WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

G/SPS/GEN/874
26 September 2008

(08-4565)

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 Hafemeister, Mr Spencer Henson and Mr Cornelis van der Meer.

Attached is the report of Mr Jason Hafemeister. This report examines the projects submitted as examples of good practice in the Central America 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

Central America Sub-region: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama

Research work for the Standards and Trade Development Facility

Jason Hafemeister

September 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations and Acronyms

APHIS	Animal Plant Health Inspection Service, United States
BSE	Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy
CAFTA-DR	Dominican Republic – Central America – United States Free Trade Agreement
Codex	Codex Alimentarius Commission
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Association
IICA	Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OIE	World Organisation for Animal Health
OIRSA	Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (Regional Organization for Agriculture Health)
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures
STDF	Standards and Trade Development Facility
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
WTO	World Trade Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. In the context of the ongoing monitoring of Aid for Trade by the World Trade Organization (WTO) and other organizations, this research work has been commissioned by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) to identify good practice in technical cooperation in the sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) area in Central America. The focus is on assistance provided to Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama. This study builds on recent work sponsored by the STDF and Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) to examine the supply and receipt of SPS-related technical cooperation in Central America and identify outstanding priorities and needs. [2]

2. Research for this study is based on responses to a survey questionnaire, which requested information on projects considered as examples of good practice (G/SPS/GEN/816 and G/SPS/GEN/816/Add.1). The questionnaire was distributed to WTO Members and OECD Development Assistance Committee contact points in January and April 2008. Eight projects in Central America were nominated in response (see table below). Six projects were put forward by donors and two by the recipient country (Costa Rica).

Projects nominated as examples of good practice in response to G/SPS/GEN/816

1. Peppers and Tomatoes Mitigating Measures Training in CAFTA-DR countries nominated by the United States *U.S. Pepper and Tomato project*
2. SPS Training in Costa Rica and Guatemala nominated by Canada *Canada SPS Training project*
3. Laboratory Improvement in Central America nominated by FAO *FAO Lab project*
4. Establishing and Strengthening Codex Committees in Central America nominated by FAO *FAO Codex project*
5. Control of '*Broca de Café*' pest in Panama and Costa Rica (FAO TCP project) nominated by Costa Rica *Broca de Café project*
6. Establishment of Fruit Fly Free Areas in Central America (various donors, including FAO, USDA, and IAEA) nominated by Costa Rica *Fruit Fly Free project*
7. Papaya Export Promotion in Guatemala nominated by Chinese Taipei *Chinese Taipei Papaya project*
8. Residue Testing in Panama nominated by Chinese Taipei *Chinese Taipei Residue Testing project*

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816

3. The consultant subsequently conducted in-person and telephone interviews with project donors and beneficiaries, and reviewed related literature where available, to identify elements of good practice in the design, implementation, outputs and achievement of higher-order objectives of these projects. Fieldwork was carried out in July and August 2008.

4. The projects nominated as examples of good practice addressed various components of SPS including institutional strengthening and technical assistance to increase market access and specific

[2] Regional SPS Balance Sheet for Central America. Available at: www.standardsfacility.org/Central_America.htm

exports (i.e. peppers, tomatoes, papaya and coffee). Several of the projects nominated were regional in scope, covering all of Central America and Panama.

5. The research in Central America identified a number of elements of good practice in project design. These included: (i) alignment of project objectives with national and regional development strategies and national policies; (ii) close collaboration of donors and beneficiaries (including private sector groups as appropriate) at the design stage; (iii) adoption of a regional approach to take advantage of economies of scale and enable benefits to be leveraged across countries; (iv) development of linkages and synergies with relevant completed and/or ongoing activities; (v) identification of needs and priorities through detailed needs assessments; (vi) development of linkages with international and regional organizations to obtain specific technical expertise and enhance implementation; and (vii) adoption of a value chain approach to maximize trade impacts.

6. Several lessons emerged with respect to good practice in project implementation. Transferring practical knowledge and skills through hands-on and on-the-job training, and using a training-of-trainers approach to get the most out of training activities, was seen as useful. The need for flexibility to address unforeseen challenges and enable lessons learned during implementation to be incorporated was emphasized. The research also highlighted the importance of being able to implement projects that respond to real trade opportunities and challenges in a timely manner, and the utility of taking a multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary approach to address the complexities and scope of SPS needs. The involvement of producers' organizations was put forward as a practical way to encourage private sector participation and enhance sustainability.

7. In terms of project outputs and the achievement of higher-order objectives, one of the main conclusions focused on the benefits of adopting a results-oriented approach and formulating projects with clear and relatively narrow objectives focused on market access. Adopting such a targeted and export-oriented approach was credited with generating more tangible outputs.

8. All the projects identified as examples of good practice in Central America sought to promote exports, directly or indirectly, and facilitate access to foreign markets by increasing capacity to comply with SPS requirements. The immediate record of success is mixed. Two projects had direct positive effects on exports; the U.S. peppers and tomatoes capacity building project and the Chinese Taipei papaya project. Elements of these projects that contributed to export success included, most importantly, targeted activities to meet the import requirements of particular foreign markets, training focused at the producer/packer level to increase capacity to meet import requirements, close coordination with competent authorities in export markets, and the identification of private sector investment to enhance sustainability. The project to establish fruit fly free zones requires further work to come to fruition in technical and market profitability terms. The Canadian BSE project in the region has helped move Costa Rica closer to minimal risk designation, which will facilitate exports in the future. The *Broca de Café* project in Costa Rica has reduced the risk of losses due to pest damage, however, it is difficult to quantify specific benefits.

9. The U.S. peppers and tomatoes project was designed jointly by the Central American governments based on private sector interest. Project implementation involved collaboration with the donor agencies (USDA and USAID) in the United States. Assistance focused on informing growers and processors about techniques and requirements to control pests and increase product quality to meet U.S. import standards. Work also included technical training for government officials to monitor and certify production practices and quality, including training in the field and tours of import facilities in the United States. Central America has competitive advantages as a fresh vegetable producer so once the market was opened, private sector participants were able to increase production and implement necessary good practices to gain and maintain market access. Similar results were achieved by another project, which applied a comparable approach to expand dairy and beef exports from Central America to the United States.

10. The Chinese Taipei papaya project shared a number of the characteristics outlined above. While the project was designed by the donor, it was based on studies showing the export competitiveness of the Guatemalan papaya industry and the success of other Guatemalan producers in the Petèn region in gaining access to the U.S. market. The donor was able to transfer relevant technical expertise from its own experience with papaya production. Implemented in close collaboration with the local producer's association and municipal government, the project focused on field-level training for local growers. A packing facility was constructed with the capacity to meet quarantine standards of the target market (the United States). Activities were undertaken with competent authorities in the U.S. and Guatemala to support certification. Other activities focused on developing marketing skills to increase exports to the United States market and within the region.

11. The success of the tomatoes, peppers and papaya export promotion projects was built in part on broader institutional capacity that includes public sector capacity to carry out quarantine, testing, diagnosis and certification, which are necessary to facilitate export performance. These services have benefited from capacity building in the past. Some of the good practice projects considered here focused on strengthening institutional capacity in these areas. However, it was much more difficult to assess and quantify the impact of such projects. Nevertheless, the recipient countries and officials involved in these projects praised them highly; an increase in the number of accredited laboratories in the region was put forward as an indicator of the success of the laboratory project.

12. Aspects of good practice that emerged in the projects focused on institutional strengthening included: (i) facilitating a leading role for beneficiaries in project design to promote legitimacy; (ii) adopting a training-of-trainers approach to disseminate knowledge and skills more widely; (iii) assessing risks as part of programme design; and (iv) the development of professional networks to share expertise and information across countries in the region. While regional activities, including training, were able to take advantage of economies of scale and scope, challenges emerged when countries participating in regional projects had differing levels of development and/or needs.

13. In general, beneficiaries emphasized the need for additional external assistance and increased national efforts to strengthen institutional capacity in the SPS area. Staff turnover, inadequate resources and a lack of infrastructure were identified as the main challenges faced. However, it is difficult to say how much additional assistance is required to enhance capacity in these areas and how to measure the impact of this assistance.

1. 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 was 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 Central America 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. Specifically, it aims to identify and analyse elements of good practice in the design, implementation, outputs and the achievement of higher-order objectives for eight projects in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama. It is to be stressed that the present study is not an evaluation of the projects studied.

3. The projects considered as examples of good practice in SPS-related technical assistance in this report demonstrate the importance of capacity to comply with SPS measures in key export markets and its critical impact on trade performance in Central America. The research and analysis further underlines that efforts to exploit higher-value food and agricultural exports, as part of poverty alleviation and export diversification strategies, are strongly linked to SPS capacity building activities.

4. Central American countries have many competitive advantages in food and agriculture production, but import markets are often restricted or closed because of SPS import requirements. Central American countries are world-class competitors in fruits, vegetables, fish and seafood, sugar, coffee and other products due to competitive production costs and high quality. Food processing industries are improving competitiveness and benefit from competitive input costs and access to large developed country markets. Meat and dairy producers are already export competitive for some products in some countries, and also benefit from cost advantages over some major competitors. However, current export opportunities are constrained by a number of market access barriers in key foreign markets. These include pest concerns (in particular related to fruit flies on horticultural products), diseases (a particular problem for animal product exports), and food safety risks associated with microbiological contamination and product wholesomeness. Central American exporters have also had difficulty in meeting process standard requirements (public and private), and in complying with labelling regulations in importing countries.

5. Institutional strengthening is required to expand the capability of the exporting country to monitor and control pests and diseases, to certify compliance with private and public standards, and improve agricultural and manufacturing process to maintain food quality. Government certification of pest or disease free status in a region or a country is a critical requirement for dealing with concerns such as fruit fly infestation or prevalence of diseases such as BSE in cattle, exotic Newcastle's disease in poultry, classical swine fever in hogs, and tristeza and greening in citrus. Food safety requirements of importing countries rely on recognition of domestic food safety procedures and/or testing to ensure compliance with importing country requirements. Obtaining these certifications and fostering a strong system of domestic food safety standards, and receiving recognition by importing countries, requires a functioning institutional system that has international credibility. A robust institutional system depends on a number of factors, including infrastructure, trained staff, a competent national authority, laboratory networks, and capacity for monitoring, inspection and quarantine. Central American countries all have needs in these areas, but despite shortcomings have managed to expand exports and develop new markets in the face of SPS requirements.

6. In a number of instances, access to particular markets for specific products is limited because of lack of infrastructure, knowledge or training. An important example relates to efforts to export horticultural products and dealing with fruit fly concerns of importing countries, including the United

States, Japan, Korea and China. Addressing importing country concerns, including by developing mechanisms for establishing pest-free regions and pest-free packing facilities, requires additional work for a number of specific products and, in particular, products not yet exported. In addition, improving existing regimes for products eligible for export, such as heat treatment for treating mangos, is a priority for exporting countries. Similarly, countries in the region have an interest in exporting poultry but need to eradicate certain diseases (such as Newcastle's disease) and receive recognition of disease-free status and acceptable sanitary conditions. The status of animal and plant health varies across the region, with some countries further advanced than others. Capacity building for both institutional strengthening and to address specific technical needs will contribute to the ability of Central American countries to meet the health, safety and quality standards of importing countries.

7. The report is structured in four sections. Following this introduction, section 2 discusses the methodology for this research work. Section 3 provides an overview of the projects nominated as examples of good practice. The fourth section discusses various aspects of good practice in project design, implementation, impact and the achievement of higher-order objectives. Section 5 summarizes conclusions and recommendations.

2. METHODOLOGY

8. In January 2008, the 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).[3] The survey questionnaire, developed jointly by the STDF and OECD, sought to obtain information on the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of nominated projects reflecting the OECD Development Assistance Committee criteria for evaluating development assistance.

9. Six countries and international organizations nominated eight projects in Central America as examples of good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation in response to this survey. Research was subsequently carried out in the region to obtain the views of project beneficiaries and partners on various aspects of good practice in the nominated projects. This comprised telephone interviews, field visits and face-to-face interviews in Guatemala, Costa Rica and Panama with donors and project beneficiaries.[4] The interviews, which were conducted using a standard semi-structured guide, explored the findings of the donor questionnaires in greater detail and sought the views of project beneficiaries and partners on practices that enabled effective implementation and sustained benefits.

10. This study is based on information derived from the interviews, responses to the survey questionnaires and other relevant documentation obtained through this fieldwork and research. It analyses good practice aspects of the nominated projects based on available project documentation (including evaluation reports where available), completed questionnaires and interviews. It does not seek to provide a comprehensive review of project operations and outputs, which is beyond the scope of this research. In some cases, some of the projects are still underway and conclusions are preliminary. Furthermore, it is not intended as an evaluation of the projects considered.

11. A number of challenges were encountered during the research for this study in Central America, which provided complications for information collection. Some of the projects were conducted several years ago and, in a number of cases, it was difficult to locate project partners and beneficiaries. In some instances, the national officials involved in project design and management had changed jobs and were unavailable for interviews. The geographic scope of nominated projects, which involved six countries in Central America, was an additional challenge in view of the time available for the research. In that context, it is also important to note that while several of the projects

[3] See Annex 1
[4] See Annex 2 for a list of persons interviewed.

studied were regional in nature, the research conducted for this study focused on their activities in a sub-set of the countries covered.

3. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECTS STUDIED

12. Eight projects were nominated as examples of good practice in response to the survey questionnaire (G/SPS/GEN/816) as illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1. Projects nominated as examples of good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation in Central America[5]

1. Peppers and Tomatoes Mitigating Measures Training in CAFTA-DR countries	
Donor/Intl Agency: United States *Countries*: All *SPS topic*: Pest management *Assistance*: Training	*Brief description*: Provide information and train officials and produces in the region on how to meet requirements to export fresh tomato and peppers to the United States.
2. SPS Training Project in Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Caribbean countries	
Donor/Intl Agency: Canada *Countries*: Costa Rica and Guatemala *SPS topic*: Animal health and general SPS capacity. *Assistance*: Training	*Brief description*: Assist Costa Rica with BSE diagnostics and animal health. Provide Guatemala with broad SPS training.
3. Strengthening Food Safety Laboratories in Central America	
Donor/Intl Agency: FAO *Countries*: All *SPS topic*: Food safety *Assistance*: Training	*Brief description*: Develop national plans and train laboratory officials to obtain accreditation in specific analytical standards.
4. Establishment and Strengthening of National Codex Committees	
Donor: FAO *Country*: All *SPS topic*: Institutional strengthening *Assistance*: Training	*Brief description*: Create and strengthen national Codex committees, disseminate information on Codex standards, and training officials and private sector experts on Codex principles.
5. Control of '*Broca de Café*' pest in Panama and Costa Rica	
Donor: FAO *Countries*: Costa Rica and Panama *SPS topic*: Pest management *Assistance*: Training and information dissemination	*Brief description*: Training officials and producers in identification and management of pest infestation.
6. Establishment of Fruit Fly Free Areas	
Donor: IAEA, OIRSA, FAO, IICA, USDA/APHIS *Country*: Costa Rica principally *SPS topic*: Pest management *Assistance*: Training, infrastructure, and management	*Brief description*: Pilot project to identify potential fly free area and development of control and monitoring programmes for selected area.
7. Papaya Export Promotion	
Donor: Chinese Taipei *Countries*: Guatemala *SPS topic*: Productivity, pest management, plant health, and export promotion *Assistance*: Training, hard infrastructure, marketing	*Brief description*: Assistance to growers, construction of packing plant, assistance in obtaining import approvals, and marketing coordination.
8. Rapid Bioassay of Pesticide Residues on Fruits and Vegetables	
Donor: Chinese Taipei *Country*: Panama *SPS topic*: Food safety *Assistance*: Training and infrastructure	*Brief description*: Technical training and funding support to establish a pilot programme for national residue testing.

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

[5] Additional information on each of the projects nominated in presented in Annex 3.

13. Most of the projects nominated had specific market objectives, which included assisting beneficiary countries in meeting SPS standards of importing countries. Three focused on pest management as a key objective, specifically meeting import standards for peppers and tomatoes, establishing fruit fly free zones, and obtaining export certification for papaya. The focus of the other projects was on animal health diagnostics for Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) testing, pesticide residue testing for fruits and vegetables, strengthening laboratory standards and obtaining laboratory certification, and establishing and strengthening national Codex committees. While all the projects included elements of institutional strengthening, including training in various technical disciplines, only one (still being implemented) entailed general SPS capacity building for the beneficiary country. The papaya export promotion project also included investment in physical infrastructure, training on good agricultural practices and marketing assistance.

14. Several of the projects were regional in scope and some included additional countries in the Caribbean. Some of the regional projects, particularly those addressing particular export priorities, were narrowly focused on specific countries. The thematic focus of the regional projects similarly differed across the areas of plant and animal health, food safety, export promotion and institutional strengthening.

15. Assistance was generally delivered through training and building technical expertise of government officials and private sector actors. Several projects entailed focused workshops and training to improve institutional capacity. This included projects for laboratories, establishing national Codex committees, building capacity to monitor and control pests and diseases, and pesticide residue testing. One project entailed investment in physical infrastructure.

16. A brief overview of each of the projects studied is provided below.

17. The objective of the U.S. Pepper and Tomato project was to assist Central American countries in meeting phytosanitary requirements of the United States for these products, particularly with respect to U.S. requirements for mediating measures for fruit flies. The United States worked with Central American countries in identifying this project and to develop a work plan for providing technical assistance. The project was implemented in 2006 at the cost of US$36,000 and entailed training of phytosanitary officials and producers in Central American countries to allow them to implement policies to meet import requirements. This training included bringing U.S. regulatory experts to the region to explain the U.S. system and to demonstrate agricultural and inspection techniques to ensure exports could conform to U.S. standards. As a result of this assistance, some producers in each of the Central America Free Trade Agreement[6] (CAFTA) countries were able to access the U.S. market and each of the countries experienced substantial increases in exports. In addition, training on pest monitoring and control expanded capacity of government authorities and private sector to implement similar controls for other products and markets.

18. The Canadian-funded SPS training was implemented in Costa Rica between 2002 and 2004 with a budget of CAN$2.2 million (equivalent to approximately US$2.1 million). It focused on establishing a system of monitoring and control for bovine spongiform encephalophathy (BSE). Through providing expert training to government officials, including through bringing Canadian expert regulators to Costa Rica for hands-on training, the project helped to strengthen Costa Rica's internal systems of monitoring and control and supported national efforts to advance from "indeterminate risk" disease status to "minimal risk" recognition at the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). Broader SPS capacity building had been planned for Guatemala but the programme was delayed, in part because of the change of government in Guatemala.

[6] Originally, the agreement encompassed the United States and the Central American countries of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua, and was called CAFTA. In 2004, the Dominican Republic joined the negotiations, and the agreement was renamed CAFTA-DR.

19. The FAO laboratory project was conducted between 2005 and 2006 with a budget of US$250,000. It followed up on work within the regional network of laboratory experts, who identified capacity building needs of food safety laboratories in the region. The project conducted a series of training workshops focused on good laboratory practices throughout Central America. The venue for training rotated across countries in the region with the host country responsible for logistical coordination. Government officials who participated in the workshops then conducted training sessions in their home country to disseminate the knowledge and skills gained. Thanks in part to this work, the number of accredited laboratories in the region has increased.

20. The FAO Codex Committee project was conducted from 2000 to 2003 with a budget of almost US$400,000. The project's objective was to establish national Codex committees in countries where they did not exist to allow governments and the private sector to better understand Codex standards and procedures, and to participate more fully in the Codex standard-setting process. FAO identified experts to conduct training sessions and hired national coordinators to work with government officials. Countries shared responsibility for hosting training sessions and participating officials subsequently conducted training sessions in their home countries. Outputs included increased number of functioning national Codex committees and improved participation in Codex activities by Central American countries.

21. The need for the FAO-funded *Broca de Café* project in Costa Rica was identified by coffee producers in Costa Rica who recognized the risks associated with this pest. Coffee producers, working with the government of Costa Rica, developed an information campaign to help identify pest outbreaks in the country and developed monitoring and control plans for government and producers. The project, which had a budget of US$400,000 and technical support from the FAO, was implemented from 2001 to 2003. Thanks in part to this training, although *Broca de Café* pests have been intercepted in Costa Rica, the pest has been unable to establish itself, saving producers from substantial crop losses.

22. The US$2.5 million project to establish fruit fly free zones in Central America was financed by in-kind contributions from a range of national and international organizations, and carried out from 2001 to 2006. Pilot activities were initiated in Costa Rica. International and regional partners involved included the International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA), the Regional International Organization for Agriculture Health (OIRSA), the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) and FAO. The project established a surveillance, eradication and control programme to detect and control fruit flies in the designated zone. Although still to be recognized by importing countries as an official fruit fly free zone, the number of fruit flies intercepted has fallen substantially. The project also identified a number of other potential fruit fly free zones in Central America for potential future work on eradication, monitoring and control.

23. The Chinese Taipei papaya export promotion project, initiated in 2007 and still ongoing, is working with local producers in Guatemala to increase productivity, reduce pest damages and develop export market potential. The project included support for marketing and the establishment of a papaya packing facility. This facility is in the process of obtaining export certification, enabling it to demonstrate that its papayas are fruit fly-free and thereby gaining access to the United States. The project, which has a budget of US$850,000, is helping to increase exports from the region.

24. The Chinese Taipei pesticide residue-testing project was conducted between 2005 and 2007 with a budget of US$440,000. The objective was to support Panama to reduce pesticide residues in fruit and vegetable products as a means to improve domestic food safety and improve prospects in export markets. Panamanian officials and their counterparts from Chinese Taipei developed testing methodologies for residues and increased testing of fresh fruits and vegetables, including field-testing. Information on good agricultural practices was shared with producers to reduce their reliance on

pesticides, and increase the use of biological controls and promote more targeted applications. Panamanian officials report that the project has helped to reduce pesticide residue findings.

Overview of the responses to the questionnaire surveys (G/SPS/GEN/816)

25. The responses to the surveys, which provide the perspectives of the donor countries and international agencies as well as one of the recipient countries (Costa Rica), are presented below.

Project design

26. The completed surveys indicate that the impetus for most of the projects (7 of 8) nominated as examples of good practice came from beneficiaries in the countries concerned. Only one project (Chinese Taipei papaya export promotion) was reported as having been identified by the donor. However, the interviews revealed that donor interest also played an important part in the initiation of several of the projects studied.

27. Three projects were identified by individual beneficiary countries (two for Costa Rica and one for Panama). Two projects were identified by recipients through regional processes (the FAO lab project was developed through the regional laboratory network and the U.S. pepper and tomato project through the CAFTA-DR trade capacity building committee), with the projects then developed the project in conjunction with donors. The FAO lab project was identified as a priority by Latin American countries through discussions held under a regional laboratory association and presented to the FAO. The beneficiaries and the donor then worked collaboratively to develop the project. The U.S. pepper and tomato project was identified by CAFTA countries as an area for priority attention under bilateral technical capacity building and presented to the United States. The donor and beneficiary then worked collaboratively to develop the specific elements of the project. According to the surveys, five of the projects were developed collaboratively by donors and recipients, while two were designed by the beneficiaries (Costa Rica regional fruit fly free zones and Panama pesticide residue testing) and one by the donor (Guatemala papaya project). Each of the projects studied were developed based on some form of needs assessment, although informal assessments and general recognition of problems and priorities informed several of them. A detailed technical assessment was carried out as part of the design phase for four of the projects studied.

28. Three of the projects studied were based on previous work, carried out by the funding organization or other development partners. Three were pilot projects.

- U.S. peppers and tomatoes mitigating measures training project – follow-up trade capacity building under CAFTA-DR;
- Canadian SPS training project – implementation of needs identified in earlier assessment;
- FAO *Broca de la Fruta* project in Costa Rica – stand-alone project;
- IAEA-OIRSA-IICA-FAO-USDA/APHIS Costa Rica Fruit Fly Free Zones – pilot project;
- FAO strengthening food safety laboratories in Central America – following regional laboratory capacity building work;
- FAO establishment and strengthening of national Codex committees – stand-alone project;
- Chinese Taipei papaya export promotion – pilot project; and
- Chinese Taipei pesticide residue testing for fruits and vegetables – pilot project.

Preparation

29. Table 2A illustrates how survey respondents perceived the sufficiency of preparation time and information gathering for their respective projects.

Table 2A. Preparation time and information gathering

Level of sufficiency	Projects
80-100%	Costa Rica Fruit Fly Free Zones, FAO Labs
60-80%	Canada SPS training, Costa Rica *Broca de la Fruta*
40-60%	Chinese Taipei Papaya, U.S. Peppers and Tomatoes
20-40%	Chinese Taipei Pesticide Residue
No response	FAO Codex

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816

30. On the whole, national government institutions or counterparts (mainly agricultural and health ministry officials) were consulted by donors during the design phase. Some projects (U.S. Tomato and Pepper, Chinese Taipei Papaya and Costa Rica Fly Free zone) also involved consultations and coordination with private sector implementers and/or other relevant international organizations such as the Secretariat for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and Regional International Organization for Agriculture Health (OIRSA).

Implementation

31. Responsibility for implementation of the projects considered varied as illustrated in Table 2B. Some of the projects were implemented by the public sector in collaboration with concerned private sector organizations. For example, the Chinese Taipei papaya project worked with the cooperation of the La Libertad producers association to implement good agricultural practices and pest control. The *Broca de Café* was implemented with the Costa Rica coffee producers association. The Costa Rica pilot project for fruit fly free zones entailed close cooperation with local companies in the zone producing and packing horticultural products. The U.S. pepper and tomato project entailed cooperation with national producer associations to organize meetings and working with particular private sector growers to implement pest monitoring and control practices.

Table 2B. Project implementation

Projects	Implementing offices
U.S. Tomato and Peppers	USDA/APHIS and USDA/FAS
Canada	Independent Contractor – TDV Global Inc.
Costa Rica – *Broca de la Fruta*	Government and Private Sector
Costa Rica – Fruit Fly Free Zones	Government and Private Sector
FAO - Labs	FAO
FAO - Codex	FAO
Chinese Taipei - Papaya	Chinese Taipei
Chinese Taipei – Pesticide Residue	Panama

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816

32. According to the completed surveys, beneficiaries participated to varying degrees in project implementation (Table 2C). In some cases, beneficiaries participated through the joint implementation of activities. In other cases, they provided in-kind contributions such as use of offices, facilities, transportation and salaries for government staff. For several of the projects studied, the beneficiary countries were responsible for hosting training sessions, as well as providing follow-up training for nationals unable to attend overseas training sessions. Beneficiaries also provided

significant inputs to needs assessment and, in some instances, data for risk assessments for example in the Costa Rica fruit fly free zones project the Government of Costa Rica has been tracking pest incidences over a period of several years.

Table 2C. Participation of beneficiaries in project implementation

Level	Projects
80-100%	Canada,, Costa Rica Fruit Fly Free Zones, FAO labs
60-80%	Costa Rica *Broca de la Fruta*
40-60%	U.S. Peppers and Tomato
20-40%	Chinese Taipei Pesticide
0 – 20%	Chinese Taipei Papaya
No response	FAO Codex

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816

33. None of the respondents to the survey identified major difficulties in project implementation. However, common challenges reported included inadequate training budgets (to cover a larger number of persons and provide additional courses), coordination difficulties, and difficulties to provide common training materials across countries with different levels of sophistication in technical areas.

34. A range of entities conducted monitoring. Given that most of the projects entailed training, monitoring was most important for the United States (to protect against pest infestations), the Costa Rica Fruit Fly Free Zones (to preserve the fly free status), and generally by donors to comply with fiduciary responsibilities.

Table 2D. Monitoring

Projects	Monitor
U.S. Tomato and Peppers	USDA/APHIS
Canada	Independent Contractor – TDV Global Inc.
Costa Rica – *Broca de la Fruta*	International Organizations involved
Costa Rica – Fly Free Zones	International Organization involved
FAO - Labs	FAO
FAO - Codex	Beneficiaries
Chinese Taipei - Papaya	Chinese Taipei
Chinese Taipei – Pesticide Residue	Panama

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816

35. Minor adjustments to timeframes for implementing projects and for allocating specific budget items were the only changes identified. One substantial change in timing occurred in one project (Canada's project in Guatemala), related to the change of government in the beneficiary country.

Evaluation

36. The completed surveys indicated that five of the projects had been evaluated formally. However, interviews with beneficiaries revealed that not much was known about these evaluations. The three ongoing projects will be evaluated once finalized.

Sustainability

37. Sustainability was considered by all projects, and generally continuation rates were reported at high levels. The U.S. pepper and tomato project is deemed to be sustainable because of the participation of private sector producers who are earning revenue from export sales. FAO laboratory and Codex projects are identified as sustainable because the training has been completed and information has been disseminated, although problems with government personnel turnover complicate this question. The Chinese Taipei papaya project, when completed, will leave a sustainable export business, although ongoing technical assistance to growers will depend on government participation.

Table 2E. Sustaining benefits without funding

Level	Projects
Continuation of benefits without funding	
80-100%	U.S. Peppers and Tomato, FAO Labs, FAO Codex, Chinese Taipei Papaya
60-80%	Canada SPS, Costa Rica *Broca de la Fruta*
40 – 60%	Costa Rica Free Zone, Chinese Taipei Pesticide Residue
Capacity of beneficiaries to sustain benefit	
80-100%	U.S. Peppers and Tomato, Costa Rica Broca, FAO Labs, FAO Codex
60-80%	Canada SPS,
40 – 60%	Costa Rica Fruit Fly Free Zone, Chinese Taipei Papaya
20 – 40%	Chinese Taipei Pesticide Residue

Source: Responses to G/SPS/GEN/816

Outputs and good practices

38. More than half of the survey respondents stated that 80-100% of their respective project's objectives/outputs were achieved. Two projects (Canada SPS and Chinese Taipei papaya) received lower scores given that these are still ongoing. Some of the most striking outputs identified were self-sustaining export systems such as the U.S. pepper and tomato programme, the Chinese Taipei papaya export promotion project and the FAO project on establishing a fruit fly free zone in Costa Rica. Either by actually generating exports and income, or creating physical and systematic infrastructures, these projects were able to generate clear gains in terms of increased international trade.

39. The FAO laboratory project was credited by several countries in helping them obtain accreditation for national labs, including for services related to export certification. The FAO Codex programme assisted in creating national Codex committees where none existed before. Activities initiated under the Chinese Taipei pesticide residue programme in Panama have been continued by national authorities there, reflecting the value that Panama derived from this assistance. The Canadian-support animal health programme in Costa Rica contributed to the development and operation of a system for BSE monitoring, while the FAO *Broca de la Fruta* programme in Costa Rica has helped reduce losses from pest infestations.

40. Respondents to the survey identified the following aspects of good practice in project design, implementation and the achievement of higher-order objectives, which could be repeated in future activities:

(a) targeted focus on specific needs (various projects);

(b) close collaboration with regulatory agencies to ensure technical assistance reflects import requirements and commercial needs (U.S. tomato and peppers);

(c) collaboration with beneficiary governments and stakeholders to identify activities and develop projects (U.S. tomato and peppers);

(d) use of expertise from various sectors of the donor country to build relationships and ensure high quality training (U.S. and Canada);

(e) application of iterative approaches to enable project activities to build on and learn from relevant experiences in the capacity building process (Canada);

(f) utilization of contractors to expedite programmes (Canada);

(g) adoption of a regional approach to enable countries to learn from their neighbours and develop professional networks that could provide support during project follow-up (FAO-Lab);

(h) use of expertise from within the region to build confidence and sustainability (FAO-Lab);

(i) promotion of sustainable practices and reduction of chemicals (Chinese Taipei Pesticide Residue);

(j) training on standard analysis procedures and introduction to manual test kits to simplify task for farmers (Chinese Taipei Pesticide Residue); and

(k) training local technicians in data collection and establishing local collection stations (Chinese Taipei Pesticide Residue).

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

41. Sponsors identified projects they believed were successful. It was not always so easy to identify good practices to explain success, or even indicators of success, but participants in beneficiary countries, where they could be contacted, corroborated these assessments. Many of the specific elements identified as good practices related to specific technical objectives and conditions in the particular projects. These good practices are discussed below in terms of: (a) project design; (b) project implementation; (c) project outputs; and (d) project impacts.

Project Design

42. National/Regional Development Strategies. Central American countries are focusing on economic development through export promotion, as well as improving domestic food safety. All of these projects related to either of these objectives in some form. Of particular note was the U.S. pepper and tomato project, which reflected Central American countries objective of exploiting the CAFTA-DR agreement. Similarly, the Canadian SPS projects reflected the political reality that Canada was developing closer economic relations with Costa Rica and Guatemala through free trade agreements that have been concluded or are under negotiation, and SPS capacity building reflects the larger political desire to facilitate trade between the countries. The FAO projects on laboratories and Codex committees reflect efforts to strengthen institutions needed to promote exports as well as improving capacity to enhance domestic health standards.

43. Complementing policy environment. Interviews with beneficiaries and partners of the projects studied underlined the importance of defining appropriate and targeted objectives that took advantage of specific market access opportunities during project design. Several of the projects were designed to take advantage of new market access opportunities by realizing the import requirements

of trading partners. This allowed for focused project development, development of political support for the project, clear economic and social benefits and quantifiable assessments of success. For example, the U.S. project to assist producers in the region to meet USDA regulatory requirements for exports of peppers and tomatoes targeted a particular opportunity and allowed for focused project design. Similarly the Canadian-financed project was focused on support to develop BSE monitoring capacity and maintain BSE-free status with regard to particular import requirements. Chinese Taipei's papaya project was designed to achieve export certification to enable producers in the region to access the U.S. market. The regional fruit fly free zone project in Costa Rica was relevant for many export markets, including the United States.

44. Collaborative identification. Close cooperation between donors and beneficiaries at the project design stage was considered as fundamental for the success of the projects studies. Donors and beneficiaries worked together closely in project identification and design in several of the projects. This allowed for efficiency in project selection, as both parties could assess the viability of the project and effectiveness of its components. Collaborative project identification also increased national ownership and beneficiary participation in implementation. The idea for the FAO laboratory project was identified by recipient countries through their involvement in a regional laboratory network, and then presented to the donor. The Canadian and U.S. training projects were developed in collaboration with the beneficiary governments, with the U.S. project part of a formal committee developed by the members of the CAFTA-DR to provide technical assistance to the region. Costa Rica took the lead in developing the pest control programmes for *Broca de Café* and fruit flies, and maintained a coordinating role in implementation. Panama identified a need for support with pesticide residue testing and approached Chinese Taipei for assistance in this regard.

45. Regional approach. Several projects were designed on a regional basis. This approach was able to take advantage of scale economies given that many of the countries in the region have similar SPS priorities and needs. It also facilitated collaboration among participants in project design, and reinforced networking and information exchange among participants in the region. The U.S. tomato and peppers project was identified and designed through the CAFTA-DR implementation process, including all parties to the agreement. The regional FAO lab and Codex projects were both designed with the participation of various stakeholders in the region. While the fruit fly free zone pilot project was initiated in Costa Rica, it was designed with other projects in the region in mind.

46. Building on completed and/or ongoing activities. The research demonstrated the benefits of ensuring linkages and synergies with relevant completed and ongoing activities. Project design was made more simple and effective in several cases by basing new assistance on activities that had already been carried out in the beneficiary country. The Costa Rica fruit fly free zone project built on efforts throughout the region to control fruit flies. The Chinese Taipei papaya project took advantage of progress already made in controlling pests and built on established protocols for papaya exports to the United States. The Chinese Taipei pesticide residue-testing project complemented earlier work sponsored by the World Bank.

47. Needs assessments. The research revealed that almost all the projects nominated as examples of good practice included some sort of needs assessment. Formal need assessments were particularly important for projects with highly technical objectives, such as the FAO laboratory project, the Canadian BSE/animal health project, and the Chinese Taipei pesticide residue-testing project. Similarly, technical assessments of conditions in the beneficiary country were important to assess the feasibility for conducting pest eradication and control projects, such as in the Costa Rican fruit fly free zones project. In projects designed to obtain market access for specific products in particular markets, an assessment of import requirements in the exporting country and the steps required to comply with these was fundamental. Such assessments were carried out for the U.S. tomato and peppers project, the Chinese Taipei papaya project, and the Costa Rica fruit fly free zone project. In each of these cases, the importing country (United States) conducted formal risk assessments and evaluations of local conditions, which overlapped with project needs assessments.

48. Institutional relationships. Several of the project beneficiaries and partners interviewed referred to the value of developing linkages with relevant international/regional organizations and/or competent authorities in importing countries at the project design stage in order to draw on their technical expertise. For instance, the design of activities focused on complex technical matters, including issues related to import access, benefited from collaboration with organizations such as FAO, IAEA, IICA, USDA/APHIS and OIRSA. The long-term institutional relationships that some of these entities had in the beneficiary countries supported the identification of needs and participatory approaches for project design. Examples include USDA/APHIS officials stationed in beneficiary countries, regional experts working for FAO, IICA and OIRSA, and IAEA officers stationed in Central America.

49. Value Chain Approach. Comprehensive projects, providing assistance to producers, government authorities, exporters and other concerned stakeholders had positive commercial results. In some cases, a targeted intervention can address a specific barrier to opening a market. However, in many cases assistance on several levels can help maximize gains to new markets. Assistance with agricultural practices, marketing and promotion, and certification can be necessary complements to specific assistance efforts. The U.S. pepper and tomato project identified import requirements, local production conditions and targeted training to meet import requirements ranging from production to testing to certification to importation to product testing at the port. The Chinese Taipei papaya project delivered technical assistance to producers (to increase yield and to control pests), built a packing facility and provided support for operations, assisted producers with import certification, and provided marketing assistance. Both projects have resulted in increased exports, in some cases with substantial exports developing into markets that had been closed to exporters from the country, with substantial increases forecast in the near future.

Box 1. Value of exports to the United States, calendar year 2007

Costa Rica: tomatoes	$196,000
El Salvador: peppers	$2,085,000
Guatemala: tomatoes	$283,000
Guatemala: peppers	$505,000
Honduras: peppers	$2,436,000
Nicaragua: peppers	$3,427,000

Source: U.S. trade statistics
Note: With the exception of Costa Rica, none of the countries above exported the indicated products in 2005. 2007 data for Costa Rica reflects a 456% increase.

50. Based on this research, aspects of good practice in the design of SPS-related technical cooperation projects include the following:

- SPS-related technical assistance that focuses on increasing exports of specific products to particular markets supports the elaboration of clear and measurable objectives and produces tangible results in terms of income generation, poverty reduction, increased foreign exchange earnings, etc.

- Recipient-driven project identification, that involves collaboration with donors and other concerned stakeholders (including regional/international organizations and competent authorities in importing countries), promotes national ownership and enhances project development and design.

- Building on completed and/or ongoing activities provides a means to learn from experiences, reinforce achievements, address unmet needs, and increase efficiency and effectiveness.

- Needs assessments should be tailored to particular country circumstances, with careful attention to import requirements in target countries for market access projects.

- A regional approach to SPS-related technical assistance enables experiences and lessons learned in different settings to be taken into account and supports the development of professional networks for knowledge exchange and mutual support.

- Use of consultants for strategic planning and operational management can facilitate project design and implementation. It is better to bring such experts in early than wait until trouble develops.

Project Implementation

51. Expert trainers. High quality trainers were valued across many of the projects. Trainers included regulatory officials from importing countries (U.S. and Canada) and experts from the region (FAO projects). Regulatory officials were valued in particular because they brought highly pertinent information directly targeted to practical needs. In addition, training by expert regulators also helped to expand personal networks of contacts and created opportunities for officials in beneficiary countries to have easy access to key personnel to address specific trade problems in the future. Training by regional experts was identified as a good way to expand technical capacity in the region and foster regional networks of experts.

52. Regional approach. A number of the projects studied were designed to be implemented across the region. The U.S. pepper and tomato project delivered capacity building to CAFTA-DR signatories, the FAO projects entailed training throughout Central America and the Caribbean, and the Costa Rica fruit fly free zone was designed as a pilot activity that could be replicated in other parts of Central America. Lessons learned from the Costa Rica experience have contributed to the larger body of knowledge in the region and assisted with progress towards identifying additional potential fruit fly free zones. Additional potential fruit fly free zones have been identified in each of the Central American countries, but to date only the area along Guatemala's northern border has been recognized, where the U.S.-Mexico Medfly eradication project is in effect. In each of these cases, a regional approach enabled project activities and their benefits to be leveraged throughout the region. Such an approach further contributed towards the strengthening of regional networks and enabled additional perspectives, knowledge and skills to enhance implementation.

53. Transfer of practical knowledge and skills. Many of the projects entailed in-country training for government officials and/or private sector representatives in the beneficiary country. In a number of cases, donors and beneficiaries highlighted the value of conducting the training on location, which allowed for greater participation from beneficiary countries. Several projects brought technical experts to the operating site, which enabled techniques to be demonstrated in the context of the beneficiary country. This allowed technicians actually involved in operations to obtain first-hand training and helped to build professional relationships and linkages between technicians and experts. For instance, the U.S. pepper and tomato project, and the Canada BSE monitoring projects brought U.S. and Canadian regulators to the beneficiary countries to meet with and train government and private sector officials. As part of the Costa Rica fruit fly free zones, various technicians visited the production zone in Costa Rica to assess and provide support for the monitoring and control process. Under the Chinese Taipei papaya project, an agronomist in the production zone assisted farmers to effectively adopt and implement production and pest control techniques.

54. Flexibility in implementation. Changing circumstances, unforeseen challenges and new information, including learning gained during the implementation process, mean that projects can rarely be implemented exactly as designed. As such, interviews with project beneficiaries highlighted the importance of flexibility in implementation. Several of the projects studied encountered minor delays for various reasons. Some identified additional areas that merited attention during implementation, such as the FAO Codex project, which incorporated training on an additional topic. Training on SPS issues carried out under the Canadian project was designed to build on progress achieved in each step of training, requiring assessment and adjustment during the process.

55. Multi-sector and multi-disciplinary activities. The research indicated that many SPS issues entail complex technical and regulatory aspects, which requires multi-sectoral participation in donor and beneficiary countries, as well as multi-disciplinary teams of trainers and participants. In the Canada SPS capacity building project, government regulators, academics and the private sector worked together to develop training material. In the Costa Rica fruit fly free zone project, a variety of experts covering a broad range of disciplines collaborated to implement eradication, monitoring and control activities.

56. Strategic use of consultants. Donors reported positive experiences in utilizing private sector consultants to support project implementation as a means to leverage limited government resources. Canada used a private sector consultant to manage implementation of its food safety programmes in Costa Rica and Guatemala, ranging from identifying and securing trainers (including government experts) to disbursing funds. The FAO laboratory and Codex projects used consultants to coordinate activities in each country, working in parallel with government officials responsible for implementing workshops and conducting national training sessions.

57. Leveraging training. Some training projects entailed following up formal training sessions with national training sessions to disseminate the knowledge. The FAO lab and Codex projects involved training several government participants in a series of technical workshops. The participants were then responsible for returning home and conducting national seminars to government and private sector representatives, allowing transmission of information beyond the limits of the regional workshops.

58. Timely implementation. Costa Rica began working on monitoring and control programmes for the *Broca de la Fruta* pest well in advance of the first identified outbreak in Costa Rica or Panama. This gave producers and government officials time to increase their knowledge and understanding of the pest and its implications for trade, and to develop systems for pest management in the event of an outbreak. The U.S. pepper and tomato programme was delivered in a relatively short timeframe, allowing producers in the region to take advantage of new access conditions shortly after implementation of the CAFTA-DR. The Canada BSE training allowed Costa Rica to develop a system to monitor BSE at a time when global trade flows were threatened by importing requirements for documentation to certify freedom from the disease. These experiences point to the importance of being able to implement SPS-related technical assistance projects that respond to real trade opportunities and challenges in a timely manner.

59. Integrated pest management. Several of the project highlighted approaches to deal with pest and disease issues by minimizing chemical applications and incorporating bio-controls. The Costa Rica *Broca de la Fruta* project emphasized beneficial insect control and non-pesticide control measures to save producers from burdensome expenses and to allow exported product to meet organic and other quality standards – as well as to guard against problems with chemical residues. The Chinese Taipei pesticide residue project included good agricultural practices to help producers identify approaches to reduce pesticide applications, thereby reducing residues that could adhere to the product and raise health concerns. The U.S. pepper and tomato programme included training in good agricultural practices to guard against indiscriminate pesticide applications.

60. Involvement of producer associations. Working with producer associations in several cases allowed projects to effectively target and partner with farmers and processors in the beneficiary countries. This delivered training services to relevant beneficiaries and facilitated organizational efforts. Working with national producer associations also enabled donors to use existing networks for information dissemination and to work within the prevailing political and socio-economic environment. Producer associations played important roles in the Costa Rica *Broca de Café* project (where they took the lead in developing the project and provided substantial financial support), the Costa Rica pest free zone project (where the Costa Rican producers helped identify participants and implement monitoring and control programmes), the U.S. pepper and tomato project (where they

helped organize training seminars and identify sites for conducing demonstration projects), and the Chinese Taipei papaya project (where the local papaya producer's association organized growers for production activities and helped identify issues to be addressed).

Box 2. Chinese Taipei papaya project

The Chinese Taipei-supported papaya project in Guatemala provides an example of a turn-key project that, from the outset, sought to increase the capacity of local beneficiaries to assume responsibility and control for project activities following a transition period.

Based on a comprehensive value chain approach, the project entailed assistance for producers, coordination with national government authorities to obtain import certification, and construction and management of packing and shipping operations. Because of the comprehensive and hands-on nature of the project, the beneficiaries expect to take over a fully-functioning operation at its end.

61. Decentralized implementation. The Chinese Taipei pesticide residue-testing project helped authorities in Panama to implement pesticide residue testing in the field. It included assistance to train producers on the use of standard analytical procedures and manual test kits, allowing for faster identification of, and an appropriate response to, problems identified during production. Similarly, the Chinese Taipei papaya project, fruit fly free zone project in Costa Rica, and the U.S. pepper and tomato project developed public and private sector capacity to assess circumstances quickly and implement adjustments in a timely manner.

62. Harmonization and alignment with national activities. Project effectiveness is enhanced when external assistance is implemented as part of local government activities. This helps to leverage local government resources, expand local ownership of project activities and enhances sustainability over the long term. The Costa Rica fruit fly free zone and the U.S. pepper and tomato projects involved collaboration with national governments in the region to establish work plans for eradication, monitoring and control. The Chinese Taipei papaya project involved working with the local authorities of La Libertad in Peten, Guatemala, who will assume control for the packing plant when the project is fully operational.

63. To summarize, research in Central America has highlighted the following aspects of good practice, which are relevant for project implementation:

- Trainers should be experts in their field and, where possible and appropriate, should be government regulatory officials from competent authorities responsible for SPS issues. Networking and opportunities to promote relationships between professionals in exporting and importing countries should be encouraged, including through the development of in-country expertise and delivery of training in beneficiary countries to maximize exposure and demonstrate techniques in actual operating environments.

- Implement projects on a regional basis where broader execution can leverage resources and/or improve the quality of the project.

- Be flexible to address changing circumstances and incorporate lessons and experiences in project implementation.

- Organize multi-disciplinary teams to develop training and implement procedures in the beneficiary country to cover all relevant facets of SPS projects.

- Employ private sector consultants to complement limited government resources and streamline project activities.

- Promote the use of a training-of-trainers approach which enables persons trained to share their newly acquired knowledge and skills with others in their country, thereby maximizing the impact of training.

- Start projects in advance of crisis situations and move quickly to address immediate trade opportunities and/or barriers in order to deliver timely results.

- Train producers in production techniques that minimize chemical applications to reduce expenses, allow products to meet health and quality standards and qualify for premium-fetching certifications.

- Work with producer associations to organize projects and deliver assistance where appropriate.

- Address intermediate steps and capacity constraints related to the project's objectives to remove possible barriers to successful project implementation.

- Work with regional, national and local governments to incorporate technical assistance projects into their ongoing and planned work programmes.

- Identify opportunities to implement training and apply lessons learned at the local level to improve delivery and responses to challenges that arise.

Elements of Good Practices in the Achievement of Project Outputs

64. Results-oriented approach. This research has highlighted that identifiable outputs are easier to obtain when projects are designed to deliver specific results. In the U.S. pepper and tomato project obtaining market access and expanding exports was the core objective. In the FAO labs project, the purpose of training was to achieve laboratory certification. In the FAO Codex project, a key objective was to establish national Codex committees in the beneficiary countries in order to strengthen the participation of countries in the region in the Codex Alimentarius Commission. In the fruit fly free zone project in Costa Rica, controlling fruit flies and obtaining recognition for pest free areas was the key objective. In the Chinese Taipei papaya project, the objective was to obtain export certification for the new packing plant and expand exports.

65. Discrete Projects. Rather than focusing on general institutional strengthening projects, the projects nominated as examples of good practice in Central America were clearly defined with a relatively narrow focus. This included strengthening particular elements of national institutions, such as laboratories, national Codex committees and pesticide residue testing programmes. Projects also included control of specific pests or diseases affecting particular projects. Such a focused approach encouraged targeted activities and manageable project outputs.

66. Key elements related to project outputs include the following:

- Identify concrete, quantifiable objectives for project outputs to facilitate project assessment and to encourage relevant project outputs.

- Develop discrete projects to encourage achievement of tangible outputs.

Project Impact

67. Improved production practices. Several projects improved production practices of farmers and processors, including controlling fruit flies in all countries in the region, reducing pesticide residues in Panama, improving papaya yields in Guatemala, and controlling *Broca de Café* in Costa Rica and Panama. These projects resulted in improved efficiency, increased outputs and application of Good Agricultural Practices. The impact was broadened in many cases as the projects served as demonstration or pilot projects for other producers in the region.

68. Improved regulatory practices. Several projects improved government operations, including establishing monitoring and control systems for pests and diseases, laboratory practices, participation in Codex activities, and pesticide residue testing. These projects resulted in improved government performance in the particular areas and also improved institutional capacity in related fields within the government.

69. Expanded export capacity. All of the projects had some relationship to expanded exports. In some cases, the effect was direct and substantial, such as the U.S. pepper and tomato project, which has generated several million dollars in new exports. In one case, the trade impact is only starting to be seen, such as the Chinese Taipei papaya project. In other cases, it is hard to measure, such as the protection against losses due to pests in the Costa Rica *Broca de Café* project and the Costa Rica fruit fly free zone project. In some instances, capacity building has preserved export markets, such as the Canada BSE monitoring project in Costa Rica. In others, the impact on exports has not been completely realized yet, such as the Chinese Taipei pesticide residue project (Panama is not exporting much fruits or vegetables yet) and the Costa Rica fruit fly free zone (zones have not yet been formally recognized by importing countries yet.) The institutional strengthening projects, such as the FAO lab and Codex projects, have provided more general assistance to beneficiary countries to improve export opportunities.

70. Expanded income generation. Expanded productivity and exports contribute to expanded income generation. Where projects have been yielding results, particularly in pest control and export certification, producers have experienced expanded income and have increased economic activity.

71. Key elements related to project outputs include the following:

- Support farmers, packers and shippers to integrate improved production practices in particular operations and to demonstrate the benefits for other operations.
- Focus programmes on specific export barriers to expand export capacity and performance.
- Expand productivity and export activity to create income effects.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

72. Central American countries and donor organizations have identified a number of needs for SPS technical assistance to assist producers and exporters in the region open new markets, or improve access conditions in current markets. Countries have identified both general institutional strengthening needs and targeted assistance to overcome specific obstacles in particular countries. Assistance is needed in both areas, at least in the short-term, to open markets and maintain access. However, there is some dynamic tension between these two areas, and results from the projects reviewed in this study show the need for result-oriented and targeted programmes to achieve measurable success in the short-term.

73. Positive results have been achieved from SPS technical assistance in the region. Producers have gained access to specific markets that had formerly been closed. Technical capacity of government authorities and the private sector has been strengthened. Groundwork has been laid for future advances, both institutionally and with respect to specific projects. In some cases, concrete gains from exports can be identified and, in others, progress has been made that will enable additional assistance to reap tangible gains.

74. Drawing from the examples studied in this review, lessons from good practices that could be implemented in future projects include the following.

75. *Coherence.* Projects that are able to exploit changes in market conditions have better possibilities of delivering results through expanded export performance. When projects take into account competitive advantages, ongoing assistance programmes, national and regional development strategies and changes in the policy environment such as free trade agreements, there is greater efficiency in achieving success. In contrast, projects developed without careful consideration of the market and policy environment may generate interesting training for officials and address policy priorities of donors, but will have a less significant impact on trade and economic performance.

76. *Regional Scope.* The countries of Central America have used regional projects to maximize resources and exploit synergies. Since many of the constraints and opportunities facing countries in the region are similar, including those related to pest and disease concerns, technical capacity, infrastructure and training levels, and competitive advantages, programmes can be applied across the region to achieve efficiency gains. For instance, regional programmes can train officials from several countries, address common pest and disease concerns and develop transboundary approaches to problem-solving. At the same time, countries can benefit from economies of scale by learning from relevant experiences and developing regional networks of technicians and professionals. Finally, regional approaches can provide more impact for donors, even though they create complexities for coordination and planning.

77. *Accessing Experts.* The use of expert trainers and consultants to implement assistance programmes is vital for transmitting state-of-the-art information and creating contacts with experts in the field. Of particular value are government officials from importing countries responsible for certification, approval and inspection of imports, as well as officials responsible for implementation of SPS monitoring and control programmes in their home country.

78. *Value Chain.* Projects that take into account all elements of export promotion, not just particular bottlenecks that impede access at one point in time, have a better record of success. Turn-key operations that address all the necessary infrastructure, training, certification and market development needs can help to ensure no issues are left to chance, as long as local partners are included in the process. Projects that address the range of import requirements help to ensure that if one obstacle is overcome, another one does not deny access.

79. *Practical Approaches.* Projects that include applied technical training for laboratory staff, regulatory authorities and the private sector (including producers and staff of packing and processing plants) are linked to successful results. Similarly, hands-on training (such as visits to inspection stations and training in foreign country laboratories) helps to reinforce knowledge and skills. Practical approaches designed to deliver concrete solutions to specific problems, rather than training that is mainly theoretical or academic, are valuable.

80. *Leveraging Resources*. The number of participants attending training sessions and workshops is often limited due to funding and space constraints. Projects that leverage training opportunities by adopting a training of trainers approach that requires trained trainers to conduct training and distribute materials in their home countries helps to maximize the impact of available resources and accelerate dissemination of knowledge. Similarly, regional approaches can exploit economies of scale and

enable relevant lessons and experiences from similar countries to inform and enhance activities. Building on previous work and coordinating with other projects can help reduce redundancies.

81. *Engagement with Beneficiaries.* Projects that engage with producers in the development and implementation of projects had good results. Participation of individual producers is necessary for actually delivering commercial results and creating a basis for economic sustainability of projects. Producers also provide practical input on needs and constraints for project development. Working closely with government officials is necessary to ensure monitoring, control and certification programmes are continued in the future, and that officials have the capacity to meet importing country requirements. Cooperation of government officials also helps identifies bottlenecks in the export process beyond constraints readily available, and helps ensure projects are tailored to the circumstances of the country.

82. *Current market trends.* Projects need to pay attention to market demand, both for particular agricultural and food products, but also for quality and process demands in importing countries. Producers, exporters and national regulatory authorities need to be aware of requirements related to traceability, organic and other production-related standards, as well as changing import requirements and consumer preferences/trends. In addition, competition from other producers needs to be taken into account when targeting specific projects.

83. *Results Oriented.* Projects that identify discrete objectives clearly linked to export promotion are more likely to achieve demonstrable export gains. While institutional capacity cannot be ignored because of the need for a robust national system for pest and disease control as well as food safety, it is hard to relate projects focused on broad-based institutional development objectives to particular market access gains.

84. *Production Improvements.* Projects that improve systemic capacity related to import requirements can raise standards for all export products and improve domestic standards. Projects that train producers in Good Agricultural Practices, Good Manufacturing Practices, quality control, disease reduction and pest eradication can improve general health and safety circumstances in countries. This not only raises the safety and quality of export products but improves safety and quality in the domestic market as well.

ANNEX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE ON GOOD PRACTICE

The following questionnaire was attached to the WTO SPS Committee document G/SPS/GEN/816 "Request for Information on Good Practice in SPS-related Technical Cooperation" (18 January 2008), which was distributed to WTO Members and OECD Development Assistance contact points.

Questionnaire on good practice

A separate questionnaire should be completed for each project identified as good practice. The aim of the questionnaire is to examine elements of good practice at two levels:

- Project cycle: From project design to ex-post evaluation; and
- Assessment of outcomes or impacts on beneficiary's objectives: i.e. impact on market access, impact on the domestic burden of food-borne illness, impact on the pest or disease prevalence, impact on institutional capabilities, impact on beneficiary's capacity to implement the SPS Agreement, etc.

General Project Information:

Please provide the following general information on the project.

Title :

Dates: beginning and end of the project

Funding: US $ or other currency,
(including information on 'in kind' services and/or equipment.)

Beneficiary: Specify the primary and secondary beneficiaries

Project type: Follow-up project ☐ Pilot project ☐ Stand alone new project ☐

Project Cycle - Questions

Design

(1) What issue(s) did the project seek to address?
Please check all relevant boxes.

Animal health? ☐ Food safety ? ☐ Plant health? ☐ General SPS capacity ? ☐

If others, please specify:

(2) Who initiated the project request?

Donor identified need? ☐ Request from beneficiary? ☐

(3) Who designed the project?

Donor? ☐ Donor and beneficiary in collaboration? ☐ Beneficiary ? ☐

If other, please specify:

(4) Was the project based on a needs assessment?

Yes ☐ **No** ☐

(5) Was the needs assessment specific to the problem being addressed (e.g. a specific capacity evaluation of animal health capabilities?)

Yes ☐ **No** ☐

or was it part a broader assessment of needs?

Yes ☐ **No** ☐

(6) In the design of the project, was account taken of other relevant on-going or completed projects?

No information available ☐ No relevant projects ☐ Project designed as a follow-on activity to previous assistance by donor ☐ Project designed as a follow-on activity to previous assistance by other donors ☐ Pilot project ☐

Please specify:

(7) Please indicate to what extent you felt the preparation time and information gathering phase for the project was sufficient?

☐ **0-20%** ☐ **20-40%** ☐ **40-60%** ☐ **60-80%** ☐ **80-100%**

(8) Please specify which beneficiaries or stakeholders, if any, were consulted during the project design phase.

Implementation

(9) Who implemented the project?

Donor ☐ Independent contractor ☐ Beneficiary ☐ International organization ☐

If other, please specify

(10) To what extent did the beneficiary participate in implementation of the project?

☐ **0-20%** ☐ **20-40%** ☐ **40-60%** ☐ **60-80%** ☐ **80-100%**

(11) In what way did the beneficiary contribute to the project implementation (for example through an in-kind contribution, joint implementation of activities etc.)?

Please specify

(12) Did difficulties arise with the beneficiary during implementation of the project?

Yes ☐ **No** ☐

If so, please specify the nature of the problem and how it was resolved.

(13) Who was responsible for monitoring the project?

Donor ☐ Independent contractor ☐ Beneficiary ☐ International organization ☐

(14) To what extent were the activities and outputs delivered according to the project cycle plan (e.g. on time and within the budget)?

☐ **0-20%** ☐ **20-40%** ☐ **40-60%** ☐ **60-80%** ☐ **80-100%**

(15) What changes, if any, changes made during project implementation?

Reallocation of budget items ☐ Time extension to allow completion of activities ☐ Supplement to original project budget ☐

If others, please specify:

(16) If changes were made, at whose request were the changes made?

Donor ☐ Contractor ☐ Beneficiary ☐

Evaluation

(17) Was an evaluation of the project undertaken?

Yes ☐ **No** ☐

If so, please attach a copy of the evaluation to this questionnaire

(18) To what extent have the benefits of the project continued after funding has ceased?

☐ **0-20%** ☐ **20-40%** ☐ **40-60%** ☐ **60-80%** ☐ **80-100%**

(19) To what extent did the beneficiaries have the necessary capacity to sustain benefits of the project?

☐ **0-20%** ☐ **20-40%** ☐ **40-60%** ☐ **60-80%** ☐ **80-100%**

(20) Was the capacity to sustain outcomes assessed during the project design phase?

Yes ☐ **No** ☐

Outputs

(21) To what extent were the project objectives/outputs achieved?

☐ **0-20%** ☐ **20-40%** ☐ **40-60%** ☐ **60-80%** ☐ **80-100%**

(22) What were the main factors determining the achievement of the objectives?

Please list:

Achievement of higher order objectives

(23) Has any evaluation been made of the project's impacts on higher order objectives, such as institutional capacity, poverty alleviation, market access, burden of pest or disease, burden of food borne illness, etc?

Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **Don't Know** ☐

If not submitted under question (8), please attach a copy of the evaluation.
Please specify the projects alignment with the national social or economic development objectives.

Good practice

(24) In what respect(s), can the project be described as an example of good practice?

Project cycle ☐ Achievement of higher order objectives ☐

Please explain:

(25) What aspect(s) of good practice from this project could be repeated e.g. in future projects in this issue, in future projects for this beneficiary and by the broader donor community?
Please explain:

(26) Please indicate to what extent was the project a cost-effective contribution to addressing the designated objectives?

☐ **0-20%** ☐ **20-40%** ☐ **40-60%** ☐ **60-80%** ☐ **80-100%**

ANNEX 2: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Costa Rica

Alexis Sandi Munoz, Ministry of Agriculture
Rolf Schoenert, Canadian Food Inspection Agency
Xenia Carro, Ministry of Agriculture
Arturo Saborio Cespedes, Ministry of Agriculture
Roberto Duran Acuna, Ministry of Agriculture
Olger Borbon M., Ministry of Agriculture
Marietta Urena, Ministry of Agriculture

Guatemala

Wen-Kai Ou, International Cooperation and Development Fund, Chinese Taipei
Tsung-ta Tsai, International Cooperation and Development Fund, Chinese Taipei
Julio Lazo Pinero, La Libertad Association of Fruit and Vegetable Producers
Victor Hugo Jimenz, National Laboratory
Ismael Mancillo, National Laboratory (formerly)
Juan Carlos Marenco, Ministry of Agriculture
Daniel Maldonado, U.S. Embassy

Honduras

Sonia Benitez, Ministry of Health

Nicaragua

Lyla Moncada de Umana, Ministry of Agriculture
Margarita Arango, Ministry of Agriculture
José David Bolaños, Ministry of Agriculture

Panama

Karla V. Adames M., Institute of Agricultural Research
Lucas Chu, International Cooperation and Development Fund, Chinese Taipei
Franz Wald - Consultant
Sra. Deidamia Rodriguez de Mora- Ministry of Agriculture
Ing. Miyela Ortega, Ministry of Commerce and International Trade

ANNEX 3: PROJECT INFORMATION FOR EIGHT NOMINATED PROJECTS

3a: Training on mitigation measures for pepper and tomato exports (Region)

3b: SPS training project (Costa Rica and Guatemala)

3c: Strengthening food safety laboratories in Central America (Region)

3d: Establishment and Strengthening of National Codex Committees (Region)

3e: Control of '*Broca de Café*' pest (Costa Rica, Panama)

3f: Establishment of Fruit Fly Free Areas (Costa Rica)

3g: Papaya Export Promotion (Guatemala)

3h: Pesticide Residue Testing (Panama)

Annex 3a: Project Information— Training on Mitigation Measures for Pepper and Tomato Exports

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	Technical Capacity Building and Pest Management
• Type of assistance	Training
• Countries	Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua
• Donor	U.S.A. (USAID and USDA)
• Implementing agency	USAID and USDA, national authorities
• Timeframe	2006
• Budget	US$ 36,105 (plus in-kind services)
• Brief description	Provide information and train officials and produces in the region on how to meet requirements to export fresh tomato and peppers to the United States.
• Objectives	Expand markets for vegetable producers by creating capacity to overcome SPS requirements and maintain market access. Enable producers to meet U.S. import requirements for fresh tomato and pepper, particularly for pest concerns such as fruit fly. Train government officials to monitor and certify pest free status, and establish remediation procedures.
• Main activities	Provide information on import requirements. Train producers and officials to identify risks associated with export and comply with import requirements. Provide follow-up training and technical assistance including port inspection and dialogue with regulatory officials. Awareness creation of SMTQ importance through group training programmes on standards, accreditation, HACCP, ISO 9000, ISO 14000, ISO 17025
• SPS components	Risk mediation to address SPS requirement of importing country.
• Partner institutions	Plant health institutions of each country Trade ministries of each country Producers.
• Beneficiaries	Producers, exporters, and plant health officials.
• Outputs	Production and inspection regimes in beneficiary countries. Import access agreed with importing country.
• Outcomes	Greater awareness of import requirements Increased exports.
• Sustainability	Producers have incentive to maintain pest control practices. Continued government financing required for monitoring and control.
• Evaluation	U.S. CAFTA-DR capacity building programme, including pepper and tomato support, evaluated in 2008.

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Relevant for WTO and bilateral trade agreements
• How project was initiated	Project was identified jointly by donor and beneficiary countries as part of DR-CAFTA trade capacity building process.

• Beneficiary's role	Beneficiary country authorities, including plant health authorities, collaborated in project design
• Needs assessment	No formal assessment, but technical assistance had been identified as a priority by government and private sector in beneficiary countries during CAFTA-DR negotiations.
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	Market access goal by meeting import requirements was clearly identified.
Project implementation	
• National ownership	Beneficiary countries showed strong interest in implementing programme, fulfilling domestic industry expectation from CAFTA-DR agreement.
• Beneficiary participation	Beneficiary countries involved in workshop planning, coordination with growers, and in establishing monitoring and control systems. Beneficiary countries responsible for long-term implementation.
• Project management	Project manager in region provided by U.S. government.
• Synergies	Project took advantage of long-standing USDA-APHIS participation in the region. Project was part of larger CAFTA-DR capacity building programme, sharing overhead and taking advantage of relationships, information, and political commitment of capacity building programme.
• Monitoring	Beneficiary governments responsible for monitoring field and export conditions and participation of growers. U.S. authorities monitor product for compliance with import requirements and conduct periodic field assessments.
• Difficulties	n/a
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Exports increased by over $5 million in a period of two years, from a base of zero in several countries. Producers and government officials trained in pest management, meeting U.S. import requirements, and quality control.
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Beneficiary countries worked closely with donors on project identification and design. Project took advantage of preparatory efforts in beneficiary countries. Project had specific objectives, identifying particular products and specific markets. Technical assistance complemented policy efforts by beneficiary and donor countries to establish access conditions.
• Project implementation	Workshops and site visits held in beneficiary countries with government officials and private sector. Training targeted on precise market access objectives. Flexibility in project implementation to address changing conditions.
• Lessons that could be replicated	Development of cooperative donor and beneficiary committee to identify and plan technical assistance, identify priorities, and design training collaboratively.

Sources: U.S. Response to G/SPS/GEN/816
Project document
Project evaluation
Interviews

Annex 3b: SPS Strengthening in Costa Rica and Guatemala

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	Food safety and animal health
• Type of assistance	Training
• Country	Costa Rica and Guatemala
• Donor	Canada
• Implementing agency	Canadian Food Inspection Agency
• Timeframe	2002 - 2004
• Budget	CDN$ 2,200,000 (plus in-kind services)
• Brief description	Assistance to Costa Rica on animal health/food safety (particularly BSE) and assistance to Guatemala on general SPS capacity building.
• Objectives	Capacity building for national authorities SPS-related responsibilities.
• Main activities	Work packages delivered through workshops, study tours, and technical training.
• SPS components	BSE risk management, risk assessment, traceability, Specific Risk Materials, equivalence, quarantine, and laboratory diagnostic and HACCP for Costa Rica.
• Partner institutions	SENASA in Costa Rica and Ministry of Agriculture in Guatemala.
• Beneficiaries	Ministry of Agriculture are direct beneficiaries, producers and exporters are derivative beneficiaries.
• Outputs	Training packages completed.
• Outcomes	Increased capacity addressing BSE and food safety issues.
• Sustainability	Not addressed.
• Evaluations	n/a

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Addressed specific food safety and animal health confirms in Costa Rica.
• How project was initiated	Donor identified need for expanded capacity in the region.
• Beneficiary's role	Project design was done in cooperation with direct beneficiaries
• Needs assessment	Needs identified in regional workshop in 2002 by beneficiaries.
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	Costa Rica project identified specific objectives for capacity building. Guatemala project still in process.
Project implementation	
• National ownership	National officials participation in training sessions.
• Beneficiary participation	Adjustments to procedures and regulations in beneficiary countries. Input to needs assessment on technical level
• Project management	Project managed by private sector consultancy (university).
• Synergies	Complements ongoing national capacity building efforts.
• Monitoring	Iterative process allowed for consideration of progress by donor and beneficiary and incorporate adjustments into subsequent training.

• Difficulties	Change in government in one beneficiary country required delay and review of project implementation.
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Food safety
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Iterative design of training packages to sequence assistance and respond to follow-up needs as identified.
• Project implementation	Multi-sector design involving government, private sector and academia. Private sector consultancy as executing agency increased administrative efficiency and facilitated identification of appropriate training resources, including finding trainers and sources outside of the government.
• Lessons that could be replicated	Sequenced programme design to ensure progressive training and adjustment to programme based on new developments. Project design in cooperation with direct beneficiaries Implementation through agency that has contacts outside of donor government. High calibre subject matter expertise.

Sources: Canada Response to G/SPS/GEN/816
Interviews

Annex 3c: Project Information— Strengthening Food Safety Laboratories

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	Technical capacity building and food safety
• Type of assistance	Training
• Countries	Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama
• Donor	FAO
• Implementing agency	FAO
• Timeframe	2005 - 2006
• Budget	$258,574 (plus in-kind) for Latin America-wide project
• Brief description	Implementation of good laboratory practices. Quality assurance for food analysis labs to comply with import/export requirements and international certification.
• Objectives	Train laboratory officials in laboratory techniques and assist in obtaining ISO certification.
• Main activities	Regional workshops for national officials in laboratory practices in five identified fields. Officials then conducted seminars in home country to disseminate information to broader group of government officials and private sector laboratories.
• SPS component	Food safety testing and certification.
• Partner institutions	Food safety laboratories of member countries
• Beneficiaries	Consumers, producers and exporters in member countries.
• Outputs	Implementation of improved laboratory practices. Certification of national labs in several countries.
• Outcomes	Improved domestic health and safety standards. Improved ability to meet import requirements in foreign countries.
• Sustainability	n/a
• Evaluations	Final report and continued dialogue among participants.

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Strengthened lab capacity will facilitate improvement in national food standards and contribute to producers and exporters ability to meet safety and quality standards in foreign markets.
• How project was initiated	Project was identified by recipients through regional process, and programme was developed in conjunction with FAO.
• Beneficiary's role	Beneficiaries identified needs at outset, collaborated in programme design, and disseminated information in the home country after participating in training sessions.
• Needs assessment	Needs assessed by countries through the RILAA (regional laboratory network)
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	Goals of improving laboratory practices and achieving certification identified at outset.

Project implementation	
• National ownership	Beneficiaries were responsible for coordinating regional training sessions and conducting follow-up workshops to disseminate information in home country following training.
• Beneficiary participation	Beneficiaries participated in identifying participants, obtaining training facilities, organizing training session logistics, and presenting technical presentations in the home country.
• Project management	FAO
• Synergies	Some beneficiary countries coordinated training work with national standards agencies in home country. Project supported work of regional laboratory network. Some countries had parallel capacity building programmes underway which complemented the programme.
• Monitoring	Monitoring and evaluation depended on individual country initiative, but beneficiaries were in close contact with donor through out programme implementation.
• Difficulties	Different level of experience and competence across countries made it difficult to target level of training expertise to maximum benefit of all participants.
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Poverty alleviation Expanding exports by achieving standards in importing countries Consumer protection and food safety
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Project identified by recipients through regional network Training programme benefited from similar programme in South America. Detailed needs assessment conducted of technical needs.
• Project implementation	Workshops conducted with four participants from beneficiary country, and then workshop participants required to conduct training sessions in home country for government and private sector. Coordination between donor and beneficiary on programme design and on specific elements of training workshops. Use of consultants from the region. Networking between countries and with expert consultants provided useful models and contacts.
• Lessons that could be replicated	Information dissemination and sharing technical material. Regional integration and participation for efficiency and to identify needs in the area. Working through established network for follow-up. Countries conducted self-evaluation, working with FAO, before project to establish baseline and identify needs. Learned from similar programme previously conducted in South America.

Sources: FAO Response to G/SPS/GEN/816
Project documents for FAO TCP/RLA/3014 (A)
http://www.fao.org/regional/Lamerica/en/comagric/codex/rla3014.htm
Report: www.**fao**.org/Regional/Lamerica/ prior/comagric/codex/rla3014/pdf/presenta.pps
Interviews

Annex 3d: Project Information— Establishment and Strengthening of National Codex Committees

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	Codex, SPS/TBT Agreement
• Type of assistance	Information and training
• Countries	Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama
• Donor	FAO
• Implementing agency	FAO in conjunction with national Ministries of Health
• Timeframe	2000 - 2003
• Budget	$399,790 (including some Caribbean countries)
• Brief description	Assisting countries to establish and organize national Codex committees.
• Objectives	Help countries improve participation and understanding of Codex system and standards.
• Main activities	Conduct regional training seminars on Codex process and standards, disseminate information at national level.
• SPS components	Codex is one of the recognized sources of international standards under the SPS agreement, and Codex standards are influential in food and agricultural trade.
• Partner institutions	National health and agriculture ministries.
• Beneficiaries	Government officials and private sector companies with an interest and involvement in food safety standards.
• Outputs	Workshops on various activities Establishment of Codex Committees Dissemination of information on Codex process and standards
• Outcome	Greater awareness and understanding of Codex Increased utilization of Codex standards and participation in Codex process
• Sustainability	n/a
• Evaluation	Conducted by FAO

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Implementation of WTO commitments, enhancement of domestic standards-setting process.
• How project was initiated	Need identified by FAO
• Beneficiary's role	Coordinated in programme implementation and information dissemination.
• Needs assessment	Conducted by FAO with beneficiary country collaboration
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	Goal of creating committee and expanding knowledge of Codex process and standards clearly articulated at beginning of programme.

Project implementation	
• National ownership	Beneficiary countries responsible for logistics of training and for disseminating information obtained, as well as implementing Codex committees and implementing Codex standards.
• Beneficiary participation	Organizing logistics, coordinating in planning, and disseminating information.
• Project management	FAO, including through hiring local consultants to coordinate work with beneficiary governments.
• Synergies	n/a
• Monitoring	n/a
• Difficulties	n/a
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Institutional capacity for international trade Food safety
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Assessment of conditions in individual countries prior to project design and implementation.
• Project implementation	Workshops conducted with four participants from beneficiary country, and then workshop participants required to conduct training sessions in home country for government and private sector. Coordination between donor and beneficiary on programme design and on specific elements of training workshops.
• Lessons that could be replicated	Beneficiary dissemination of training information. Identification of discrete objectives and focused project to address need.

Sources: FAO response to G/SPS/GEN/816
Project documents for FAO/TCP/RLA0065
http://www.fao.org/regional/Lamerica/en/comagric/codex/rla0065.htm
Report www.rlc.fao.org/es/nutricion/codex/pdf/01tcp.pps
Interviews

Annex 3e: Control of '*broca de café*' pest

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	Plant health
• Type of assistance	Pest monitoring and control
• Country	Costa Rica and Panama
• Donor	Various, including FAO and local producer associations
• Implementing agency	Ministry of Agriculture
• Timeframe	2002 - 2003
• Budget	$396,124
• Brief description	Monitoring advance of '*Broca de Café*' pest and development of procedures to identify and control infestations.
• Objectives	Establish and implement control mechanisms for pest.
• Main activities	Training, pest monitoring, and pest control.
• SPS component	Pest control, protecting plant health and preserving quality of product.
• Partner institutions	OIRSA, FAO, government of Panama and Costa Rica, and producer associations.
• Beneficiaries	Plant protection personnel involved with plant quarantine Coffee producers
• Output	Officials and producers trained in pest identification and control, establishment of action plans to address pest infestation
• Outcome	Increased capacity for pest identification and control
• Sustainability	Developed capacity for control, and engaged interested parties in private sector, but no long-term funding established for government actions.
• Evaluation	n/a

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Important to maintain production and quality of coffee.
• How project was initiated	Producers in Costa Rica identified need.
• Beneficiary's role	Producers collaborate in project design and trained in pest identification and control.
• Needs assessment	No formal assessment, but reflected need to deal with inevitable spread of pest.
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	Producers and government identified programme goals and objectives.
Project Implementation	
• National ownership	Costa Rica private sector and government identified and managed project.
• Beneficiary participation	Identifying donors, developing techniques, organizing logistics, coordinating in planning, and disseminating information.
• Project management	Costa Rica government and private sector

• Synergies	Drew from experiences of countries that had infestation problems.
• Monitoring	Ongoing monitoring for pest by growers and government.
• Difficulties	Coordinating with growers and teaching new cultivation and harvesting techniques
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Expand production and economic income Preserve export capacity
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Needs identified by producers
• Project implementation	Implement programme significant time before pest appears.
• Lessons that could be replicated	Integrated education and monitoring programme for producers Identification of good agricultural practices and biological controls

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

Annex 3f: Project Information— Establishment of Fruit Fly Free Areas

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	Plant health
• Type of assistance	Training, development of monitoring and control systems, and implementation of surveillance system
• Country	Costa Rica pilot programme for region-wide project
• Donor	Several provided services and financing, including IICA, FAO, IAEA, OIRSA, and USDA/APHIS
• Implementing agency	Ministry of Agriculture, collaborating with OIRSA, IAEA and USDA
• Timeframe	2001 - 2006
• Budget	$2.5 million, plus in-kind provision of support services
• Brief description	Create zones free, or low prevalence, of fruit flies to facilitate exports of fruits and vegetables from Central America. Initial programme in Los Innocentes, Guancaste, Costa Rica, but work begun on 12 other potential free zones in the region.
• Objectives	Identify feasible programmes of integrated pest management for establishing pest free zones in the region. This includes developing effective quarantine, surveillance, monitoring, and control programmes, including through release of sterile fruit flies.
• Main activities	Identify potential free zones. Develop programme of monitoring and control. Identify eradication strategy.
• SPS components	Plant health
• Partner institutions	Ministry of Agriculture in beneficiary countries, along with IAEA, ORISA, IICA, FAO and USDA/APHIS
• Beneficiaries	Producers and exporters in the region
• Outputs	Pest control programme design Fruit fly free area established in Costa Rica (not formally recognized by importing countries yet)
• Outcomes	Understanding of process needed to establish fly free zone. Reduction in fruit fly incidence in pilot zone. Development of institutional capacity to manage fruit fly surveillance and control programme.
• Sustainability	Private sector continuing with monitoring and control in pilot zone.
• Evaluations	No formal evaluations.

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Fruit flies damage crops and are grounds for denial of market entry in many key foreign markets.
• How project was initiated	Agriculture ministers in the region identified common need and solicited assistance for regional programme from donors.
• Beneficiary's role	Provide institutional assistance from Ministry of Agriculture, organize private sector participation, ensure private sector provision of labour, and collaborate in programme design and implementation .
• Needs assessment	Based on general assessment of need for fly free areas and identification of potential free zones carried out by beneficiary countries.
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	Control, eradication, and monitoring of fruit fly based on empirical sampling.
Project implementation	
• National ownership	Beneficiaries active in proposing, planning and implementing programme.
• Beneficiary participation	Government and private sector responsible for contribution to ongoing monitoring and control programmes, including providing in-king service and institutional support.
• Project management	Overall project managed by regional manager. Individual countries responsible for coordinating national programmes.
• Synergies	Coordinated with other capacity building exercises to improve monitoring and control capacity in the region. Hooked into US/Mexico fruit fly control programme.
• Monitoring	Beneficiary countries responsible for ongoing monitoring of fly free zones. Importing countries will audit and conduct their own inspections when applications submitted for recognition of pest-free status.
• Difficulties	Resources to implement monitoring and control, lack of access to reliable and feasible source of sterile fruit flies, capacity limitations in some countries quarantine services.
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Improve productivity and expand access to foreign markets. Poverty reduction.
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Strategic planning assistance through outside consultant. Comprehensive preparation on physical site feasibility critical.
• Project implementation	Training in data and detection analysis conducted on regional basis, with actual personnel working on project. Importance of working with multi-disciplinary team.
• Lessons that could be replicated	Capacity building by training producers on-site, working with producers association.

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

Annex 3g: Project information— Papaya Export Promotion

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	Plant health and technical assistance to producers
• Type of assistance	Training and physical infrastructure
• Country	Guatemala
• Donor	Chinese Taipei
• Implementing agency	Chinese Taipei International Cooperation and Development Fund
• Timeframe	2007 - 2008
• Budget	$850,000
• Brief description	Technical assistance for papaya export from Guatemala.
• Objectives	Assist producers in increasing productivity and in meeting plant quarantine requirements of importing countries. Build packing plant and work with government to get meet importing countries certification requirements for pest control (fruit fly).
• Main activities	Training of producers. Obtain import certification Construction of packing plant and assist in developing marketing channels.
• SPS components	Plant health
• Partner institutions	Ministry of Agriculture Guatemala export promotion agency Local producers association
• Beneficiaries	Producers and exporters Government officials
• Outputs	Training of producers on good agricultural practices Pest control Physical infrastructure (packing shed) Import certification (pending) Marketing channels
• Outcomes	Capacity to meet import requirements Establishing marketing contacts Expanded exports
• Sustainability	Donor intends to turn facilities over to local organization after transition period with expectation that programme will be profitable.
• Evaluations	n/a

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Project is occurring in area of low pest prevalence. Obtaining export certification will allow expansion of exports to key markets. Improved productivity will increase output and income generation.
• How project was initiated	Donor identified economic potential and technical expertise to provide assistance. Local producers had solicited assistance from government to improve capacity and open export markets for papaya.
• Beneficiary's role	Provide labour and produce crop. Work with donor to implement project.
• Needs assessment	No formal assessment, but responded to interest from local producers and authorities.
Project implementation	
• National ownership	Local producers already selling through preliminary packing shed into regional markets. Expanding production to meet future capacity of new packing shed.
• Beneficiary participation	In-kind contribution of labour, and participation in sales already.
• Project management	Chinese Taipei International Cooperation and Development Fund
• Synergies	Region is part of fruit fly control programme already.
• Transparency	Coordination between donor and local producers.
• Monitoring	Joint monitoring by donor and beneficiary
• Difficulties	Marginal technical issues related to production, construction, and certification.
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	Improve productivity, establish export certification, operate packing plant with progress monitored by production and sales data.
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Expanded production, exports, and income. Poverty reduction.
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Donor delivered on area of technical expertise. Comprehensive project: production assistance, certification assistance, construction of physical plant, and marketing.
• Project implementation	Production and marketing experts on site. Implementation of new production techniques.
• Lessons that could be replicated	Comprehensive – from production to marketing Turn-key project

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

Annex 3h: Project Information—Pesticide Residue Testing Training

Project data sheet	
• Topic/issue	Food safety
• Type of assistance	Training
• Country	Panama
• Donor	Chinese Taipei
• Implementing agency	Chinese Taipei International Cooperation and Development Fund
• Timeframe	2005-2007
• Budget	$440,000
• Brief description	Provide training in pesticide residue testing in fruits and vegetables.
• Objectives	Improve domestic and export food safety by establishing capacity to test for pesticide residues.
• SPS components	Food safety of fruit and vegetables
• Partner institutions	Ministry of Agriculture Ministry of Health Panamanian Institute for Agricultural Investigation
• Beneficiaries	Food safety authorities Producers, exporters and consumers
• Outputs	Trained staff and development of test methodologies
• Outcomes	Greater understanding of testing methodologies for pesticide residues on fruits and vegetables. Framework for national network of residue testing laboratories
• Sustainability	Depends of government funding and prices for testing services
• Evaluations	Final evaluation

Issues

Project design	
• Relevance	Pesticide residues can pose health risk and detection of residues can deny access to foreign markets
• How project was initiated	Government of Panama identified need, approached Government of Panama with proposal, which offered to participate.
• Beneficiary's role	Helped design programme, validate methodologies and technology, and collaborated in implementation.
• Needs assessment	Panama conducted needs assessment prior to beginning project.
• Articulation of goals, objectives and indicators	Measurement of residue levels and establishment of testing facilities.
Project implementation	
• National ownership	
• 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 government of Panama
• Synergies	Project complemented parallel work by World Bank on residue testing
• Transparency	Collaboration between donor and beneficiary.
• Monitoring	Beneficiary is monitoring continued implementation.
• Difficulties	n/a
Impacts	
• Higher-order objectives	Improve food safety Expand possibility for food exports
Key lessons for good practices	
• Project design	Review and validation of technical methodologies by donor and beneficiary before project implementation.
• Project implementation	Training and implementation in field to allow producers to test and identify shipments with positive test results Use of technical experts from Ministry of Agriculture to train producers in Good Agricultural Practices
• Lessons that could be replicated	See above

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