfied with the implementation and impact of the Project. The regular Steering Committee meetings and the mid-term review have allowed them to get together almost every year to express their views on the Project priorities and emit recommendations, which are included in annex. The overall views will be included in the TPR report that will be compiled as a result of the terminal Review and reflected in the Report from the Fourth Steering Committee Meeting.

5. If the programme or project has been evaluated, what is the implementation status of the recommendations made by the evaluators?

Most recommendations from the three Steering Committee meetings and the Mid-term Review (October 1998) have been at least partly implemented. Recommendations and notes on their implementation are included in annex.

6. What activities or steps do you recommend as follow-up to the project?

- a) While the activities appear to be embedded into SPC Plant Protection service, it is imperative that a high level of flexibility and responsiveness needs to be maintained.
- b) The fruit fly activities need to be treated like Forestry, where SPC has considered a post in SPC core funding. A core position should be identified to give some assurance of sustainability as has been stated in all project documents since 1990.
- c) Activities need to focus on field activities and not become too much office-bound. The major activities must centre on national quarantine surveillance, eradication programmes, demonstrations and encouraging adoption of bagging and protein bait spray control technology, expanding emergency response planning, and developing quarantine treatments.
- d) It is essential to maintain the high quality PACIFLY web site with regular updates through a technical review committee.
- e) Continue to use the steering committee system, run back-to-back with other SPC regional meetings to save on cost.
- f) Progressively publish Status Reports on fruit flies in all PICTs.
- g) Re-establishment of quarantine surveillance in Western Province of Solomon Islands is a very high priority. Early warning systems for rapidly expanding Asian Papaya fruit fly and banana fly are essential for Solomon Islands and all PICTs.
- h) Demonstration of protein bait spraying technology using locally available protein (Tonga, Vanuatu and possibly PNG, Fiji Islands and Samoa) or imported bait in combination with Fipronil powder that forms a gel to improve adherence to foliage.
- i) Need to expand the male annihilation technique (MAT), especially on small islands, to reduce or eradicate fruit flies to increase food security.
- j) Continuation of pressure on Nauru government to completely implement the Agricultural Quarantine Service.

7. Provide any other information that may further support or clarify your assessment of the programme or project. You may include annexes as you deem necessary.

The Terminal Report that covers overall activities and achievements of the Project is being compiled and will be presented at the combined Fourth Steering Committee Meeting and Terminal Review, on November 21<sup>st</sup>. With extra input by the Committee during the meeting, a final version of the report will be produced and sent to all PICTs and to funding organisations in early December. For now, you can consult the Project WEB site on the internet for a good overview of the Project: <http://www.pacify.org> .

**For target groups:**

Name:

Title:

Signature:

Date:

**For the programme or project management:**

Name:

Title:

Signature:

Date:

**For the government:**

Name:

Title:

Signature:

Date:

**For UNDP:**

Name:

Title:

Signature:

Date: