WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

G/SPS/GEN/872
10 September 2008

(08-4247)

Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures Original: English

SPS/STDF/OECD WORKSHOP ON GOOD PRACTICE IN SPS-RELATED TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Background research has been funded by the STDF for consideration at the workshop on good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation, which is being organized jointly by the SPS Committee, Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), in Geneva on 6 October 2008.

The STDF research is based on replies from WTO Members and OECD Development Assistance Committee Contact Points to the request for information on good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation, circulated to the SPS Committee in document G/SPS/GEN/816 and G/SPS/GEN/816/Add.1. In this information request, Members were asked to identify one or more SPS-related technical assistance projects which could be considered as examples of good practice in one or more of the following regions: Central America, East Africa and the Greater Mekong Delta Sub-region.[1]. A total of 24 projects were nominated by 19 organizations in response to this request.

In-depth research has been undertaken on the projects nominated as examples of good practice in response to G/SPS/GEN/816 by a team of three consultants: Mr Jason Hafmeister, Mr Spencer Henson and Mr Cornelis van der Meer.

Attached is the report of Mr Kees van der Meer. This report examines the projects submitted as examples of good practice in the Greater Mekong Sub-region.

This report has been prepared under the consultant's own responsibility and is without prejudice to the WTO Secretariat, the positions of Members or to their rights or obligations under the WTO.

[1] The following countries were included in the research: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama for Central America; Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda for East Africa; and Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam for the Greater Mekong Delta Sub-region.

Good Practice in SPS-related Technical Cooperation

Greater Mekong Sub-region: Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam

Research work for the Standards and Trade Development Facility

Kees van der Meer
Laura L. Ignacio

September 2008

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AFTA	ASEAN Free Trade Area
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BOA	Board of Accreditation, Viet Nam
CARD	Collaboration for Agriculture and Rural Development, Viet Nam
CLV	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Viet Nam
CLMV	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Viet Nam
CSF	Classical Swine Fever
DAFF	Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DISM	Department of Intellectual Property, Standardization and Metrology, Lao PDR
DOLF	Department of Livestock and Fisheries
EC	European Commission
EP	Enquiry Point
ETV2	European Technical Assistance Programme for Viet Nam (2nd programme)
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FDD	Food and Drug Department
FDQCC	Food and Drug Quality Control Center
FIBOZOPA	Fishborne zoonotic parasites
FMD	Foot and mouth disease
FSPS	Fisheries Sector Programme Support
FZP	Fishborne zoonotic parasites
GAP	Good agricultural practice
GHP	Good hygienic practice
GMP	Good manufacturing practice
GMS	Greater Mekong Subregion, which includes Cambodia, China (Yunnan Province and Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region), Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points
HPAI	Highly pathogenic avian influenza
IF	Integrated Framework for Trade-Related Technical Assistance to Least Developed Countries
ISC	Department Standardization Organization
ISO	International Standardization Organization
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
Lao PDR	Lao People's Democratic Republic
MAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Lao PDR
MARD	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
MIME	Ministry of Industry, Mine and Energy, Cambodia
MOH	Ministry of Health
MOST	Ministry of Science and Technology, Viet Nam
NAHC	National Animal Health Center
MUTRAP	Multilateral trade assistance project
NAFIQAD	National Agro-Forestry and Fisheries Quality Assurance Department
NAFIQAVED	National Fisheries Quality Assurance and Veterinary Directorate
NCD	Newcastle disease
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NSTA	National Science and Technology Authority
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OIE	World Organisation for Animal Health

PCB	Phytosanitary capacity building
PPC	Plant Protection Centre, Lao PDR
PQ	Plant Quarantine
PQD	Plant Quarantine Division
PRA	Pest risk assessment
PRRS	Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome
QUATEST	Quality Assurance and Testing Centre
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
RIA	Research Institute of Aquaculture
RPS	Regional partnerships scheme
SEAFMD	Southeast Asian Foot and Mouth Disease Control Programme
SECO	State Secretariat for Economic Affairs, Switzerland
SEDP	Socio-Economic Development Plan
SMTQ	Standards, metrology, testing and quality
SPS	Sanitary and phytosanitary
SPSCBP	The Sanitary and Phytosanitary Capacity Building Program
STAMEQ	Directorate for Standards, Metrology and Quality
STDF	Standards and Trade Development Facility
TA	Technical assistance
TAD	Transboundary animal disease
TBT	Technical barriers to trade
TCP	Technical Cooperation Project
TDF	Trade Development Facility
UNCTAD	United Nations Committee on Trade and Development
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
VINALIVESCO	Viet Nam National Livestock Corporation
VCCI	Viet Nam Chamber of Commerce and Industry
VMI	Viet Nam Metrology Institute
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization

Currencies

1 US Dollar (US$) = AUS$ 1.1343
AUS$ 1 = US$ 0.8816

1 US Dollar (US$) = € 0.6793
€ 1 = US$ 1.472

1 US Dollar (US$) = ¥114
¥ 1 = US$ 0.00877

1 US Dollar (US$) = DKK 5.0753
DKK 1 = US$ 0.197

Note: Exchange rates as of end of 2007.
Source: IMF International Financial Statistics

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This research work seeks to identify good practice in the delivery and receipt of SPS-related technical cooperation in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS) countries of Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam. The research has been funded by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) as part of its collaboration with the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) on the monitoring of Aid for Trade.

SPS assistance and development cooperation

SPS capacity building is a relatively new area of development cooperation. There is a need to learn from experiences and move towards consensus about what works and what constitutes good practice. There are as yet no specific global evaluations of SPS assistance. However, recent evaluations of trade-facilitation projects, as well as of technical assistance projects focused on food safety, and animal and plant health, have findings relevant to assistance in the area of SPS.

The quality and relevance of technical assistance (TA) for SPS capacity building could benefit from better use of general frameworks on goals and effectiveness of development cooperation, especially the:

- *UN Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (2000)*
- *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and*
- *OECD analysis of trade related assistance (2007)*

SPS capacity building can significantly contribute to MDGs. By increasing capacity for plant and animal health and food safety, SPS assistance can increase income from productive employment thereby contributing to the reduction of poverty and hunger (MDG1). Improved food safety in developing countries contributes to reduced child mortality (MDG4), and incidence of major diseases (MDG6). Assisting developing economies to meet international SPS requirements and increase exports of food and agricultural products to markets in developed countries contributes to the goal of further developing an open trading system that is rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory (MDG8).

Methodology

A survey questionnaire, developed jointly by the STDF and OECD Secretariat, was distributed to WTO member countries and OECD Development Assistance Committee contact points in January 2008. They were asked to nominate projects that they considered as examples of good practice and to provide information on aspects of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

Projects

Ten projects were nominated as examples of good practice in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (see Table 1 below). The topics covered important areas of SPS, notably food safety, plant and animal health, SPS Enquiry Points and standards, metrology, testing and quality (SMTQ) aspects. In some of these projects, SPS issues were one of a number of issues addressed. For MUTRAP II and the SMTQ projects, the SPS issues are smaller components of broader projects. The FIBOZOPA addresses domestic public health concerns and not market access issues. The training course on thermal treatment of fruit flies nominated by JICA was a component of a bigger technical cooperation project (TCP) on disinfestation techniques for fruit flies in dragon fruit and the whole TCP was included as well.

Three of the ten projects (SPSCBP, SEAFMD and NORAD-UNIDO) are regional in character. Viet Nam was a beneficiary of eight of the ten projects. Cambodia participated in three regional projects and had two stand alone projects. Lao PDR participated in the three regional projects.

Of the ten projects nominated in response to the survey, six were selected (Projects 1-6 in Table 1 below) for more in-depth research. Further information was gathered from interviews with donors, implementing agencies and beneficiaries in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam.

Table 1. Projects nominated as examples of good practice in response to the WTO/OECD survey

1. Market Access and Trade Facilitation Support for Mekong Delta Countries through Strengthening Institutional and National Capacities Related to SMTQ Phase I by NORAD and UNIDO *SMTQ project for Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam*
2. Market Access Support for Viet Nam Through the Strengthening of Capacities Related to Metrology, Testing and Conformity by SECO and UNIDO *SMTQ project for Viet Nam*
3. Southeast Asia Foot and Mouth Disease (SEAFMD) by AusAID and OIE *Animal health project for Southeast Asian countries*
4. Multilateral Trade Assistance Project Viet Nam II (MUTRAP II) by EC *Project on WTO Accession and SPS/TBT Agreement for Viet Nam*
5. Fish-borne Zoonotic Parasites (FIBOZOPA) by DANIDA *Food safety project for Viet Nam*
6. Plant Quarantine II–Thermal Treatment for the Disinfestation of Fruit Flies by JICA *Plant health project for Viet Nam*
7. Sanitary and Phytosanitary Capacity Building Programme (SPSCBP) by AusAID *Project with plant health and animal health components for ASEAN countries*
8. Zoonotic and Animal Diseases Affecting Trade in Viet Nam by SECO *Animal health and food safety project for Viet Nam*
9. Follow up to Regional Laboratory Diagnostic Workshop by USDA *Animal health project for Cambodia*
10. Costs of Agri-food Safety and SPS Compliance by UNCTAD *General SPS project for Cambodia*

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816

Absorptive capacity

The absorptive capacity of a country is a major factor in the successful implementation of SPS capacity building projects and most often explains the differences in outcomes among countries for a regional project—a project may work well for one country but may have weaker impacts on another country with less absorptive capacity. Smaller countries have difficulty in mobilizing sufficient critical mass of financial and human resources for specialized institutions and specialist tasks that are needed for SPS management. Human resource constraints often include skills for policy analysis and management. With increased economic development some of these constraints can be overcome. However, some factors affecting absorptive capacity, such as governance and institutional arrangements, can only be changed in the long-term. Thus, good practice should be understood in the context of a country's absorptive capacity. The main conclusion arising is that a country's absorptive capacity should be adequately considered in project design and implementation.

Project design

Sufficient time should be available for thorough preparation, which includes broad participation, needs assessment and transparency. Preparation for SPS projects requires, first of all, needs assessment that caters to a broader public perspective than the interest of government agencies and specific private enterprises/sectors which may be the immediate focus of the project.

A good project design affects the ease with which the project is implemented. An important attribute for a project is a good logical framework. This facilitates subsequent monitoring and evaluation given the set outputs, activities and indicators. The size and time frame of the projects should depend on the complexity of the issues involved. Generally, SPS capacity building in developing countries, particularly if it involves laboratories, legal frameworks and institutions, is a long-term process which requires much dialogue, policy development, legal and institutional adjustments, technical training and continued funding. Finally, for most projects, implementation is still undertaken by donors, international agencies and consultants rather than by recipients due to limited management and technical skills in the receiving agencies, pressure to spend money quickly, or fear for inappropriate use of resources. The good practice conclusions arising include:

- Thorough preparation that includes consultation with beneficiaries and counterparts to clarify roles and responsibilities and to prepare for execution by the recipient.
- Needs assessments should take a broader public perspective (MDGs) than the interest of services and private enterprises served.
- Assessment of relevance is an important aspect of needs assessment.
- Beneficiaries should be involved in project design.
- Ensure transparency in project preparation.
- Incorporating a log frame at the project design phase enhances results-based management in implementation of SPS capacity building projects, and supports monitoring and evaluation.
- Project design with balanced input of expertise in development assistance, project management and technical expertise.
- The size, scope and duration of a project should be sufficiently tailored to the complexity of the problems to be solved.
- Ensure donor coordination.
- Projects should be implemented by national authorities, where possible, to promote ownership and learning.

Project implementation

During the implementation phase of a project, important parameters of good practice are flexibility, transparency, monitoring and evaluation, integration of training and provision of equipment, and the provision of training on management. In most of the nominated projects, adjustments were made in either the budget or time frame to accomplish the set objectives. For projects involving laboratory skills, a key parameter is the interlinked approach of providing equipment together with training and institution building. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is important for accountability, transparency, feed back on management and ongoing learning. The good practice lessons arising include:

- Allow for flexibility in project implementation.

- Promote transparency about important decisions and budget allocations and create effective mechanisms for communication with stakeholders.
- Active involvement of stakeholders, in particular the private sector is crucial for project effectiveness and sustainability.
- Combine support for training, institution building and provision of equipment in integrated hands-on projects.
- Incorporating a system for M&E, based on the project log frame, and allocating sufficient resources for M&E activities are important for accountability, transparency and ongoing improvement.
- Integrate management training into SPS capacity building projects, especially in countries with weak absorptive capacity.
- Separate regulatory powers and service provision.

Each of the nominated projects explicitly or implicitly contributes to some of the desirable higher-level objectives of poverty reduction, improved human health and market access, though impacts are mixed. The projects are also aligned with national development strategies.

Regional level

A regional approach is suitable when dealing with cross-boundary issues such as the management of plant and animal health hazards, and harmonization needed for economic integration. There is synergy in joint action in areas of economic cooperation, promotion of trade and managing cross-boundary risks in plant health, animal health and food safety. The SEAFMD model has proven to be technically good practice and, with adjustments, could be applied to other transboundary diseases if sufficient resources are available and projects economically feasible. However, such projects require long periods for preparation and decision making and incur relatively high costs. Moreover, complications arise from the differences in needs, potential benefits and absorptive capacity. Activities that address specific national needs and capacity are generally most cost-effectively carried out in stand-alone projects given differences in capacity. These differences may be eased by training provided by the more advanced countries in the region. Therefore, the focus of regional projects should be selective. The good practice lessons arising include:

- Conduct capacity building as much as possible at the national level, and focus regional approaches on particular areas of interaction and interdependency among countries.
- More advanced countries in the region offer training to staff from less developed neighbouring countries.

Conclusions

Good practices that are replicable are those involved with the proper design and effective implementation of projects. The needs for SPS capacity differ much between countries, depending on many factors, and determining appropriate assistance should take into account the country's absorptive capacity. Projects in Viet Nam appeared to be better tailored to needs and absorptive capacity than similar ones in Cambodia and Lao PDR, which contributed to fewer problems of sustainability and effectiveness. For the delivery and receipt of SPS-related technical assistance, the main conclusions arising are:

- Cross-cutting activities can have significant value added for SPS capacity building.

- The level of commitment and involvement, including political support, of beneficiaries contributes to the success of the project.
- There is great need for good quality and well-targeted technical assistance.

I. GOOD PRACTICE IN SPS-RELATED TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Introduction

1. This study is part of research on good practice in the delivery and receipt of SPS-related technical cooperation, carried out by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) in collaboration with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The aim of this research is to examine the impact and effectiveness of SPS-related technical assistance and identify good practice that could be replicated elsewhere.

2. This good practice research builds on previous research work and regional consultations, which took place in East Africa, the Caribbean and Greater Mekong Sub-Region within the Aid for Trade Initiative to synthesize the results of existing SPS capacity evaluations, develop an inventory of technical assistance and identify gaps and priorities not being addressed. It aims to identify elements of good practice in project design, implementation, outputs and the achievement of higher-order objectives that could be applied in future activities. It is to be stressed that the present study is not an evaluation of the projects surveyed.

3. The second part of this Chapter looks at SPS capacity building projects within the framework of development cooperation and in particular the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Paris Principles on Aid Effectiveness. Chapter 2 explains the methodology of this research work and provides an overview of the surveyed projects. Chapter 3 discusses the parameters of good practice in the delivery and receipt of SPS-related technical assistance. The final chapter provides conclusions and recommendations.

SPS capacity building as part of development cooperation

4. The purpose of SPS capacity building is to enable countries to receive the full benefit of participation in the multilateral rules-based system for international trade established by the WTO. These benefits include job generation, increased incomes, and improved public health, among others.

5. SPS capacity building is a relatively new area of development cooperation. SPS-related technical assistance builds on previous work in promoting food safety, plant health and animal health. But it does more than that. It also aims to provide tools for successful participation in trade opportunities opened up by the WTO, and other bilateral and regional trade agreements. Since SPS themes are cross-cutting and often require expertise from several professions and disciplines, there is a need to learn from recent experiences and work towards consensus about what works and what constitutes good practice.

6. This report considers SPS capacity building as part of official development cooperation.[2] However, given its specialized nature, it is often somewhat isolated from mainstream development cooperation. It is important to increase the profile of SPS capacity building at the country level, raise understanding about the linkages and synergies between SPS-related activities and technical assistance in other areas (agriculture, trade, health, etc.) and better integrate SPS-related assistance into overall development policy approaches and assess its performance within relevant frameworks for development cooperation (see Box 1).

[2] Some of the providers prefer to speak about technical assistance and not consider themselves as development agencies.

Box 1. SPS assistance within the framework of development cooperation

The following are of special relevance for discussing quality and relevance of SPS assistance:

UN Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (2000)

The MDGs are measurable and time-bound goals for development cooperation. The question on how SPS capacity building in general can contribute to reaching these MDGs is relevant for discussing good practice.

Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005)

The *Paris Principles on Aid Effectiveness: Ownership, Harmonization, Alignment and Mutual Accountability* formulate the commitments of donors and recipients about the way development cooperation should be implemented. These commitments include a number of criteria and principles that are of direct importance for assessing good practice in capacity building projects: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. For the purpose of assessing good practice in SPS capacity building, the following criteria for good practice can be highlighted:

- Country ownership, country implementation
- Donor assistance integrated in national frameworks
- Harmonization of donor efforts
- Result-based management
- Mutual accountability and transparency

OECD analysis of trade-related assistance (2007)

The OECD analysis of trade-related assistance uses the Paris Principles to assess the rapidly growing volume and value of trade-related development support and, accordingly, identified a number of weaknesses. A recent review of SPS needs assessment (Van der Meer 2007) suggests that several of the identified weaknesses may also apply also to SPS capacity building in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam. Some main points are:

- needs assessments are generally unsatisfactory and affect the effectiveness of capacity building efforts;
- SPS capacity building appears to be implemented in isolation from broader development projects;
- the mission of aid agencies is generally to promote poverty reduction, but the link between trade capacity building and poverty outcomes deserves more attention; and
- donor coordination is weak.

Sources: OECD 2005; OECD 2006; and OECD 2007.
http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/index.html#

7. There are no specific global evaluations of SPS assistance however, there are some relevant general evaluations of trade-facilitation projects (*OECD analysis of trade-related assistance,* see Box 1). Although these evaluations do not specifically refer to SPS, the analytical framework and generic findings provide an important input for assessment of good practice in technical assistance in the area of SPS. Most likely, there will be differences between SPS and other areas of trade facilitation related to the technical characteristics of human and agricultural health and the specific character of the institutions involved, but there are also common findings that need to be taken into consideration and that link these studies to a broader perspective.

8. *Good projects and good practices* A project can be judged by the results it produces and by the way the project is executed. The criteria for good projects are that they produce desirable results and that they are implemented in a cost-effective way. Most basic is that a project produces desirable results. Good practice is about effectiveness and efficiency in which desirable results are achieved. For example, a good needs assessment for training leads to outputs (skills) for which there is employment. In most cases, genuine needs are targeted, yet project efficiencies are still critically dependent on the way the project is conducted. Good design and management may avoid delays in implementation, and provide desirable results to recipients with high efficiency.

9. SPS capacity building can contribute to several of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which are the overarching goals for development cooperation adopted by the United Nations. The most important contribution of SPS capacity building is the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger (MDG1) through increased income from productive employment. Improved food safety in developing countries can contribute to reduced child mortality (MDG4), and incidence of major diseases (MDG6). SPS capacity also enables countries to trade in food and agricultural products, contributing to the further development of an open trading system (MDG8).

10. Increased SPS capacity can contribute to poverty reduction (MDG1) in several ways:

- Through increased market access, more productive employment and income can be generated for farmers and those seeking jobs through participation in production for export.

- Better control of plant and animal pest and diseases will result in an improved agricultural health status and reduced losses of stock and production. This will create more and cheaper food supply for consumers and more income for those engaged in agricultural production and export.

- Safer food will result in improved human health status. This contributes to net welfare through reduced cost for treatment of human diseases and fewer unproductive or lost work days.

- Improved control of plant and animal pests and diseases and improved food safety may be indispensable for creating net income through participation in high-end markets and adding value in the supply chain.

11. Improved SPS capacity does not emerge spontaneously. In many cases, they have to be preceded by improved awareness among beneficiaries, stakeholders, and high-level decision makers about the importance of SPS capacity and their potential contribution to higher-level outcomes such as trade, employment, increased incomes, foreign exchange earnings, etc. Such increased awareness, though a necessary condition for successful capacity-building, is not sufficient. There should also be adequate SPS management capacity:

- to identify and prioritize areas of high return for SPS capacity building;

- to design SPS projects;

- to maintain SPS infrastructure; and

- to mobilize resources for SPS capacity building.

12. It is important to note here that SPS capacity can rarely achieve development goals in isolation; many other factors contribute as well and can play more important roles. Examples of such other factors are a good business climate, governance, infrastructure, and human skills. The impact of SPS capacity building efforts can be negatively affected by ignoring these other factors.

II. OVERVIEW OF PROJECTS SURVEYED

Methodology

13. In January 2008, STDF requested WTO Members, as well as OECD Development Assistance Committee contact points, to identify and provide information on SPS-related technical assistance

projects that are considered as examples of good practice (G/SPS/GEN/816). The survey questionnaire, developed jointly by the STDF and OECD, follows OECD Development Assistance Committee criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability (see Box 1).

14. Eleven international and donor agencies nominated ten projects (see Table 2) in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam as examples of good practices. The questionnaires, thus, represent perspectives of the donors and international agencies. The consultants and STDF then selected six of the ten nominated projects to be used as basis for a more detailed in-country field work to obtain the views of beneficiaries. The field work in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam consisted of interviews with donors, implementing agencies and beneficiaries[3] on the various aspects of the delivery and receipt of these projects similar to the topics in the donor questionnaire, to be able to explore in greater detail practices that enabled effective implementation and sustained benefits of the projects.

15. This study is based on information derived from the interviews, responses to the survey questionnaires and other relevant documentation, including project evaluations and annual reports (see References).

16. ***Limitations and constraints of research work*** The findings and conclusions drawn in this report are based on sufficient evidence, however, the detail and precision are in some cases constrained by the limited coverage of the nominated projects, the time available for the research, the availability of documentation, and the number of interviews that could be conducted. Two specific limitations encountered were the following:

- Many of the interviewees for various reasons had only fragmented information of the project and could answer only a limited number of the questions. Often they had not been involved throughout all stages of the project and its components. This was, in particular, the case for projects with a long time span (UNIDO projects and SEAFMD), regional projects (SEAFMD, SPSCBP, UNIDO-NORAD) and projects with many diverse components (MUTRAP II).

- While (mid-term) evaluation reports contain much valuable information, they focus on the project as a whole. Their findings about diverse project components in different countries are sometimes not sufficiently specific for the purpose of a study of this nature. Moreover, some of the evaluation reports are several years old and some of their expectations appear not to have materialized. In some cases (UNIDO and MUTRAP II), SPS activities are just one small component of a broader project and the general evaluation findings do not fully apply to the SPS components.

Overview of projects

17. There were eleven responses to the survey questionnaires nominating ten projects as examples of good practice. Two respondents (OIE and AusAID) nominated the same project (SEAFMD). Table 2 provides general information for the ten nominated projects.

18. ***SPS topics*** The ten projects nominated represent a good cross-section of SPS-related technical cooperation. Four of the ten projects were on animal health: control and management of disease (SEAFMD), risk assessment (SECO Zoonotic), diagnosis (USDA lab training) and integrated disease risk management (component of SPSCBP). On plant health, one project was about plant health quarantine treatment techniques (JICA) and one on pest surveillance and diagnosis (another component of SPSCBP). Two projects were concerned with food safety, one on animal products in general (SECO Zoonotic) and one on fish products (FIBOZOPA). Three projects contributed to diagnostic capacity or standards, metrology, testing and quality (SMTQ) (NORAD-UNIDO, SECO-

[3] The list of people interviewed is in Annex 2.

UNIDO and USDA lab training) and two had a broader focus – one on WTO accession (MUTRAP II) and one was a SPS needs assessment study (UNCTAD).

19. ***SPS scope*** The projects differ with regard to SPS content. The SMTQ projects had a limited scope on SPS issues. Similarly, MUTRAP II was more on trade policy and trade promotion. The focus of the FIBOZOPA project appeared mainly on domestic food safety concerns related to raw fish consumption and not on market access issues. The trematode problem in fish products targeted is a domestic human health concern; there are no international requirements for fresh fish[4]. SEAFMD, SPSCBP and JICA were the only projects entirely about SPS issues. Nonetheless, there are lessons that may be gleaned from the non-SPS projects or components as well, considering parallel issues in capacity building.

20. ***Individual and multi-country*** Viet Nam was involved with eight of the ten projects: five were country projects (JICA, FIBOZOPA, SECO Zoonotic, MUTRAP II and SECO-UNIDO) and three were regional projects (SPSCBP, SEAFMD and NORAD-UNIDO). Cambodia participated in the three regional projects and had two country projects: USDA lab training and UNCTAD. Lao PDR was involved in the three regional projects.

21. This distribution is consistent with findings of earlier studies of SPS assistance in the region, that is that Viet Nam is the major recipient of such assistance. An STDF overview of supply and demand of SPS assistance in the Greater Mekong delta Sub-Region estimated that US$162 million in assistance was received by Viet Nam over the period 2001-2006. This amount only pertains to individual country assistance and does not include benefits obtained from Viet Nam's share of the US$200 million in assistance at regional level for ASEAN members (Ignacio 2007).

22. ***Types of assistance*** With regard to the main types of SPS assistance (see Box 2), MUTRAP II provided information and training assistance. Three projects (NORAD-UNIDO, SECO-UNIDO and SEAFMD) contributed to hard infrastructure development. Six were soft infrastructure development assistance that consisted of capacity building in risk assessment (FIBOZOPA and SECO Zoonotic), laboratory skills (JICA and USDA lab training), establishment of disease-free areas (SEAFMD) and SPS needs assessment (UNCTAD).

[4] Fish products are considered safe after sufficient cooking or freezing below 18°C.

Table 2. Projects nominated as examples of good practice in SPS-related technical assistance

1. Market Access and Trade Facilitation Support for Mekong Delta Countries Through Strengthening Institutional and National Capacities Related to SMTQ Phase I (NORAD-UNIDO)	
Donor/Intl Agency: NORAD, UNIDO *Countries*: Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam *SPS topic*: SMTQ TBT and SPS *Assistance*: Soft and hard infrastructure	*Brief description*: Overall support for SMTQ that included an initial assessment of gaps, provision of trainings, workshops and equipment
2. Market Access Support for Viet Nam Through the Strengthening of Capacity Related to Metrology, Testing and Conformity (SECO-UNIDO)	
Donor/Intl Agency: SECO, UNIDO *Country*: Viet Nam *SPS topic*: SMTQ TBT and SPS *Assistance*: Soft and hard infrastructure	*Brief description*: Overall assistance to SMTQ capacity that included equipment, facilities and support towards accreditation
3. Southeast Asia Foot and Mouth Disease (SEAFMD)	
Donor/Intl Agency: OIE, AusAID *Countries*: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Viet Nam, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, and the Philippines *Assistance*: Soft and hard infrastructure	*SPS topic*: Animal health *Brief description*: Coordination mechanism among animal health services of member countries to achieve progressive reduction of FMD, creation of disease-free zones and compartments
4. Multilateral Trade Assistance Project Viet Nam II (MUTRAP II)	
Donor: EC *Country*: Viet Nam *Assistance*: Information, training and hard infrastructure	*SPS topic*: WTO Accession, SPS/TBT Agreement *Brief description*: Overall assistance to enable Viet Nam to satisfy WTO commitments with major support for the SPS/TBT Enquiry Points
5. Fishborne Zoonotic Parasites (FIBOZOPA)	
Donor: DANIDA *Country*: Viet Nam *SPS topic*: Food safety *Assistance*: Soft and hard infrastructure	*Brief description*: Support for coordinated research on fish-borne zoonotic parasites (FZPs) that included fellowships for graduate studies, equipment and facilities
6. Plant Quarantine II–Thermal Treatment for the Disinfestation of Fruit Flies (JICA)	
Donor: JICA *Country*: Viet Nam *Assistance*: Soft infrastructure	*SPS topic*: Plant health *Brief description*: Training course for two and a half months utilizing Japanese experts and facilities
7. Sanitary and Phytosanitary Capacity Building Programme (SPSCBP)	
Donor: AusAID *Countries*: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Viet Nam, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, and the Philippines	*SPS topic*: Plant health and animal health *Assistance*: Training, soft infrastructure *Brief description*: Capacity building in plant and animal health in ASEAN countries
8. Zoonotic and Animal Diseases Affecting Trade in Viet Nam (SECO Zoonotic)	
Donor: SECO *Country*: Viet Nam *Assistance*: Soft infrastructure	*SPS topic*: Animal health and food safety *Brief description*: Workshops on risk assessment of zoonotic and animal diseases
9. Follow up to Regional Laboratory Diagnostic Workshop (USDA lab training)	
Donor: USDA *Country*: Cambodia *Assistance*: Soft infrastructure	*SPS topic*: Animal health *Brief description*: Diagnostic capacity building to improve management and control of animal diseases
10. Costs of Agri-food Safety and SPS Compliance (UNCTAD)	
Donor: UNCTAD *Country*: Cambodia *Assistance*: Soft infrastructure	*SPS topic*: General *Brief description*: Study of SPS capacity and needs in Cambodia

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816.

Box 2. Type of SPS assistance

There are four general categories of SPS-related technical assistance:

- *Information*—assistance (conferences, seminars or workshops conducted) to improve awareness and general understanding of the SPS agreement either for public officials involved with SPS implementation or policymaking or for the general public or media;
- *Training*—assistance (seminars, workshops or training courses) on specific SPS issues such as risk analysis, dispute settlements, and establishment of enquiry points;
- *Soft infrastructure development*—assistance with more technical or scientific orientation such as training activities for veterinarians, plant pathologists, food chemists and microbiologists; development of SPS-related software or regulatory frameworks; consumer education programs; initiatives in harmonization of standards; training in certification, surveillance, risk assessment, laboratory practices, diagnostic techniques, HACCP techniques;[1] and
- *Hard infrastructure development*—assistance that provides equipment and infrastructure, facilities, create databases, or establish systems (such as surveillance systems).

Source: G/SPS/GEN/206

23. ***Supplementary project*** In the course of the research work, the authors learned that the nominated JICA project is a training course that was one component of a larger JICA technical cooperation project (TCP) that aims to build capacity on fruit fly disinfestation techniques for tropical fruit market access (see Box 5 of Annex 1e). Given the significant potential of application for market access and the focus on SPS, the full project was included in the research work.

Overview of questionnaire surveys (G/SPS/GEN/816)

24. ***Project design*** Most of the projects (7 of 10) were initiated based on requests of beneficiaries; only SPSCBP was initiated by the donor AusAID. The beneficiaries were consulted with regard to the design of almost all of the projects; UNCTAD was responsible for the SPS study. All the projects were based on some form of needs assessment. The UNCTAD study itself was the needs assessment. For most of the projects, the needs assessments were focused on specific issues: capacity of labs, research, plant quarantine treatment techniques and other animal and plant health issues. MUTRAP II had a broader scope of needs across different ministries and functions. The UNIDO projects (NORAD and SECO) were based on needs assessment of the service provider, the SMTQ institutions and labs.

Eight projects were based on previous work either based on assistance of other donors or follow-up activities of earlier work of the same donor:

- USDA lab training – follow-up of regional diagnostic workshops;
- MUTRAP II and SEAFMD – subsequent phases of earlier projects;
- JICA training course – part of regular JICA training programme;
- UNCTAD study – made use of projects of other donors for its evaluation;
- SPSCBP – based on AusAID's and other donors' projects;
- SECO Zoonotic project – got the information from the Viet Nam SPS Action Plan that there was no project on risk assessment for animal diseases;

- SECO-UNIDO project – complementary intervention to the NORAD-UNIDO work; and
- FIBOZOPA – pilot project.

25. ***Preparation*** Table 3 illustrates how the donor respondents perceived the sufficiency of preparation time and information gathering.

Table 3. Preparation time and information gathering

Level of sufficiency	Projects
80-100%	SEAFMD (AusAID), JICA, SECO zoonotic, SPSCBP, FIBOZOPA, UNCTAD
60-80%	NORAD-UNIDO, SEAFMD (OIE), USDA
40-60%	MUTRAP II, SECO-UNIDO
20-40%	None
No response	None

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816

26. In general, there was consultation with beneficiaries during the design phase, specifically with government institutions or counterparts. For the UNIDO projects, there was consultation with the SMTQ institutions; for MUTRAP II, with the four ministries involved with SPS/TBT (i.e. Agriculture, Fisheries (formerly a ministry), Health, and Trade); and for the UNCTAD study, the SPS institutions or agencies. DANIDA, USDA and SECO consulted with the relevant ministries, research institutions, laboratories, and plant and animal health agencies for the FIBOZOPA, USDA lab training and SECO Zoonotic projects, respectively. FIBOZOPA had two project preparatory workshops with stakeholders. SEAFMD and JICA had broader consultations with governments: SEAFMD consulted with ASEAN member countries and the ASEAN Secretariat and JICA consulted with governments and ODA[5] task members of recipient countries.

27. ***Implementation*** The projects were carried out either by the donor/international agency, independent contractor(s), the beneficiaries or a combination of parties (see Table 4).

Table 4. Project implementation

Projects	Implementing offices
JICA	JICA
UNCTAD	UNCTAD
SEAFMD	OIE Regional Coordination Unit
SECO and NORAD	UNIDO (with SECO and NORAD as co-implementors)
SECO zoonotic	Independent contractor
SPSCBP	Australia's Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
MUTRAP II	Beneficiaries
FIBOZOPA	RIA1 with Danish counterpart
USDA	USDA, the trainers (independent contractors) and staff of lab

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816

28. ***Participation*** Table 5 shows the extent of participation of beneficiaries. For the SEAFMD, coordination is the main implementing activity that is being carried out by the RCU; the OIE considers the beneficiaries to be more involved in developments in respective countries.

[5] Official Development Assistance

Table 5. Participation of beneficiaries

Level	Projects
80-100%	SPSCBP, MUTRAP II, FIBOZOPA, JICA
60-80%	USDA, SEAFMD (AusAID)
40-60%	SECO-UNIDO, SECO zoonotic
20-40%	SEAFMD (OIE), UNIDO
No response	UNCTAD

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816

29. Beneficiaries provided in-kind contributions such as use of offices, venues and facilities, including laboratories, transportation and salaries for government staff and, more importantly, contributed through the joint implementation of activities. They also provided significant inputs to needs assessment and data necessary for risk assessments.

30. ***Difficulties*** According to most respondents, no difficulty arose with the implementation of the projects. However, MUTRAP II raised the issue of coordination, with SPS being a concern of various ministries with varying capacity, but this was resolved through regular policy networking sessions and workshops. For the SEAFMD project, the same concern was magnified given the need for coordination, not only across ministries in one country but across ASEAN countries with differing socio-economic circumstances. The project, thus, assisted countries in finding bilateral donors to fund activities within countries and helped promote cooperation at ministerial and department director level.

31. ***Monitoring*** For most of the projects, the donors and international organizations were involved in monitoring of projects. For the SECO zoonotic project, an independent contractor was also involved. Beneficiaries of FIBOZOPA and MUTRAP II were likewise involved. For the SPSCBP and USDA lab training, all stakeholders (donors, beneficiaries and independent contractors) were responsible for monitoring.

32. ***Adjustments*** Except for three projects, adjustments were made during the implementation of the projects either with regard to budget or timeframe. Both donors and beneficiaries of SPSCBP and SEAFMD agreed to extend the time period to enable the completion of objectives. Adjustments to the budget were made for NORAD-UNIDO and MUTRAP II to allow for greater output; for MUTRAP II, the budget was adjusted to support training for risk assessment methodologies. UNIDO, the implementing agency for the SECO-UNIDO project, requested for an adjustment in budget and an extension of time period. There were similar adjustments agreed upon by both beneficiaries and donors for the FIBOZOPA project.

33. ***Evaluation*** Almost all projects were evaluated (mid-term or final), or will shortly undergo evaluation (SPSCBP's evaluation was completed but not available at the time of research); evaluations for the SECO zoonotic project will be completed by the end of 2008). The USDA lab training had no formal evaluation but the USDA trainers (independent contractors) provided observations.

34. ***Sustainability*** Donors/international agencies generally believe that benefits of the projects will continue even after funding has ceased because the beneficiaries have the capacity to sustain benefits (see Table 6). One donor raised concerns about budgetary support constraints. All projects, except one, stated that capacity to sustain outcomes was assessed during the project's design phase.

Table 6. Sustaining benefits without funding

Level	Projects
Continuation of benefits without funding	
80-100%	SECO-UNIDO, NORAD-UNIDO, FIBOZOPA, MUTRAP II, SEAFMD (OIE)
60-80%	USDA (ongoing)
No response	SECO zoonotic – forthcoming evaluation SPSCBP – ongoing, at that time SEAFMD (AusAID) – ongoing JICA – no data UNCTAD
Capacity of beneficiaries to sustain benefit	
80-100%	SECO-UNIDO, NORAD-UNIDO
60-80%	FIBOZOPA, MUTRAP II, SPSCBP, JICA, SEAFMD (OIE), USDA
No response	SEAFMD (AusAID), SECO zoonotic, UNCTAD

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816

35. ***Outputs and good practices*** Most respondents to the survey stated that 80-100% of the project objectives/outputs were achieved. USDA identified factors that affected results: capacity of lab staff to absorb training and the availability of appropriate lab equipment and supplies. UNCTAD, SPSCBP, JICA and FIBOZOPA projects were considered as examples of good practice in terms of the project cycle. OIE looked at SEAFMD as a good practice in terms of achieving higher-order objectives. For respondents for USDA lab, MUTRAP II, NORAD-UNIDO and SEAFMD (AusAID) projects, the projects are examples of good practices both in the perspective of the project cycle and in the attainment of higher objectives. On another aspect, USDA, JICA and SECO believed the projects are examples of good practice because they filled a necessary gap in animal disease diagnosis, plant quarantine and risk assessment, respectively.

- *Following project cycle* Most respondents believed that activities and outputs were accomplished 80-100% according to the project cycle plan. Two respondents (OIE and DANIDA for SEAFMD and FIBOZOPA, respectively) thought it was 60-80%.

- *Achieving higher-order objectives* Almost all of the projects indicated having impacts on higher-order objectives. FIBOZOPA and two UNIDO projects were aligned with Viet Nam's Five-Year Socio-Economic Development Plan. MUTRAP II's assistance focused on institutional capacity and market access. SEAFMD has impacts on veterinary services, market access and poverty alleviation through control of FMD, and provides an example of inter-country coordination.

- *Cost-effective* Nine respondents believed that their projects made an 80-100% cost-effective contribution to address the objectives.

36. ***Aspects of good practices*** Respondents identified aspects of good practice exemplified by the projects that allowed the achievement of objectives and may be repeated in other projects.

- *Beneficiaries* On the part of beneficiaries, the level of commitment and involvement, including political support, contributes to the success of the project. FIBOZOPA and UNIDO cited the involvement of beneficiaries during project design. SECO and JICA stated that beneficiaries were cognizant of the importance of and the benefits to be gained from the risk assessment and plant quarantine projects. In the SECO zoonotic project, special topics in risk assessment were selected by beneficiaries themselves.

- *Project design* On the part of donors and international organizations, good preparations and planning, transparency and flexibility in project management and the use of good quality

technical expertise were identified as factors contributing to the attainment of objectives. SECO cited the use of a lean agency mode which made the project effective not only in terms of implementation but in costs as well. UNIDO cited the use of an interlinked approach to strengthening SMTQ, notable by providing assistance for both facilities and equipment, and training.

- *Synergies* USDA and OIE cited linkages with similar and or related programmes of other donors and international organizations.

III. PARAMETERS OF GOOD PRACTICE IN THE DELIVERY AND RECEIPT OF SPS-RELATED TECHNICAL COOPERATION

37. From a perspective of good practice in SPS capacity building all the projects reviewed had strong and some weak points and something could be learned from each one. Some good practices, such as good project design are generic and apply nearly everywhere. However, good practice depends much on the context. What can be considered good practice in a large country may be bad practice in a small country and what works in a middle income country may not be feasible in a least developed country. Some projects are regional and there are issues about what is good practice for regional projects.

The importance of absorptive capacity

38. The possibility of successful implementation of SPS capacity building projects depends much on the absorptive capacity of a country. In the GMS area there are major differences in absorptive capacity. Absorptive capacity in the region is best in Thailand and China, and most limited in Lao PDR and Cambodia, while Viet Nam is in-between. This means that projects that can be successfully implemented in more advanced countries, such as SEAFMD, can still be too complicated for countries with limited absorptive capacity. Good practice should be understood in the context of a country's absorptive capacity. The absorptive capacity of a country depends on many factors that change gradually over the medium and long term. These factors include governance and cultural factors, country size and level of development.

39. In terms of governance, the nature of institutional arrangements for SPS differs considerably between countries. While Viet Nam has established an effective SPS system and is making efforts to improve it, Lao PDR and Cambodia are establishing the basic elements of their SPS systems. These variations in institutional arrangements affect the level of national ownership of TA and the ability of countries to direct, manage and maximize the benefits of SPS-related capacity building assistance.

40. For larger countries it is easier to mobilize a sufficient critical mass of financial and human resources, including management skills, for specialized institutions and specialist tasks to be performed in SPS management. In smaller countries, many potential activities compete for limited resources and capacity is spread thinly. Specific constraints include:

- *Available human capital within a country* The size of a country plays a major role but not exclusively. In Lao PDR for example, there has been insufficient supply of academically trained specialists in food science, plant health and animal health. As a result the demand for specialists in SPS services cannot be met.

- *Access to financial resources within the country* Although outside financial support can be available, effectiveness and sustainability require that there is sufficient basic government budget for employing staff and funding operational cost.

41. With increased economic development some of the constraints of being a small and resource-poor country can be overcome; the supply of private services will increase and there will be more competition, more diversity of interest and more countervailing power.

42. The importance of absorptive capacity is evidenced by the difference in success among the countries served by the three regional projects (SPSCBP, SEAFMD and NORAD-UNIDO). In many respects there was weaker performance in the countries with the lowest absorptive capacity. This finding suggests that the outcomes of regional projects could be improved by better tailoring support to in-country needs and conditions including absorptive capacity. One size does not fit all.

Good practice: A country's absorptive capacity should be adequately considered in project design and implementation.

43. Good practices by projects with specific focus may be replicated successfully for similar products or diseases in situations where the absorptive capacity is sufficient and provided there is a similar need. For example, the FIBOZOPA project includes several good practice aspects in addressing risks of zoonotic parasites for consumers of raw fish in Viet Nam. These good practices could be adapted and applied to similar problems facing consumers in Cambodia and Lao PDR. With the acquired skills and equipment, the JICA disinfestation project for fruit flies in dragon fruit in Viet Nam can be replicated for other fruit products. The risk assessments performed for the SECO zoonotic project can be extended to other animal diseases and the FIBOZOPA research may be applicable to other food-borne diseases. With adaptation, the SEAFMD model is applicable to other diseases.

Parameters of good practice in project preparation and design

44. Good project design is crucial to enhance performance, impact and sustainability of capacity building projects. Important issues related to project preparation and design are discussed below, and good practices identified.

45. ***Sufficient preparation*** Good preparation is most important for capacity building processes that are complicated and take a long time to mature. Adequate time and resources for preparation helps to ensure that stakeholders have a common understanding and expectations about the planned project and clearly understand their roles, responsibilities and required inputs. This contributes to smoother implementation, fewer delays and complications, and increased local ownership and accountability.

Good practice: Thorough preparation that includes consultation with beneficiaries and counterparts to clarify roles and responsibilities and to prepare for execution by the recipient.

46. Almost all of the projects indicated that preparation time and information gathering was sufficient (80-100%). The FIBOZOPA project did relatively well with a long and intense preparation over a three-year period. The JICA project had a solid preparatory phase that included dialogue with Vietnamese counterparts. USDA had numerous meetings with the animal health lab officials. In general, there were consultations with government institutions or counterparts.

47. ***Good needs assessment*** Special interests may be very enthusiastic about proposed capacity building projects. However, enthusiasm of the beneficiary is no guarantee for successful investment from a broader public perspective. Service chiefs and laboratories commonly face budget constraints, and external support that adds resources for equipment and training is always welcome. Considerations of sustainability and cost-effectiveness are not always a main concern for the public and private recipients of resources.

Good practice: Needs assessments should take a broader public perspective (MDGs) than the interest of services and private enterprises served.

48. Carrying out a needs assessment during project design is a useful way to seek the views of relevant public and private sector groups on the proposed activities and identify costs and benefits. A good needs assessment has to strike a balance between the narrow interest of institutions and enterprises on the one hand and broader more diffuse social and sectoral interests on the other. A needs assessment is also important to provide much of the analytical information needed for designing a log frame.

49. ***Relevance*** Assessment of relevance of project for the country, especially with regard to contribution to higher-levels of goals, should be part of needs assessment. What is a priority for one country is not necessarily a priority for another country and what is priority for commercial farmers may not be priority for smallholder farmers (see Box 3). ISO 17025 certification for a laboratory is much more relevant for a country with much export to high-end markets than for countries that hardly export or only export commodities to less demanding markets. Quality management systems are crucial for enterprises exporting to developed country markets, but less economically feasible for small enterprises and those that serve less demanding domestic markets.

Good practice: Assessment of relevance is an important aspect of needs assessment.

Box 3. Diverging benefits from eradicating FMD

FMD control is a top priority for OECD countries. Outbreaks can cost billions of dollars of loss in trade and cost of culling. The adoption of non-vaccination policies in OECD countries has made exports from developing countries with endemic FMD virtually impossible for the foreseeable future, and for OECD countries and exporting developing countries, outbreaks have become much more costly and the risks higher than they were before. Because of the financial risks related to FMD outbreaks, OECD countries give high priority to fighting FMD in developing countries in order to reduce risks of spill-over of outbreaks. As a result, donor support for fighting FMD is more readily available than for other animal diseases (except for HPAI), regardless of their priority from a poverty reduction perspective.

For commercial farmers in Thailand and Viet Nam, FMD is a clear economic risk because of movement and domestic trade restrictions, and import bans by importing countries in the region in case of outbreaks. Disease-free zones and compartments can be established and be recognized by OIE and importing countries, but outbreaks from spill-over form permanent high risks for trade.

Companies and commercial farmers in Thailand are exporting pork to Hong Kong (carcasses), Singapore (cooked meat), and Japan (processed meat, for which 25 factories have been approved). There is a general belief among professionals that the Thai commercial sector could significantly increase export of pork meat, provided that they have secure and recognized FMD-free zones or compartments. Export interests in Viet Nam are also of increasing importance and aim at consolidating and expanding FMD-free zones. At present, Viet Nam exports pigs to Hong Kong, China and Malaysia.

For the more numerous small-scale farmers and traders (who do not export) in the GMS, FMD does not pose a serious economic threat. In their view FMD is not dangerous for people and the disease disappears after about four weeks. FMD is allegedly mainly a seasonal problem at the beginning of the rainy season. Treatment for preventing secondary effects is normal practice in many areas. Vaccination is generally not practiced, even where good commercial vaccines are available. The importance of draft animals in the region is declining through use of two-wheel tractors. Farmers have developed ways of dealing with the risks of FMD and other diseases: they know seasonality in outbreaks, are aware of early signs and they sell or consume at early sign. Diseases perceived as more costly by these farmers include *haemorrhagic septicaemia* for buffalo, classical swine fever (CSF) for swine and Newcastle Disease (NCD) for chicken.

Source: Interviews

50. ***Adequate involvement of stakeholders*** Most of the projects nominated in this study are strongly government focused even when impact also depends heavily on private sector involvement. One evaluation report consulted reiterated the importance of consulting proposed users of services as well as service providers during needs assessment.

Good practice: Beneficiaries should be involved in project design.

51. ***Transparency*** It is good practice to promote transparency in project preparation. This can be achieved in different ways including through consultations with concerned groups, distribution of information proposed activities, organization and management, procedures, decision making and budget allocation. FIBOZOPA had two preparatory workshops for partner institutions to clarify respective functions and responsibilities in the research work. MUTRAP II was a continuation of MUTRAP I and SPS agencies were consulted on the scope of work. The SECO-UNIDO intervention was based on the needs assessment undertaken by NORAD-UNIDO and, thus, included important inputs from beneficiaries.

Good practice: Transparency in project preparation.

52. ***Log frame*** Result-based management requires close attention to the linkages between objectives sought, outputs and inputs. This can be achieved through a good log frame. Yet, many projects give inadequate attention to developing a log frame. The FIBOZOPA project and MUTRAP II had a log frame. The second phase of the SECO SMTQ project incorporated a log frame. The JICA TCP had a project design matrix outlining activities and outputs, inputs from both Japanese and Vietnamese partners, verifiable indicators and means of verification.

Good practice: Incorporating a log frame at the project design phase enhances results-based management in implementation of SPS capacity building projects, and supports monitoring and evaluation.

53. ***Qualification of experts involved in project design*** SPS is a highly technical area that involves strong professional services (veterinary services, plant protection organizations and food authorities). Just as for other technical areas in development cooperation there is a tendency for technical expertise to dominate in project design. This can result in projects that have not fully internalized lessons from work on aid effectiveness (see Chapter 1), lack a good log frame and adequate monitoring and evaluation.

Good practice: Project design with balanced input of expertise in development assistance, project management, and technical expertise.

54. ***Size of project and time-frame*** Projects should be of sufficient length to deal effectively with the complexity of the issues addressed. SPS capacity building is complex and significant time and budget are required to achieve objectives. For example, the preparation of a veterinary law with provisions and regulations for implementation translated into inspection programmes can take many years, and building up surveillance capacity for plant pests and diseases involves much technical expertise backed up by diagnostic capacity. Building laboratories for testing and diagnostic work also requires time. Capacity building in these fields is a long-term process which requires dialogue, policy development, legal and institutional adjustments, technical training and adjusted funding. Short-term assistance, small-scale projects and assistance to limited technical aspects in complex capacity building processes may be effective if the conditions are right, but the impact of fragmented support is often limited and its sustainability reduced. A more effective approach is generally to provide substantive, comprehensive, long-term project support as part of a comprehensive capacity building process focused on the SPS area.

Good practice: The size, scope and duration of a project should be sufficiently tailored to the complexity of the problems to be solved.

55. A good example of this is the Danish support for Vietnamese fisheries sector, and the FIBOZOPA project. The MUTRAP II project has such engagement in the trade policy area. SEAFMD is the clearest example of long-term engagement. Although designed as short-term projects and small in size, the UNIDO projects also have elements of long-term engagement, especially with standards and metrology components.

56. ***Donor coordination*** Encouraging and facilitating linkages and synergies between related technical assistance projects, as called for in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, promotes a more efficient use of resources and improved outcomes. There are a number of good practice examples among the projects considered during this research. SEAFMD activities are linked with the AusAID-funded Programme for the Strengthening of Veterinary Services (PSVS) and SPSCBP. FIBOZOPA has linkages with DANIDA's Fisheries Sector Programme Support (FSPS) where FSPS support on fish production makes use of the findings of FIBOZOPA. In both cases, the two projects are funded by the same donors, AusAID and DANIDA, respectively. In another example, the UNIDO projects with NORAD and SECO are components of UNIDO's Integrated Programme of assistance for Viet Nam. The SECO-UNIDO project itself is an intervention arising from the needs assessment conducted by the NORAD-UNIDO project.

Good practice: Ensure donor coordination.

57. ***Country management and implementation*** While the Paris Principles recommend the use of local expertise and systems as far as possible, in general, in many projects, including those considered in this research, donors, international agencies and consultants continue to direct project design and *de facto* implementation. There are many reasons for this, including limited management and technical skills in the national counterpart agencies, concerns about inappropriate use of resources, and pressure to spend budget on time. Facilitating a leading role for project beneficiaries in project design and implementation helps to increase country ownership and learning. Further attention is needed to encourage national-led design and implementation of SPS-related projects.

Good practice: Projects should be implemented by national authorities, where possible, to promote ownership and learning.

Parameters of good practice in implementation

58. The following parameters of good practice are relevant for project implementation:

59. ***Flexibility*** While implementation should seek to follow an agreed timetable and work plan, flexibility is important to be able to respond to new or unforeseen issues and challenges, and to address assumptions that may have been flawed. It is good practice to build some flexibility into project execution. In most of the nominated projects, adjustments were made either with regard to the budget or to the timeframe. Stakeholders of SPSCBP, UNIDO and SEAFMD agreed to extend the time period to be able to accomplish the objectives. MUTRAP II beneficiaries requested that the budget be adjusted to allow for the addition of training on risk analysis.

Good practice: Allow for flexibility in project implementation.

60. ***Transparency*** Regular communication with stakeholders and the general public and dissemination of information about important decisions, budget allocations and changes to proposed activities support implementation and enhance performance. FIBOZOPA held annual status and planning meetings for all project institutions to review project implementation. The SEAFMD

programme is examined each year by national coordinators to re-evaluate priorities. Vietnamese SPS agencies were involved in the implementation and provided the local experts for MUTRAP II.

61. Transparent and effective mechanisms for communication among the stakeholders involved are important to provide a venue for dialogue which helps to facilitate coordination and promote consensus on areas where there are divergent opinions. This is particularly important in the SPS area given the number of institutions involved. The projects considered in this research have designed different types of communication and coordination mechanisms. The approaches adopted by FIBOZOPA and MUTRAP II illustrate how effective coordination can be achieved. FIBOZOPA developed a data sharing agreement for participating research institutions, which was signed by all project partners. MUTRAP II held regular policy networking sessions and workshops, and adopted a cross-sectoral approach to risk analysis activities.

Good practice: Promote transparency about important decisions and budget allocations and create effective mechanisms for communication with stakeholders.

62. ***Involvement of beneficiaries*** An important consequence of transparency that contributes to the success and impacts of projects is the involvement, support and commitment of beneficiaries. Beneficiary participation builds ownership and facilitates coordination. Beneficiaries may contribute to needs assessment, provide data for risk assessment, or provide human resources, facilities or equipment. In the SECO zoonotic project, the beneficiaries selected the topics for risk assessment. The JICA TCP underscored the dedication and commitment of the plant quarantine staff. The JICA project also provides a good example of an effort to involve the private sector, which enhances sustainable outcomes. This project will be scaled up to a commercial size by private companies.

Good Practice: Active involvement of stakeholders, in particular the private sector is crucial for project effectiveness and sustainability.

63. ***Combination of training, institution building and equipment*** Partial support for complex capacity building processes can easily result in less than optimum effectiveness. Training provided in one of the projects considered could not be effectively utilized in the workplace in some countries due to inadequate equipment. In other projects, implementation was sometimes constrained by a lack of resources. This research indicates that it is good practice to combine staff training, institutional development and the provision of equipment. In this respect, the metrology component of the UNIDO project was regarded as successful, by evaluators and recipients. The JICA project on fruit flies also provided a full package of equipment, training abroad, on the job training and institutional development.

Good practice: Combine support for training, institution building and provision of equipment in integrated hands-on projects.

64. ***M&E based on log frame*** M&E is important for accountability, transparency, feedback on management and ongoing learning. Unfortunately, many projects, especially projects in technical areas, pay inadequate attention to M&E. In several cases there is no formal M&E mechanism and activities are underfunded. Activities were regularly reviewed and revised during annual meetings of project partners in the FIBOZOPA projects. SEAFMD RCU regularly prepared semi-annual and annual reports although there was no formal M&E. The EC specified "systematic monitoring and evaluation" in the questionnaire as one of the reasons why MUTRAP II is an example of good practice. The project evaluation noted that the Project Task Force monitored the many activities mainly through semi-annual reports but also through day-to-day oversight and implementation; but also noted the lack of formal M&E mechanism. For the JICA TCP, being a highly technical work, a delay in one component would affect the entire project and monitoring and evaluation were crucial. The project established four working groups for monitoring: on the fruit fly rearing component, on

the treatment component, on reporting and on general support. SEAFMD plans to incorporate a built-in M&E in its subsequent phase.

Good practice: Incorporating a system for M&E, based on the project log frame, and allocating sufficient resources for M&E activities are important for accountability, transparency and ongoing improvement.

65. ***Quality of management*** Good management is crucial not only for SPS capacity building projects but also for services responsible for operating the SPS system. In the SPS services of most developing countries, qualified and experienced managers are scarce. There is a temptation among donors and international agencies to compensate for this scarcity by direct implementation, joint management and appointment of managing consultants. This has disadvantages as indicated above and does not resolve bottlenecks in management capabilities.

Good practice: Integrate management training into SPS capacity building projects, especially in countries with weak absorptive capacity.

66. The management aspect was singled out as a factor contributing to achievement of objectives for two of the projects included in this research. For the SECO-UNIDO project, the lean agency mode run by the UNIDO country office with involvement of the Vietnamese counterpart was considered effective. For MUTRAP II, the efficiency of the Vietnamese project director and Project Task Force staff was commended.

67. ***Sustainability*** Many of the SPS components in the nominated projects still face major challenges of sustainability. In several cases follow-up activities are deemed necessary to safeguard achievements and to implement capacity created. Follow-up phases are being planned for the SMTQ projects of UNIDO. In some cases, weak demand for services both from the market sector and from the government is the main challenge. In several cases, regulatory powers are used to generate income from mandatory services, which is not good practice.

Good practice: Separate regulatory powers and service provision.

Parameters of good practice in regional projects

68. Regional projects are popular in Southeast Asia reflecting support for cooperation among ASEAN countries. This research indicates that regional projects are typically more challenging to design and implement than national projects. They require long periods for preparation and decision making, and are generally expensive to manage. Language barriers often act as an additional challenge in implementation. Needs between countries are quite diverse and it is often challenging to develop activities that address the diversity of needs that exist at the regional level.

69. Regional projects can produce important results if the needs are well identified. A regional approach is most applicable in the management of cross-boundary risks related to plant and animal health. For such issues and similar topics, there is synergy in joint actions involving different donors.

70. Mixed results of regional training were identified in the NORAD-UNIDO and SPSCBP projects. The SEAFMD was considered to have struck a balance between in-country and regional approaches. In SEAFMD coordination, planning and specialized support is organized centrally, and national strategies and implementation are undertaken at the national level. The SEAFMD model is in principle applicable for other transboundary animal diseases, but human and financial resource constraints put limits on its applicability (see Box 4).

Good practice: Conduct capacity building as much as possible at the national level, and focus regional approaches on particular areas of interaction and interdependency among countries.

Good practice: More advanced countries in the region should offer training to staff from less developed neighbouring countries.

Box 4. SEAFMD model on transboundary animal diseases

SEAFMD recognizes that a single country cannot be successful in its efforts and has established coordinating mechanisms among Southeast Asian countries for this purpose. The project helps countries with preparation of national plans, training and mobilization of resources from donors. A model has been developed for dealing with outbreaks. Preventive efforts of large-scale vaccinations are recommended in strategic areas. Progressive expansion of disease-free zones can work well, as suggested by experiences in the Myanmar-Thailand-Malaysia region. However, the applicability, pace of implementation and achievement of results depend on many critical factors, including:

- *Costs* FMD management and control is expensive. It requires expensive vaccines, compensation for culling and large numbers of trained staff. There are different strains of FMD that require different vaccines.
- *Cooperation* Cooperation of farmers and traders is necessary for successful implementation. Commercial farmers have an incentive and well-understood self-interest in participating in FMD control, but that is generally not the case among traditional farmers and those who depend on local trade (See Box 3).

Vietnam Viet Nam has FMD plans and policies in place, including emergency funds for outbreaks and compensation for culled animals, and it has a general implementation budget of over US$30 million for a five-year period. The control of FMD is difficult especially in remote areas and for free grazing animals in the bush areas. Veterinary services face human and budgetary resource constraints at all levels. There are in particular insufficient numbers of paravets at the commune and sub-commune levels and their compensation in many provinces is too low to provide sufficient incentive. The central labs have been upgraded, but diagnostic capacity at local levels are still very weak. However, it is expected that the incidence of FMD will decline and there is scope for the establishment and expansion of FMD-free zones.

Lao PDR In Lao PDR, there are weak legal and regulatory frameworks and no comprehensive plan with adequate funding for FMD. Numbers and training of veterinarians and paravets are lower than in Viet Nam. Large-scale preventive vaccination is not practiced because of its cost and complexity. Occasional culling is being practiced in case of outbreaks, but there is no compensation. In the absence of compensation, cooperation by farmers is unlikely. So in fact the country is hardly ready for implementing the FMD eradication model and progress can be slow at best. Yet, the country has reportedly benefited through workshops, help in finding sources for vaccines in case of outbreaks, and assistance in the development of policy for FMD eradication.

Cambodia There is a draft plan and strategy but reportedly not implemented because of lack of funds. Vaccination is sparsely and irregularly available from public and international sources and mainly applied in case of outbreaks. Culling is not practised for FMD and other diseases except for HPAI. Paravets are responsible for reporting but the insufficient funds do not provide for cost of travel and per diem. SEAFMD is still considered useful in providing a network, training and forum for meetings.

Application There is general agreement among specialists and interviewees in the countries that it is technically not very difficult to modify the FMD model for eradication to cover other transboundary animal diseases. Application to other diseases may be facilitated by the lower cost of vaccination and better cooperation from farmers (dealing with diseases more economically-relevant to them). ASEAN has adopted it as the regional model for control of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI). Extension of the model to other diseases would still require additional resources and face the same constraints as expanding FMD eradication. For the more resource constrained countries, there tends to be competition for scarce resources. However, more in general, lack of information about costs and benefits and distributional effects of implementation of the FMD model make it so far difficult to make a compelling case to senior decision makers in Government finance about additional allocation of resources, prioritizing of transboundary diseases, and recovery of costs among beneficiaries.

Source: Project documents and interviews.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

71. SPS capacity building is a relatively new area of development cooperation with limited experience to build on. There is not yet a well-established literature on good practice recommendations. Further work needs to be done to facilitate exchange of views and consensus building on what constitutes good practice in this highly technical area.

72. There is a tendency for technical specialists to dominate SPS project design. The quality and relevance of TA for SPS capacity building could benefit from better use of general frameworks on goals and effectiveness of development cooperation, especially the:

- *UN Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)(2000)*
- *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005); and*
- *OECD analysis of trade related assistance (2007)*

73. SPS capacity can in principle significantly contribute to achieving the Millennium Development Goals, especially poverty reduction (MDG1), reduction of child mortality (MDG4), reduction of incidence of major diseases (MDG6) and participation in further developing an open trading system (MDG8). Identifying and quantifying how far SPS-related technical assistance projects go towards achieving these objectives is a significant challenge.

74. SPS capacity building needs can differ greatly between countries, depending on many factors, such as country size, the pest and disease situation, food safety status, economic development, and product mix and markets served. In assessing what can be developed and how it can be done, each country's absorptive capacity plays a major role. The absorptive capacity also depend on many factors, especially the size and level of development of a country, institutions, human, managerial and financial resources. What can be done in one country cannot be automatically repeated in another country. One size does not fit all. The sustainability of capacity created depends critically on the assessment of needs, sequencing, and absorptive capacity.

75. Some of the resource constraints associated with efforts to control plant and animal diseases and to improve food safety may be relieved by well-targeted donor support. However, other preconditions – such as high-level buy-in, commitment from stakeholders to be involved, adequate human resources, sound planning, etc. – are essential to ensure sustainability. Constraints in absorptive capacity, especially in Cambodia and Lao PDR, but to a lesser extent also in Viet Nam, require long-term commitment and attention by governments and donors. Without simultaneously expanding human resource and diagnostic capacity, and operational budgets, donor support is not likely to lead to sustainable results. The scope for short-term assistance to produce sustainable improvements is limited.

76. The findings of this research indicate that, while these projects have produced benefits, there is further room to improve performance and results, especially in terms of sustainability and contribution towards higher-level objectives, by giving attention to the Paris Principles on Aid Effectiveness, in particular with regard to ownership, implementation by recipients, result-based management, donor coordination, and monitoring and evaluation. In this respect the OECD's findings on effectiveness of trade-related assistance appear to apply to a significant degree to the area of SPS capacity building.

77. The main conclusions arising from this study are as follows:

- The design and implementation of SPS capacity building projects have to be built on a thorough assessment of specific needs and absorptive capacity of a country.

- Projects in Viet Nam appeared to be better tailored to needs and absorptive capacity than similar ones in Cambodia and Lao PDR, which contributed to fewer problems of sustainability and effectiveness.

- The level of commitment and involvement, including political support, of beneficiaries contributes to the success of the project.

- There is great need for good quality and well-targeted technical assistance.

- The SEAFMD model has proven to be technically good practice and can with adjustments be applied to other transboundary diseases if sufficient resources are available and projects are economically feasible.

Recommendations

78. Capacity building activities that address specific national needs and capacity are generally most cost-effectively carried out in stand-alone projects. However, in areas of economic cooperation, trade promotion and management of cross-boundary risks in plant health, animal health and food safety, there is often synergy in joint action. Regional projects should therefore be selective in their coverage. Training provided by experts from more advanced countries in a region to officials from less developed neighbouring countries can be an effective and efficient means to transfer knowledge and skills in regional and national capacity building activities, and this deserves further consideration.

79. A cross-cutting approach to SPS-related technical assistance has the potential to add significant value to capacity building activities. For instance, MUTRAP II brought experts from fisheries, plant quarantine, food safety and animal health together in one project on risk analysis, which made participants aware of similarities in sectoral approaches to, and methodologies, for risk assessment. Further adoption and implementation of such cross-cutting approaches and activities has the potential to generate significant benefits and increase efficiencies in resource allocation.

80. Much of the success of projects is determined during the preparation phase. Deficiencies at this stage affect implementation and outcomes. Although SPS capacity building projects are often technically complex, project design requires more than technical expertise. As such, it is beneficial to incorporate expertise in development assistance, project management and technical expertise at the design stage. Well-planned and executed needs assessments can further enhance project effectiveness and sustainability, and there is scope to improve the planning and delivery of needs assessments for SPS and trade-related technical assistance.

81. The quality of project management of SPS capacity building activities is of critical importance for performance. The same is true for the management of SPS services. Since capable management is generally a constraint, it can be a worthwhile objective for SPS projects to improve management capacity. Mitigating such constraints through direct management by donors and international agencies is generally not good practice and does not support aid effectiveness and ownership.

82. Ongoing M&E is important for accountability, transparency, feedback on management and ongoing learning. M&E systems should be well planned and integrated in project design, and there should be sufficient resources available.

83. To conclude, the main recommendations emerging from this research are as follows:

- Conduct capacity building as much as possible at the national level and focus regional activities on specific areas of interaction and interdependency among countries.

- Thorough and participatory preparation involving beneficiaries and counterparts is essential to ensure common understanding and expectations about projects, clarify roles and responsibilities, and facilitate the leading role for recipients in project execution.

- Ensure a balanced input of expertise in development assistance, project management and technical expertise at the project design stage.

- Needs assessments should: (i) address the relevance and cost-effectiveness of proposed activities and capacity; (ii) consider the sustainability of funding for services to be provided and include a business plan; and (iii) focus on the broader public interest (MDGs) rather than at the narrow interest of public institutions and private enterprises served.

- A good log frame is fundamental for result-based management of capacity building projects. A well-formulated log frame clarifies how goals, objectives and activities are causally related, shows how outputs and outcomes depend on assumptions and quantifies inputs and outputs to provide a framework for result-based management.

- Stakeholders in recipient countries should play a greater role in project management and implementation. Management training should be integrated in SPS capacity building projects, especially in countries with weak capacity.

- M&E systems should be included as integral components of all SPS-related technical assistance projects and implemented without delay.

ANNEX 1: PROJECT INFORMATION FOR SIX SURVEYED PROJECTS

1a: Market Access and Trade Facilitation Support for Mekong Delta Countries through Strengthening Institutional and National Capacities Related to Standards, Metrology, Testing and Quality Phase I (NORAD-UNIDO)

1b: Market Access Support for Viet Nam through the Strengthening of Capacities Related to Metrology, Testing and Conformity (SECO-UNIDO)

1c: Southeast Asia Foot and Mouth Disease (SEAFMD)

1d: Multilateral Trade Assistance Project Viet Nam II (MUTRAP II)

1e: Plant Quarantine II–Thermal Treatment for the Disinfestation of Fruit Flies (JICA)

1f: Fish-borne Zoonotic Parasites (FIBOZOPA)

Annex 1a: Project Information – Market Access and Trade Facilitation Support for Mekong Delta Countries through Strengthening Institutional and National Capacities Related to Standards, Metrology, Testing and Quality Phase I (NORAD-UNIDO)

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	SMTQ TBT and SPS
• Type of assistance	Soft and hard infrastructure
• Countries	Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam
• Donor	NORAD
• Implementing agency	UNIDO
• Timeframe	May 2003 – July 2005
• Budget	US$ 804,000 (w/o agency support costs); US$ 908,520 (w/support costs)
• Brief description	Overall support for SMTQ that included an initial assessment of gaps, provision of trainings, workshops and equipment
• Objectives	*Development objective*: Facilitate industrial development and export capabilities by reducing TBTs through strengthening of SMTQ infrastructures and national capacity *Immediate objective 1*: Capacity building related to market access requirements and TBT and identifying manufacturing sub-sectors and export market focus for remedial action *Immediate objective 2*: Review and upgrade required technical infrastructure for standards development and harmonization; metrology and testing labs; standards for labelling, accreditation, certification of labs and quality systems
• Main activities	Assessment of SMTQ infrastructure Technical assessment evaluating facilities and capacity on metrology, chemical and microbiology labs Bring together SMTQ institutions to harmonize standards, possibility of forming regional accreditation authority Awareness creation of SMTQ importance through group training programs on standards, accreditation, HACCP, ISO 9000, ISO 14000, ISO 17025
• SPS components	Assessment of diagnostic capacity for food safety, plant health and animal health
• Partner institutions	SMTQ institutions of each country Viet Nam: Directorate for Standards, Metrology and Quality (STAMEQ) Cambodia: Department of Industrial Standards of Cambodia (ISC) (MIME) Lao PDR: Department of Intellectual Property, Standardization and Metrology (DISM) of (formerly) STEA
• Beneficiaries	Viet Nam: Directorate for Standards, Metrology and Quality (STAMEQ) Viet Nam Metrology Institute (VMI) Quality Assurance and Testing Centre (QUATEST) Bureau of Accreditation (BOA) Cambodia: Department of Industrial Standards of Cambodia (ISC) (MIME) Lao PDR: Department of Intellectual Property, Standardization and Metrology (DISM) of (formerly) STEA

Project data sheet	
	Food and Drug Quality Control Center (FDQCC) under MOH Plant Protection Center (PPC) under MAF Manufacturing facilities Exporters
• Outputs	Detailed action plan for each country to bridge SMTQ gaps; report to be basis for Phase II Work plan and resource requirement for lab development and accreditation Trainings on food safety, HACCP system and auditing
• Outcomes	Greater awareness of SMTQ and SPS issues Increased SMTQ capacity
• Sustainability	Phase II to establish/strengthen metrology, microbiology and chemical testing labs in countries (US$ 1.5 million); UNIDO to target donor countries for funds for Phase II
• Evaluation	Post-project evaluation made by NORAD, representatives of beneficiary countries and UNIDO (independent consultant), July 2005

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Relevant for WTO and AFTA Consistent with strategy of governments and institutions
• How project was initiated	Project was a follow-on activity to previous UNIDO work
• Beneficiary's role	Viet Nam's STAMEQ, Cambodia's ISC, and Lao DISM collaborated in project design with NORAD and UNIDO
• Needs assessment	Actual interventions based on detailed needs analysis
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	The logical framework was not consistently applied. Some activities are not precisely defined and success factors (output, expected impact and outcomes) are not included. Link between inputs, including costs and outputs is weak.
Project implementation	
• National ownership	All institutions expressed high level of ownership (except in finances) mainly due to high quality of interventions Cambodia provided US$ 100,000 to build metrology center
• Beneficiary participation	Beneficiaries participated 20-40% through staff inputs, infrastructure and facilities, and needs assessment on technical level. The Cambodian government provided funding for chemical and microbiology lab.
• Project management	There were a Project Manager, a Chief Technical Adviser, an Associate Expert and the UNIDO National representatives. The evaluation report noted a perceived lack of clarity among country counterparts and beneficiaries with regard to delineation of responsibilities among these implementing officers.
• Synergies	NORAD-UNIDO needs assessment was supported by stand-alone projects in Viet Nam (funded by SECO) and Cambodia (funded by Austrian Development Agency).

• Transparency	There were joint reviews (Government, UNIDO, NORAD) annually and a terminal review
• Monitoring	UNIDO was responsible for monitoring.
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Development of SMTQ infrastructure in areas of policy development, awareness creation and knowledge enhancement Addressed issues for export, thus contributed to development and poverty alleviation Project contributed to protection of domestic consumers against substandard or hazardous products, domestic or imported
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Participatory approach allowed for high degree of ownership and sustainability
• Project implementation	Long-term contract with same consultants provided continuity and efficiency Combination of hardware (equipment) and software (capacity building, consulting and policy advice) was effective UNIDO consultants—high competence, ability to adapt to environment of beneficiary institutions, good communication skills International and national experts worked together
• Cost-effective	Combined expert missions for regional project led to cost savings
• Lessons that could be replicated	Creating linkages between different interventions funded by different donors and implemented by UNIDO and counterparts was effective

Sources: UNIDO Response to G/SPS/GEN/816
Project document
Project evaluation
Interviews

Annex 1b: Project Information – Market Access Support for Viet Nam through the Strengthening of Capacities Related to Metrology, Testing and Conformity

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	SMTQ TBT/SPS
• Type of assistance	Soft and hard infrastructure
• Country	Viet Nam
• Donor	SECO
• Implementing agency	UNIDO
• Timeframe	2004-2007
• Budget	US$985,000 (excluding agency support cost)
• Brief description	Overall assistance to SMTQ capacity that included equipment, facilities and support towards accreditation
• Objectives	*Development objective*: Facilitate market access and export capabilities by reducing TBTs through strengthening of SMTQ and conformity assessment institutional structures and national capacity *Immediate objective*: Upgrade the required technical infrastructure for metrology, textile/apparel, microbiology and chemical testing and calibration needs in industry, system certification capacity and strengthen SMTQ institutional service capability
• Main activities	Provision of equipment and training to strengthen metrology lab, microbiology and chemical testing labs Training of trainers courses on ISO 9000, ISO 14000, HACCP, etc. Provision of training for Bureau of Accreditation
• SPS components	Diagnostic capacity for food safety for NAFIQAVED 1 Biological lab and Quality Assurance and Testing (QUATEST) Centre 3 to provide testing services to exporters in food processing and fisheries sectors Capacity for HACCP
• Partner institutions	STAMEQ
• Beneficiaries	STAMEQ, (former) NAFIQAVED, manufacturing enterprises, and exporters
• Outputs	Upgraded 5 testing and 6 metrology labs International accreditation for 4 metrology labs, 4 testing labs (including microbiology for NAFIQAD and chemical and microbiology for Quatest 3) More national trainers on HACCP, ISO 9000, ISO 14000 and GMP Establishment of National Accreditation Council
• Outcomes	Increased capacity for testing and metrology labs Separation of certification services (Bureau of Accreditation) from standard setting services for STAMEQ
• Sustainability	Follow-up phase being developed
• Evaluations	Independent final evaluation carried out at end of first project cycle

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	In line with Viet Nam's national strategies on SMTQ and export promotion Important for the growing export sector of Viet Nam, especially the fisheries sector
• How project was initiated	Complementary intervention to NORAD-UNIDO regional project
• Beneficiary's role	Project design was done in cooperation with direct beneficiaries
• Needs assessment	Needs assessment done for NORAD-UNIDO project was used for project formulation; although needs assessment was conducted at service provider level
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	Outputs, outcomes and performance indicators were not clearly defined; no baseline data at outset of project Budget not linked to outputs and activities
Project implementation	
• National ownership	Viet Nam had significant investments in infrastructure Detailed follow-up plan on implementing recommendations on governance/institutional issues
• Beneficiary participation	Significant staff inputs Infrastructure and facilities (upgrading and renovation of buildings) Operating costs of labs to be developed Funding for supplementary training courses Input to needs assessment on technical level
• Project management	Lean agency execution/implementation mode UNIDO country office was focal point and coordinator of technical input
• Synergies	Component of UNIDO-Viet Nam Integrated Programme of Cooperation Took into account other SECO and UNIDO projects and EU's ETV2, but formalized linkages were not established
• Monitoring	Implementing agency UNIDO was responsible for monitoring
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Promotion of exports Increased protection of domestic consumers against substandard or hazardous products
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Comprehensive interlinked approach to strengthening SMTQ, combining upgrade of facilities with training, support to international accreditation and policy advice High level of beneficiary ownership
• Project implementation	High quality of technical input Project implementation mode (agency execution, with active involvement of STAMEQ) Project management flexibility in adjusting to changed needs Vietnamese counterparts were proactive

• Lessons that could be replicated	Project design in cooperation with direct beneficiaries Lean agency execution mode (with active day-to-day involvement of counterpart), where implementing agency has strong offices and counterparts

Sources: SECO Response to G/SPS/GEN/816
Project document
Project evaluation

Annex 1c: Project Information – Southeast Asia Foot and Mouth Disease (SEAFMD)

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	Animal health
• Type of assistance	Soft and hard infrastructure
• Countries	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Viet Nam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines and Thailand
• Donor	AusAID for Phase 3
• Implementing agency	OIE Regional Coordination Unit (RCU)
• Timeframe	Phase 1 (1997-2001): Preparatory phase Phase 2 (2001-2005): Control phase Phase 3 (2006-2010) : Eradication and consolidation phase
• Budget	Australia's contributions: Phase 1: AUS$ 600,000 (about US$530 thousand)* Phase 2: AUS$ 2.37 million (about US$2 million) Phase 3: AUS$ 1.018 million (about US$1 million) Total: AUS$ 3.99 million (about US$3.5 million) Other donors: France, New Zealand, Japan, FAO-ADB support in training
• Brief description	Coordination mechanism among animal health services of member countries to achieve progressive reduction of FMD, creation of disease-free zones
• Objectives	*Immediate objective*: Improve veterinary services to build info base to develop regional control strategy *Intermediate objective*: Improve productivity and increase income of livestock producers *Long-term objective*: Facilitate and promote international trade of animals and animal products among countries having FMD-free regions in Southeast Asia FMD freedom with vaccination among member countries
• Main activities	*Among others*: Establishment of MOUs among countries Monitoring of FMD among member countries through monthly reports Management of animal movement and identification of cattle zones
• SPS component	Control of FMD to allow for livestock trade
• Partner institutions	Animal health services of member countries
• Beneficiaries	Member countries and neighboring border country (People's Republic of China) Animal health services of member countries Farmers, traders and processors

*Using AUS$1.1343 = US$1, end of 2007 market rate, IMF International Financial Statistics

• Outputs	SEAFMD 2020 – long-term strategy of progressive zoning approach to control and eradicate FMD Regional reference lab for FMD in Thailand SEAFMD Access database with monthly monitoring reports from member countries Establishment of FMD control zones Training modules for vets and para-vets National FMD plans
• Outcomes	FMD-free Southeast Asia, ultimately by 2020 Better FMD monitoring and control among member countries, varying results Increased awareness on FMD among member countries through SEAFMD Communication Plan and website
• Sustainability	Project to be integrated with ASEAN, to be funded by the ASEAN Animal Health Trust Fund
• Evaluations	Reviews by experts were carried out for Phases 1 (1999) and 2 (2003). A review was conducted in 2008 for Phase 3 the outcome of which formed the basis of a project application to AusAID for funding up to December 2010.
• Website	http://www.seafmd-rcu.oie.int/index.php

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Importance of FMD with regard to livestock trade in region
• How project was initiated	Mainly donor-driven—OIE, AusAID, DAFF
• Beneficiary's role	To some extent recipient countries were involved, though not the farmers and traders
• Needs assessment	Phase 3 took into account outcomes of Phases 1 and 2; limited needs assessment
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	No good log-frame; no M&E in place because of lack of budget
Project implementation	
• National ownership	Beneficiaries are responsible in large part for driving in-country developments under an agreed approach.
• Beneficiary participation	In terms of coordination activities, involvement can be 20% including secondments to the RCU, planning and the like. The beneficiaries have made and continue to make a strong in-kind contribution to staffing, operations and engagement of stakeholders. The project provides coordination and strategic advice to harmonize effective disease control. The member countries provide resources from their own budget or through support of bilateral projects to implement in-country field activities. Thailand hosts RCU office.
• Private sector involvement	Private Sector Consultative Committee
• Project management	OIE Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) implements the project

• Synergies	FAO/ADB GMS TADs – joint activities in trainings, surveillance and public awareness campaigns OIE/AusAID Programme in Strengthening Veterinary Services
• Transparency	Programme is examined each year by National Programme Coordinators to re-evaluate priorities in light of developments
• Monitoring	Monitoring and evaluation are core components of the project. RCU regularly submits semi-annual and annual reports to donor and OIE headquarters. In the future, programme will have built-in monitoring and evaluation component.
• Difficulties	Given the socio-economic circumstances of countries, difficulties have been encountered amongst poorer countries in conducting for example field activities. Powers for enforcement of implementing agencies can be limited through inadequate legislation. SEAFMD has sought to overcome these problems through a series of activities including assisting countries find bilateral donors; entering into joint projects; engaging at Ministerial and head of department level; improving communication, among others.
• Funding	Core funding is only for regional activities. For implementation of project at country level, countries have to find own resources.
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Greater productivity Poverty alleviation
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project implementation	Political and high official level support in member countries and OIE Effective RCU staff Member country support and constructive engagement Sound planning with agreed outcomes and objectives and expert evaluations Ongoing funding and commitment Continuing review and annual meetings
• Lessons that could be replicated	Approaches used for inter-country coordination

Sources: AusAID Response to G/SPS/GEN/816
OIE Response to G/SPS/GEN/816
SEAFMD 2020 Project document
Interviews

Annex 1d: Project Information – Multilateral Trade Assistance Project Viet Nam II (MUTRAP II)

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	WTO Accession, SPS/TBT Agreement
• Type of assistance	Information, training, and hard infrastructure
• Country	Viet Nam
• Donor	European Union
• Implementing agency	Executing agency is Ministry of Trade Project management by Project Task Force
• Timeframe	2005-2008
• Budget	€5.35 million (EC: €5.1 million; Viet Nam: €0.25 million) OR US$7.88 million (EC: US$7.51 million; Viet Nam US$0.37 million)*
• Brief description	Overall assistance to enable Viet Nam to satisfy WTO commitments with major support for the SPS/TBT Enquiry Points
• Objectives	*Overall objective*: To improve and put in place conditions for sustained and stable economic growth through stronger integration into the global trading system and ultimately contribute in turn to poverty alleviation *Project purpose*: Strengthen the capacity of Government and stakeholders for managing WTO accession and meet their commitments and challenges from other international and regional trade related agreements
• Main activities	Specific studies on agriculture and services Specific assistance for the SPS/TBT EPs such as study tours, provision of equipment, establishment of "portals and databases" and assessment of regulations relevant to SPS/TBT Agreements Various "horizontal" activities on legislations and regulations, dispute settlements and negotiation techniques
• SPS components	5 out of 27 activities were SPS-related, specifically on: WTO SPS Agreement and SPS Enquiry Point
• Partner institutions	Ministry of Trade (MOT), Ministry of Health (MOH), Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) and (former) Ministry of Fisheries (MOFI)
• Beneficiaries	SPS Enquiry Point Agencies involved in WTO accession and implementation: MARD, MOH, MOST; business associations, universities and training institutions
• Outputs	Final reports on various activities including studies on WTO equivalence and mutual recognition agreements and risk assessments Workshops on various activities Establishment of SPS Enquiry Point
• Outcome	Greater awareness and understanding of WTO SPS/TBT Agreements Increased capacity for SPS Enquiry Point

*Using €0.6793 = US$1, end of 2007 representative exchange rate, IMF

• Sustainability	Beneficiaries have 60-80% of necessary capacity to sustain benefits (survey)
• Evaluations	Mid-term independent evaluation (February 2007)
• Website	http://www.mutrap.org.vn/

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Implementation of WTO commitments
• How project was initiated	Follow-up to MUTRAP I
• Beneficiary's role	Consultation with MOT, MARD, (former) MOFI, MOH
• Needs assessment	Follow-up of extension phase of MUTRAP I
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	No clear benchmarks and appropriate technical capabilities required to measure activity-related impacts (from evaluation)
Project implementation	
• National ownership	Executing agency is MOT; joint implementation of activities
• Beneficiary participation	Provision of staff that includes Project Director and Accounting Officer Office and venues for meetings Experts from SPS agencies were consultants
• Project management	Competent management by Project Task Force to oversee implementation and facilitate communication
• Monitoring	Independent contractor and beneficiaries were responsible
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Institutional capacity for international trade Market access
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Strong ownership and political support Demand-driven project design; meeting needs of beneficiaries Active association with the ongoing work plan of beneficiaries
• Project implementation	Coordination was not easy given the number of SPS agencies with different capacity levels. Facilitated through regular policy networking sessions and workshops, close involvement of relevant stakeholders, including WTO negotiators, in the subject studies. High quality of foreign experts and project staff
• Lessons that could be replicated	Addressed cross-cutting issues, matching with the national agenda (WTO accession and implementation of commitments)

Sources: EC Response to G/SPS/GEN/816
Project document
Project evaluation
Interviews

Annex 1e: Project Information – Plant Quarantine II – Thermal Treatment for the Disinfestation of Fruit Flies

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	Plant health
• Type of assistance	Soft infrastructure
• Country	Viet Nam
• Donor	JICA
• Implementing agency	JICA
• Timeframe	May 2003 – September 2007
• Budget	US$ 630,000 (about ¥ 72 million*)
• Brief description	Training course for two and a half months utilizing Japanese experts and facilities
• Objectives	*Course objective*: To have understanding of principles and techniques of treatments and skills to carry out procedures
• Main activities	Lectures, practical training, study tours, and preparation of country report
• SPS component	Capacity to perform quarantine treatments in accordance with importing country requirements
• Partner institutions	Plant Protection Department, MARD
• Beneficiaries	Plant protection personnel involved with plant quarantine treatments (vapour heat treatment, cold treatment, etc.) of fruit flies Exporters of fruits
• Output	Staff trained in plant quarantine treatments
• Outcome	Increased capacity for plant quarantine
• Sustainability	Linkage with JICA TCP "Improvement of Plant Quarantine Treatment Techniques against Fruit Flies on Fresh Fruits in Viet Nam" that included equipment so skills can be applied

*Using ¥114 = US$1, end of 2007 market rate. IMF International Financial Statistics

Issues

Project design and implementation	
• Relevance	Important to growing and potential fruit exports of Viet Nam
• How project was initiated	Training was component of JICA TCP
• Beneficiary's role	4 participants in training course
• Needs assessment	Based on needs assessment
• Monitoring	JICA was responsible

Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Improved market access for fruits with acquisition of skills towards the development of disinfestations procedures that comply with phyto requirements of importing countries
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Specific requirements guarantee qualification of trainee (experience in plant quarantine, presently working in PQ, command of English (course taught in English), educational attainment)
• Project implementation	A required country report will indicate knowledge and understanding of issues and problems because it includes discussion of PQ organization, fruit industry, PQ system and problems, and plant pests. It allows the course to be country-specific, for the participants to see application within context of respective country.
• Lessons that could be replicated	Training programme matches the needs of developing countries that wish to export tropical fruits Efficient and effective technology transfer to multiple countries utilizing human resources and facilities in Japan

Sources: JICA Response to G/SPS/GEN/816
Project document
Interviews

Box 5. JICA's TCP on Plant Quarantine

Vietnam's tropical fruits have considerable potential for export but a key factor to develop such potential is a quarantine system that meets the requirements of the importing country. The Vietnamese government requested Japanese assistance on fruit fly disinfestation techniques.

JICA's "Project for Improvement of Plant Quarantine Treatment Techniques against Fruit Flies on Fresh Fruits" ran from March 2005 to February 2008. The TCP provided the capacity to apply disinfestation techniques, specifically, vapour heat treatment, for fruit flies on dragon fruits. The project included training by Japanese experts in Vietnam, training for plant quarantine staff in Japan and the provision of equipment for vapour heat treatment to the Post-Entry Quarantine Centre II laboratory in Ho Chi Minh City.

Four participants attended the training course "Thermal Treatment for the Disinfestation of Fruit Flies" in Okinawa. The course covered methods to perform vapour heat treatment, treatment techniques, development of a system to store diagnostic data and analyse results.

The Vietnamese beneficiaries contributed staff time, facilities and equipment, and financial resources. The technology could eventually be applied to other tropical fruits. The likelihood of sustainability of the project is high because of the support of Plant Protection Department in terms of staff allocation and budget resources and the dedication and commitment of the plant quarantine staff.

Key aspects of good practice in the project include: (i) thorough preparation with dialogue between Japanese and Vietnamese officials; (ii) combination of training, institution building and provision of equipment; and (iii) consultation with the private sector which is expected to generate investments to scale up these techniques to a commercial size.

Source: Project evaluation, JICA website, documents provided and interviews.

Annex 1f: Project Information – Fish-borne Zoonotic Parasites (FIBOZOPA)

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	Food safety (mostly domestic concerns)
• Type of assistance	Soft and hard infrastructure
• Country	Viet Nam
• Donor	DANIDA
• Implementing agency	Research Institute for Aquaculture 1 is main core partner
• Timeframe	2005-2008
• Budget	DKK 7 million or about US$ 1.4 million*
• Brief description	Support to do coordinated research on fish-borne zoonotic parasites (FZPs) that included fellowships for graduate studies, equipment and facilities
• Objectives	*Developmental objective*: General awareness created nationally of the occurrence, risks and preventive measures for FZP infections of humans, as well as specialized knowledge of how to handle the problems at Central Government and provincial levels *Immediate objective*: Key factors leading to infection of fish and humans with FZPs described and preventive measures recommended and made commonly known among the direct stakeholders
• Main activities	Fellowships for Masters and PhD students to do research on FZPs Trainings of scientists, technicians and students on detection, identification and epidemiology of FZPs Provision of lab equipment
• SPS components**	Food safety of fish products Risk assessment of FZPs
• Partner institutions	Faculty of Life Science, Department of Veterinary Pathology, Royal Danish Veterinary and Agricultural University Research Institute of Aquaculture No. 1 (RIA1), Bac Ninh Research Institute of Aquaculture No. 2 (RIA2), Ho Chi Minh City (former) National Fisheries Quality Assurance and Veterinary Directorate (NAFIQAVED) National Institute of Malariology, Parasitology and Entomology Institute of Biotechnology Institute of Ecology and Biological Resources Institute for Health Research and Development, Denmark Fisheries Sector Programme Support (FSPS), Hanoi College of Aquaculture and Fisheries, Can Tho University Parasitology Department at National Institute of Veterinary Research, Hanoi

*Using DKK 5.0753 = US$1, end of 2007 market rate, IMF International Financial Statistics

**Trematode problem in fish products is more of a domestic human health concern, there being no international requirements for fresh fish because the product is supposed to be safe after sufficient cooking or freezing below 18°C.

• Beneficiaries	Viet Nam research institutions General population, reduced risks of food contamination
• Outputs	Surveys on prevalence of FZPs in humans and in aquaculture systems Studies on epidemiology, occurrence and risk factors of FZPs Lab manual
• Outcomes	Greater awareness about FZPs through workshops, television documentary, website, newspaper articles Increased capacity to do research Increased capacity to do risk assessment on FZPs Increased collaboration among institutions
• Sustainability	Findings used as bases to plan second phase to include pilot studies on control and prevention, dissemination of materials and regional network (collaboration with Laos and Cambodia). Follow-up activities planned in Phase II to be co-funded with Vietnamese government and international donors and organizations
• Evaluations	Mid-year interim status reports done by Vietnamese partners; annual reports
• Website	www.fibozopa.ria1.org

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Fish-borne zoonotic parasites are severe health problem in Southeast Asia; about 1 million people affected in Viet Nam (WHO, 1995) Importance of aquaculture in exports
• How project was initiated	Built on FAO risk assessment work in Viet Nam Consultations with (former) Ministry of Fisheries, MARD, MOH, RIA1, Ministry of Science and Technology, and (former) NAFIQAVED, FAO, WHO
• Beneficiary's role	Experiences by MOH and local WHO office in drug treatments of infected humans were utilized in the design of human prevalence surveys
• Needs assessment	Based on FAO risk assessment carried out in south of Viet Nam and other donor research capacity building projects
Project implementation	
• National ownership	Partners active in proposing, planning and implementing new activities Researchers from 11 institutions responsible for planning and implementing 33 research projects
• Beneficiary participation	In-kind contribution: laboratory and vehicle use, Government staff salaries, local costs for graduate students All activities were implemented as joint activities
• Project management	Implementation carried out by RIA1 and other main Vietnamese partners with co-management by Danish counterparts
• Synergies	DANIDA's FSPS II focuses on food safety of fish products at production taking into account findings from FIBOZOPA project
• Transparency	Adjustments in research planning and implementation done with mutual agreement between partner institutions

• Monitoring	Joint monitoring by donor and beneficiary
• Difficulties	Research activities involved different institutions; resolved by formalizing sharing of data and publishing rights among different institutions
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Reduced food-borne diseases upon implementation of findings
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Preparation: All necessary permits and agreements were obtained and in place before start of project or during the first year. Long planning period with full stakeholder involvement
• Project implementation	PhD students carried out research work in Viet Nam Mix of higher education needs according to ability of students Sandwich-like educational (Masters and PhD) programs with stays in Viet Nam
• Lessons that could be replicated	Mutual research interests Mutual decision and ownership of research work

Sources: JICA Response to G/SPS/GEN/816
Project document
Interviews

ANNEX 2: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Thailand

Dr. Ronello Abila	OIE-SEAFMD, Regional Coordination Unit
Dr Laddawanla Ratananakorn	Department of Livestock Development
Dr Carolyn Benigno	FAO
Mr. Royce Escolar	AusAID
Mr. Michael Cole	AusAID
Mr. Boonpeng Sanitwattanatam	President, Swine Producers and Processors for Exporting Association

Lao PDR

Dr. Souklatsamy Vongsack	Director, FDQCC
Mr Soumana Choulamany	Director, Metrology Institute NAST
Mr Phaydy Phiaxaysarakham	Director, Plant Quarantine Division, DoA, MAF
Dr. Inthavong Phouth	Acting National Coordinator SEAFMD Lao PDR
Mr Sounthone Vongthilath	Chief, Veterinary Legislation Division, DOLF, MAF
Mr. And Ms. Poh	Owners, Slaughterhouse in Vientiane capital

Viet Nam

Mr. Nguen Nhu Tiep	Deputy Director General, NAFIQAD, MARD
Ms. Tran Bich Nga	Deputy Director General, NAFIQAD
Dr. Hoang Van Nam	Deputy Director General, Department of Animal Health, MARD National Coordinator, SEAFMD
Mr. Vu Van Minh	Deputy Director, SPS Notification Authority and Enquiry Point
Mr. Pham Anh Tuan	Deputy Director, Research Institute of Aquaculture No 1
Mme. Bui Thi Cuc	Vice Chief of Planning, International Cooperation & Science Division, Department of Animal Health, MARD
Ms. Tran Viet Nga	Director, Foreign Relation and Integration Division, MOH
Ms. Nguyen The Thanh Van	Senior Officer, International Cooperation Department, STAMEQ
Mr. Dang Viet Yen	Plant Quarantine Division, Plant Protection Department, MARD
Ms. Phan Thanh Hang	Plant Quarantine Division, Plant Protection Department, MARD
Mr. Tujii Kensuke	Deputy Resident Representative, JICA
Mr. Hans Farnhammer	First Secretary-Economic Co-operation & Governance, EC
Ms. Vu Thi Tuan Anh	Programme Officer, Co-operation Section, EC
Mr. Paolo Vergano	SPS Expert, MUTRAP II
Mr. Nguyen Minh Tuan	Deputy General Director, VCCI
Dr. Pham Ngoc Khoi	Vice Director, CMT Hanoi Joint Stock Company Local consultant, MUTRAP II and MUTRAP III

Cambodia

Mr. Hou Leng	Deputy Director General, Metrology, and Intellectual Property National UNIDO Coordinator,
Mr. Chuon Khlauk	Deputy Director, CAMCONTROL, MOC
Mr. Chan Sopha	Deputy Director, Department of Industrial Standards (DISC) Ministry of Industry, Mining and Energy (MIME)
Mr. Saroeun Kessara	Director of Technical Affair and Public Relation Department, Camcontrol
Mr. Dim Theng	Director, Laboratory Camcontrol
Mr. Chen Seng Heang	Head, Industrial Laboratory Center of Cambodia (ILCC)
Mr. Chheng Uddara	Chief, Product Certification Office, DISC, MIME
Dr. Sorn San	Director, National Animal Health and Production Investigation Centre, DAHP, MAFF, National Coordinator, SEAFMD

Mr. Holl Davun	Deputy Director, National Animal Health and Production Investigation Centre
Mr. Sok Leng	Chief, Standards Formulation Division, DISC, MIME
Mr. Yem Narith	Chief, Information Office and TBT EP, DISC, MIME
Ms. Hin Kesar	Chief, Training and Consultancy Office, DISC, MIME
Mr. Sawai Tangtanaporn	Vice President, CP Cambodia Co Ltd.

REFERENCES

Responses to WTO SPS Document G/SPS/GEN/816

Type of SPS assistance Document G/SPS/GEN/206

Scoullar, B. and Perkins, N. 2008. AusAID Grant Funding to World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) for the Southeast Asia Foot and Mouth Disease (SEAFMD) Campaign. Independent review report.

DANIDA. 2007. FIBOZOPA Project Annual Report 2007

EU. 2007. Mid-term Evaluation of Multilateral Trade Assistance project Viet Nam (MUTRAP II). Final Report.

Ignacio, L. 2007. "Overview of SPS-related assistance for Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam (2001-06)." Paper prepared for the Standards Trade Development Facility workshop in the Aid for Trade for Asia event, Manila, September 19-20, 2007.

JICA. 2007. Final Evaluation Report on the Project for Improvement of Plant Quarantine Treatment Techniques Against Fruit Flies on Fresh Fruits in Viet Nam.

OECD 2005. *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Ownership, Harmonization, Alignment and Mutual Accountability.* Adopted by: High Level Forum, Paris February 28 – March 2, 2005.

OECD 2006. *Aid for trade: Making it Effective.* Paris: OECD.
http://213.253.134.43/oecd/pdfs/browseit/4306171E.PDF

OECD 2005. *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Ownership, Harmonization, Alignment and Mutual Accountability.* Adopted by: High Level Forum, Paris February 28 – March 2, 2005.

OECD 2007. Trade-Related Assistance: What Do Recent Evaluations Tell Us? Paris: OECD.
http://213.253.134.43/oecd/pdfs/browseit/4307051E.PDF

OIE. 2007. "SEAFMD 2020. A Roadmap for Foot and Mouth Disease Freedom with Vaccination by 2020 in Southeast Asia" 2007. Regional Coordination Unit, OIE Sub-Commission for Foot and Mouth Diseases in Southeast Asia.

UNIDO. 2005. Market Access and Trade Facilitation Support for Mekong Delta Countries, through Strengthening Institutional and National Capacities Related to Metrology, Testing and Conformity (SMTQ). Mekong Delta Countries (Viet Nam, Lao PDR, Cambodia).

UNIDO. 2007. Final Report. "Market Access Support through the Strengthening Institutional and National Capacities Related to Metrology, Testing and Conformity" Funded by SECO.

UNIDO. 2007. Independent Evaluation "Market Access Support through the Strengthening Institutional and National Capacity Related to Metrology, Testing and Conformity" Funded by SECO.

Van der Meer, K. 2007. Overview of SPS Capacity Building Needs Assessments and Compliance Studies for Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam 2001-2006. Research work for STDF.

Van der Meer, K and Ignacio, L. 2008. SPS Balance Sheet for CLV: Strengthening links between supply and demand of SPS-related technical assistance in a sub-group of ASEAN countries (Stage 2). Research work for STDF.

WTO. 2000. Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures G/SPS/GEN/206 "Technical Assistance Typology" 18 October 2000.

WTO. 2008. Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures G/SPS/GEN/816 "Request for Information on Good Practice in SPS-related Technical Cooperation" 18 January 2008.