

National SPS planning

The project aimed to develop a methodology to identify SPS challenges in the agricultural sector and to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the range of capacity building options open to developing countries. This framework was applied to Peru and Uganda to support the development of their national SPS action plans.

STDF/PG/020

Status

Completed

Start Date

01/11/2004

End Date

01/03/2007

Project Value (US\$)

\$170,862

STDF Contribution (US\$)

\$170,862

Beneficiaries

Peru

Uganda

Implementing Entities

Agra CEAS Consulting

Background

Developing and least developed countries face a number of SPS challenges to export agro-food products. To unlock export opportunities, the project built a tool for developing countries to use in SPS capacity building planning.

Results

The first phase of the project designed a methodology to evaluate SPS capacity at national level. This included steps on prioritizing products ahead of a cost benefit analysis. The methodology looked at SPS capacity challenges, needs and opportunities at national level across food safety, animal and plant health.

The second phase of the project tested the methodology in two pilot countries. In Uganda, the findings showed fish had the greatest potential in terms of export expansion. In Peru, meanwhile, upgrading asparagus for export was found to have a positive potential spill over effect.

As a result of the project, Peru developed a National Action Plan with active stakeholder engagement from the National Codex Committee and the private sector. Together with workshops nationwide, a report on outstanding SPS priority needs was produced. Technical assistance to facilitate market access for specific products was identified to be taken forward under Aid for Trade activities.

Recommendations

Alongside the cost-benefit methodology, other methods such as cost-effectiveness or multiple criteria decision analysis should be explored. In the case of Peru, the cost-benefit analysis was recommended as a way to prioritize between products for example, rather than between SPS capacity building investments.

