STDF PROJECT GRANT APPLICATION FORM

Desired Title	
Project Title	Development of a framework to facilitate e-veterinary
	certification for international trade on the basis of a
	single window system
Objective	To share terminologies and concepts of electronic veterinary certification (e-veterinary certification), and then facilitate future development of a versatile e-veterinary certification scheme for use in a single window system with recommendations to Veterinary Authorities, the OIE and donor communities.
Budget requested from STDF	\$146,048
Total project budget	\$ 200,748
Full name and contact details of the requesting organization(s)	Dr Unesu Ushewokunze-Obatolu Department of Livestock & Veterinary Services Ministry of Agriculture, Mechanisation & Irrigation Development P.O Box CY 66, Causeway, Harare, Zimbabwe newazvo@dlvs.qov.zw Dr Chinyere Akujobi Department of Veterinary & Pest Control Services Federal Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Development PMB 135, Area 11, Garki, Abuja, Nigeria Chimed22@yahoo.com +2348035877722 Dr Roland Xolani Dlamini Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives Veterinary and Livestock Services PO Box 162 Mbabane H100 SWAZILAND roland.dlamini@uni.sydney.edu.au Tel: +268 2404 27 31 Dr Sen Sovann Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 200 Preah Norodom Boulevard Sangkat Tonle Basak Khan Chamkamon PO Box 2447 Phnom Penh 3 CAMBODIA Tel: +855 16 880 047 sensovann.gdahp@gmail.com Dr Hugo Federico Idoyaga Benítez National Service of Quality and Animal Health (SENACSA) P.O Box CAPY - 1101 - 1110 CAMPUS UNA -2169 SAN LORENZO - PARAGUAY presidencia@senacsa.gov.py;hidoyagab@gmail.com Phone: 595-21-576 435
Full name and contact details of contact person for follow-up	Ms Ann Backhouse World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) 12 rue de Prony, 75017, Paris, France a.backhouse@oie.int

I. BACKGROUND & RATIONALE

1. Relevance for the STDF

In 2015, the STDF Working Group took particular interest in electronic certification in SPS areas as a topic of the session on "information exchange among providers of SPS capacity building and dialogue among relevant stakeholders." The Working Group members concluded that "there is still a lack of understanding amongst SPS and trade practitioners regarding the implementation of ecertification."

This was followed by a "Seminar on electronic SPS certification" in June 2016 organised by the STDF, taking the opportunity of an SPS Committee meeting with over 100 participants to raise awareness of the opportunities and the challenges related to the implementation of electronic SPS certification systems, particularly in developing countries.

On both occasions, the applicable standards on the animal health side were presented by the OIE, and there were presentations about actual cases including meat trade at the Seminar. However, it is apparent that electronic certification for animal health is not widely used, and the understanding of the application of electronic certification among veterinary services is still limited, especially in developing countries.

The OIE Animal Health Standards, both Terrestrial and Aquatic, include an article stipulating requirements for e-certification in their respective Chapters on Certification Procedures, which were updated in 2014 to align with similar standards of the IPPC and the Codex. However, some Member Countries, especially applicant developing countries, feel that there should be more concrete guidance and support under the leadership of the OIE so that animal health electronic certification systems can become more established in international trade involving developing countries. Applicant countries believe that support through the OIE is particularly pertinent in light of the commencement of an STDF project to develop a global e-certification system by the IPPC, the recent recommendation by the Codex to undertake revision of its existing guidance, discussion at the above-mentioned STDF Working Group and its Seminar and, most importantly, comments expressed by some Members at the 84th and 85th OIE General Session.

Given that increasing uptake of e-certification could, due to its technical complexity and financial implications, create a challenge for developing countries to participate in international trade and that developing a way to harmonise and simplify the practice would help all parties, notably those in resource-scarce developing countries, and that e-veterinary certification would exhibit the greatest utility if introduced in conjunction with the use of a single window for all relevant documentations required for international trade of animal and animal products including customs documentations, certificates of origin and veterinary certificates, this STDF Project Grant application was prepared on behalf of interested developing and developed countries.

2. SPS context and specific issue/problem to be addressed

Safety of international trade in animal and animal products depends on a combination of factors which should be taken into account to ensure unimpeded trade without incurring unacceptable risks to human and animal health. Differences in the animal health situations among countries, such as the exporting country, the transit country and the importing country, should be considered before determining the requirements for trade, and satisfaction of such requirements should be stipulated in the veterinary certificates issued by the Veterinary Authority of the exporting country. Thus, the capacity for issuing timely and appropriate veterinary certificates is a critical issue.

In order to facilitate smooth exchange of veterinary certificates, the OIE Terrestrial and Aquatic Animal Health Standards provide globally agreed certification procedures and model certificates, including for electronic certification.

As noted by Peter Stokes¹, electronic certifications provide improved efficiency, reduced administrative costs and reduced clearance times due to electronic transmission with automated validation and cross checking against the import permit and import declaration, and some

¹ http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/SPS Ecert Backgroundpaper.pdf

developed countries have been establishing such systems through bilateral arrangements between major trading partners. Implementation through an increasing array of bilateral arrangements could prove costly and lead to harmonisation problems, and would create an obstacle for developing counties to benefit from electronic certification.

Nigeria, having experienced rejection of some of its agricultural produce, set up an Inter-ministerial Technical Committee to address this issue. The committee identified poor documentation and in some cases falsified documents as major causes of these rejections and has recommended migration to Electronic Certification for International trade as a mitigation measure.

3. Links with national/regional development plans, policies, strategies, etc.

Trade in animal and animal products is an inevitable reality for the development of Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Swaziland, Cambodia, Paraguay many other developing countries. Certification and scrutiny of certification are important activities of Veterinary Authorities to support such business, but the current paper-based system constrains the ease of business for the livestock sector.

While the number of currently issued veterinary certificates may not be very high in applicant countries other than Paraguay, irrespective of these numbers it is pertinent to note that in addition to facilitating business transactions, a key specific objective of migration to electronic certification, in addition to improve administrative efficiency, is to eliminate falsification of certificates. Certificate authentication through electronic certification will ensure that diseased/infected animals and infected/contaminated animal products are not imported or exported, thereby protecting animal and public health. Also, in view of various interventions by Governments in the Livestock Subsector, Nigeria, for example, anticipates that the volume of trade in livestock and livestock products for export trade will increase in the years to come. Electronic certification therefore will help reduce rejection of the country's commodities resulting from improper documentation.

This problem becomes more apparent as the plant health counterparts in these countries have been moving towards e-certification for trade of crop commodities. In the case of Nigeria, the plant health and food safety Authorities are already operating some level of electronic certification. Nigeria's Veterinary Authority has also commenced the process of migration to paperless/electronic certification. However, while the plant health and food safety authorities have international guidance for electronic certification from IPPC and CODEX respectively, the Veterinary Authority has no such international guidance for its migration to electronic certification. Adoption of electronic certification for animal and animal products and promoting paperless trade would both be an advantage for national agriculture sectors and also meet the conditions under the Trade Facilitation Agreement of the WTO.

Additionally, in the case of Zimbabwe's livestock sector this initiative would allow benefits from the on-going project of development of an animal identification and traceability system. In fact Zimbabwe's Ministry of Agriculture is currently working on introducing an on-line system for administering permits. While this is anticipated to include veterinary certification, developing a system without international guidance makes Zimbabwe's Veterinary Authority uneasy about quality assurance and future compatibility.

In the case of Swaziland, a fully-functional computerised "Swaziland livestock information and traceability system" (SLITS) has been developed. Following the development of SLITS, adding identification and traceability of consignments is considered the logical next step to complete the flow which will feed information into an electronic certification system. Although the export volumes are still limited, beef exports to various markets, including the EU and Norway, are important and their expansion is one of the priorities for the country's development.

In the same vein, the present project will support Nigeria in the implementation of its Integrated Export Control Plan currently being developed. Furthermore, under the Single Window Platform for international trade developed by the Nigerian Customs Services, relevant regulatory authorities are expected to be integrated. A major prerequisite for this integration is the complete migration to electronic certification. Thus, this project, therefore will help the Nigeria Veterinary Authority meet up with the pre-requisite. This project, thus, facilitates seamless integration by the National Veterinary Authority.

In Paraguay, a single window for exports and imports has already been implemented, the database of which is located in the Customs office. Thus, once e-veterinary certification is introduced, substantial improvement of efficiency is expected.

4. Past, ongoing or planned programmes and projects

In the SPS area, electronic certification has been receiving growing attention over the last several years. For veterinary certification, bilateral arrangements have been initiated mostly by developed exporting countries: example includes meat products from Australia to countries including the Philippines and Japan, meat products from New Zealand to Canada and the U.S., and dairy products from the Netherlands to China. Malaysia recently started discussion with New Zealand to introduce e-veterinary certification. These have been arranged through successive bilateral negotiations, a procedure that is rather costly and may not be optimally efficient.

Meanwhile for plant health certification, the IPPC-developed STDF project titled "ePhyto - Global electronic trade facilitation: Enhancing safe trade in plants and plant products" was adopted in March 2016. Aimed at benefiting all National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) that issue and receive phytosanitary certificates, especially those of developing and least developed countries, this project consists of 1) the development of a hub, 2) the development of a generic gateway system for the use by countries that do not have a national system for sending and receiving ecertifications, notably developing countries and LDCs, and 3) providing training and the development of training tools. National Veterinary Authorities are aware of such a move by their plant health partners and often long for commencement of discussion about what the animal health side can do beyond bilateral arrangements.

In June 2016, the STDF organised a Seminar to raise awareness of the opportunities and the challenges related to the implementation of electronic SPS certification systems. While the level of interest shown by participants, including developing countries and private sectors, is high, good practices in the application of electronic certification to animal and animal products were very limited, which substantiated the general observation that the introduction of electronic certification is lagging behind.

At present, there is no project in the field of animal health to contribute to the development of a versatile electronic certification system.

While not directly targeting development of an electronic certification system, in Nigeria, the UNIDO-supported National Quality Infrastructure (NQI) Project will be strengthening the National WTO Notification Authority and SPS Enquiry Points, which include the National Veterinary Authority as the SPS Enquiry Point for Animal Health. Although the specific objective of the relevant subcomponent of the NQI project is to improve communication and notification from enquiry points and the Notification Authority, it also will be supporting relevant agencies with human capacity building and equipment to facilitate electronic exchanges of information.

5. Public-public or public-private cooperation

Public-public cooperation:

National Veterinary Authorities have been stimulated by the move of their plant health partners and the need for cooperation among relevant agencies is well understood at the national level. Such sentiment was bolstered by STDF PG/504. This proposed project will further promote communication among the relevant authorities.

It should be noted that the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA) supports the implementation of paperless trade and the National Committee[s] on Trade Facilitation (NCTF) of which establishment is stipulated by the TFA will help to promote such cooperation. While the OIE survey on the establishment of NCTF (conducted in 2015) has not been updated, the level of awareness among Veterinary Services about TFA is considered yet to be improved, as only 49 Members replied to the survey. Among them, 22 Members have NCTF while only 14 Members involve Veterinary Services as a permanent participant. Among the five applicant countries, Zimbabwe, Nigeria and Paraguay have already established an NCTF that involves Veterinary Services. Activity 1.3 requires survey at the national level concerning not only certification procedures, but also overall efforts towards establishment and execution of a single window, which surveying includes interviewing relevant authorities.

Public-private cooperation:

Veterinary certificates are issued by and directed to Veterinary Authorities in order to facilitate safe trade. Thus, the entities (importer=customer and exporter=supplier) benefiting from smooth transactions are usually private sector. Electronic certification provides improved efficiency, reduced administrative costs and reduced clearance times due to electronic transmission, which would be most welcome by private partners. Electronic certification can also mitigate the risk of the

use of fraudulent certificates. In order to maximise the possible benefits, discussion to be conducted in the course of project activities should involve relevant private sectors.

In addition, as discussed at the above-mentioned STDF Seminar, "implementation of electronic SPS certification can act as a driver for reform, including by streamlining import-export business processes, and by promoting regulatory reform and inter-institutional collaboration." This means that adopting electronic certification, in addition to positive long-term benefits, might generate difficulties in the private sector during the transitional period.

6. Ownership and stakeholder commitment

The primary stakeholders who actively support this project include Veterinary Authorities of interested OIE Members, both developing and developed (Reference Group). Letters of support from some members of Reference Group and the OIE are attached.

II. PROJECT GOAL, OBJECTIVE, OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES (LOGICAL FRAMEWORK)

7. Project Goal / Impact

The overall goal of this project is to assist developing countries by facilitating their understanding and potential use of e-veterinary certification to better engage in international trade of animals and animal products. Furthermore, though the implementation of this project, veterinary services of Member Countries will better liaise with their counterparts of plant health, food safety and customs authorities to establish e-veterinary certification.

The establishment and implementation of bilateral e-certification arrangements by a well-resourced group of exporting countries that lock in the major importing blocks is understandably based on the self-interests of these countries and as such may not address the challenges and opportunities for developing countries. This project aims to take a more global view of the opportunities associated with solutions to animal health electronic certification.

8. Target Beneficiaries

The primary beneficiaries of the project are the national Veterinary Authorities that issue and receive veterinary certificates, especially those of developing countries.

Veterinary Authorities of some developed countries have been establishing their own such systems through bilateral arrangements between major trading partners. Implementation through an increasing array of bilateral arrangements could prove costly and may lead to harmonization problems in future. In light of the technical complexity and financial implications, such situation could create a challenge for developing countries to participate in international trade. Thus, creating a way to harmonise and simplify the practice would help all parties, notably those in resource-scarce developing countries.

Through facilitating adoption of e-veterinary certification by developing countries, private entities involved in cross-border trade of animals and animal products will then benefit from improved efficiency, reduced administrative costs and reduced clearance time. Further, facilitated certification procedures will benefit the livestock industry in developing countries by improved access to export market, though that may occur somewhat farther in the future from the perspective of this small-scale project.

(a) Gender-related issues

One of many advantages of e-certification is to allow the sending and receiving of certificates without physical attendance at a designated window, and ultimately 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. Removing physical and time restrictions helps everybody, but especially helps women cope with their local situations so as to permit their easy involvement in export and import transactions.

9. Project objective, outputs and activities (including logical framework and work plan)

Considering the lack of comprehensive information about the state of play of implementation of eveterinary certification, a study should be conducted about the basic features of currently-operating systems, including technical details, the drivers for introducing e-certification (e.g. economic development, trade facilitation, enhancing regulatory controls), and challenges in overcoming the hurdles preventing widespread use. Considering the desirability of establishment of streamlined border processes (including, as appropriate, single window systems) compatible with e-veterinary certification, such survey should include an additional element regarding the state of play of implementation of streamlined regulatory processes for cross-border trade. It is also necessary for the study to consider issues of e-certification in other SPS areas, in order to enable a clear picture on trade facilitation. Based on these review documents and other relevant information, an expert group will develop recommendations towards a harmonized simple mechanism.

Overarching activities to be carried out by the OIE:

Establish the Steering Committee: comprising experts from relevant international organisations (OIE, World Customs Organisation, UN/CEFACT, World Bank, FAO, Codex and IPPC) (maximum five including the OIE), as well experts from the Reference Group (maximum of six).

Establish the Reference Group of countries (hereafter called the Reference Group): comprising interested OIE Members, including both developing and developed countries, (see list at Section 16 point b).

Output 1: Development and implementation of a survey among interested Member Countries

A review document to feed into the Steering Committee should cover key questions and good representation of Members, both developed and developing. Thus, the survey should be devised and implemented by selected experts in consultation with the OIE.

- **Activity 1.1** Steering Committee to identify relevant expert(s) from interested Members who are in charge of veterinary certification to support Activity 1.4 and Activity 2.2.
- **Activity 1.2** convening a meeting of the Steering Committee and developing an in-country survey plan (and defining research framework and selecting consultant for Output 2). Steering Committee may invite additional experts from animal industry organizations to reflect their concern in the survey plan.
- **Activity 1.3** conducting the survey in respect of selected interested Members, which includes visits in the case of developing countries.
- **Activity 1.4** drafting a report of the survey results
- **Activity 1.5** validation of the relevant part of the report by surveyed countries, which includes a workshop in the case of developing countries

Expected products

- List of issues needing examination in considering introduction of e-certification and single windows (survey content), and
- Report of state of play of application of e-veterinary certification and single windows, including needs and challenges among surveyed Members

Output 2: Research of on-going work on e-certification in other SPS areas and analysis of the commonalities and differences

For this output, the standards, guidelines and recommendations on e-certification developed by sister organisations (IPPC and Codex) and other relevant international organisations (including UN/CEFACT) are studied. The on-going work, notably STDF PG/504 "An ePhyto Solution: Enhancing safe trade in plants and plant products through innovation," is also reviewed. Analysis will be conducted to identify commonalities and differences between other SPS areas and veterinary certifications and how to make use of the experience of non-veterinary areas.

Activity 2.1 Defining research framework and selecting a consultant (conducted during Activity 1.2)

Activity 2.2 Drafting the report

Expected product:

• Report of research and analysis

Output 3: Development of recommendations and plan on how to move forward

This output is based on the discussion by the Steering Committee.

Activity 3.1 convening meetings of Steering Committee.

Activity 3.2 draft recommendations (to Veterinary Authorities, OIE and to possible donors)

Activity 3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1, 2 and 3 in relevant languages

Expected products:

- Recommendations to Veterinary Authorities, e.g. general technical infrastructure to be set up before adopting e-veterinary certification,
- Recommendations to the OIE and other partners, i.e. how the OIE in partnership with other organizations can support Member Countries, and
- Recommendations to possible donors to support Member Countries in the development or implementation of e-veterinary certification.

Attach:

- (i) **A logical framework** summarizing what the project intends to do and how, what the key risks and assumptions are, and how outputs and outcomes will be monitored and evaluated (Appendix 1). See Qn. 15 (I) of the Guidance Note and the template attached to this application form.
- (ii) A detailed work plan indicating the start and completion date of the project, as well as sequence in which activities would be carried out (Appendix 2). See Qn. 15 (m) of the Guidance Note and the template attached to this application form.
- (iii) **Terms of Reference** (TORs) for key national/international experts to be involved in implementation of activities included in the work plan. The TORs should include information on specific tasks and responsibilities, duration of assignments, number of missions (if appropriate), and required qualifications/experience (Appendix 6). See Qn. 15 (n) of the Guidance Note.

10. Environmental-related issues

Migration to e-veterinary certification, i.e. paperless certification, will lead to reduction in felling of trees, being the natural source of paper. Less tree feeling will protect forests and also the livelihood

of communities that depend on forest resources for economic empowerment. Reduction in tree felling will in turn reduce carbon circulating in the atmosphere, as trees absorb circulating carbon. In addition, as there will be less need for transportation to obtain paper certificates by the final users (Exporters and Importers), it will lead to less carbon emissions from vehicle use. For these reasons, e-certification will contribute to the fight against climate change. This project, through facilitating the adoption of e-veterinary certification, will help countries meet their targets in Nationally Determined Contributions and obligations in the Paris Agreement.

11. Risks

This project assumes key partners of the applicant countries, notably the OIE and other OIE Members which indicated their interest, in joining in the Reference Group, will continue to actively participate in the planned activities. Thus, the immediate risk during the implementation is loss of interest by some key partners. The OIE's moving spirit is important to avoid such situation, and this is pledged by the OIE. From time to time communication by the OIE to its Members beyond the Reference Group will help to maintain the momentum.

The possibility that the final output, being recommendations developed concerning how to move forward, may not be supported by a substantial proportion of national Veterinary Authorities is a fundamental risk. In such event, the objective of facilitating future development of versatile eveterinary certification would not be achieved. To avoid such situation, the OIE will, among taking other steps, communicate closely with sister organisations (IPPC, CODEX) and other relevant international organisations including WCO and UN/CEFACT, which is important to ensure the recommendations are consistent with existing practice and on-going discussion outside of veterinary domain. Selecting a well-informed expert for Activity 2 and involving partner organisations in the Steering Committee in Activity 3 will mitigate such risk.

A risk to the ultimate goal is that developed recommendations may not sufficiently attract support from the donor community to meet developing countries' resource needs. Reaching out to donor communities, through the STDF and OIE, will mitigate such risk.

12. Sustainability

During the project period, through communication by the OIE and others, the awareness of eveterinary certification will be improved among Veterinary Authorities. The final report will be translated into relevant languages so that common terminologies and concepts of e-veterinary certification will be further shared. The OIE will consider all recommendations made to it on how to move forward, which will ensure the institutional sustainability of the results. Also, the recommendations to the donor community will serve, if convincing enough, the financial sustainability of the results.

III. BUDGET

13. Estimated budget

Please refer to Appendix 3 for budget request and breakdown, including in-kind contributions from applicants and some interested Members.

14. Cost-effectiveness

As discussed earlier (2. and 4.), in the SPS area, electronic certification has been receiving growing attention over the last several years and arrangements have been made through successive bilateral negotiations. This process is rather costly and may not be optimally efficient. Implementation through an increasing array of bilateral arrangements could prove costly and lead to harmonisation problems, and would create an obstacle to developing counties benefitting from electronic certification. The present project will respond to the growing attention by sharing concepts of e-veterinary certification and facilitating future development of a versatile e-veterinary certification scheme, which will greatly reduce the time and effort for investigation and negotiation by each interested country.

IV. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION & MANAGEMENT

15. Implementing organization

Applicant countries request the OIE to be the implementation organization including administrative and financial management.

16. Project management

In principle, the OIE will be in charge of project management. The Steering Committee will support the OIE's management from a technical viewpoint including ensuring that the project's outputs and direction is consistent with other on-going efforts related to electronic certification and trade facilitation.

The OIE will inform the Reference Group consisting of interested OIE Members, including both developing and developed (below listed) on the state of play of the implementation when appropriate including physical gathering at the OIE General Session to get advice.

Reference Group (17):

- a) Applicant members (Cambodia, Nigeria, Paraguay, Swaziland and Zimbabwe)
- b) Non-applicant members (Australia, Canada, Chile, EU, France, Germany, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Singapore, UK and USA)

V. REPORTING, MONITORING & EVALUATION

1. Project reporting

As the implementation organisation, the OIE will complete and submit the project's bi-annual technical reports and annual financial reports to the STDF. The OIE will also submit a final technical and financial Project report to the STDF.

2. Monitoring and evaluation, including performance indicators

One performance indicator is the achievement of progress with respect to "expected products" listed under each output in accordance with the timeline stipulated in the Work Plan.

In addition, as mentioned above in IV. 15., the OIE is assumed to be the implementation organisation. The OIE will inform the Reference Group. Feedback from the Reference Group members is considered a performance indicator.

3. Dissemination of the projects results

The result of this project is, as described at Activity 3.3, a final report in relevant languages combining all products from Outputs 1, 2 and 3. In addition to posting on the OIE website, a hard copy will be delivered to interested countries beyond the Reference Group and donor community.

ATTACHMENTS

- **Appendix 1:** Logical framework (see attached template)
- **Appendix 2:** Work Plan (see attached template)
- **Appendix 3:** Project Budget (see attached template)
- **Appendix 4:** Letters of support from organizations that support the project request
- **Appendix 5:** Written consent from an STDF partner that agrees to implement the project **OR** evidence of the technical and professional capacity of another organization proposed to implement the project.
- **Appendix 6:** Terms of Reference for key staff involved in project implementation

APPENDIX 1: Logical Framework²

	Project Description	Measurable indicators /	Sources of verification	Assumptions and risks
		targets		
Goal	Developing countries better engagement in international trade of animals and animal products by good understanding and potential use of e-veterinary certification through a single window	Adoption or move towards adoption of e-veterinary certification among developing countries including request of specific projects	Publication/communication by countries and survey by the OIE to be conducted at some point in future	Attention by donor community to developing country's resource need
Immediate objective (purpose)	Sharing terminologies and concept of e- veterinary certification; Facilitating future development of versatile e- veterinary certification schemes that enable streamlining of border processes (e.g establishment of a single window	Veterinary Authorities able to communicate in depth about e- veterinary certification with each other, with the OIE, and other relevant competent authorities. Concrete recommendations developed and forwarded to OIE	Report developed under Output 1 (result of country survey) Survey among Veterinary Authorities by the OIE to be conducted after the project completion Recommendations developed under Output 3	Substantial proportion of national Veterinary Authorities lose interest in e-veterinary certification or that of the kind analysed in this project
Expected results (outputs)	Output 1: Development and implementation of a survey among interested OIE Members Output 2: Research of ongoing work on ecertification in other SPS areas and analysis of the commonalities and differences Output 3: Development of recommendations on how to move forward, to national Veterinary Authorities, OIE and	Project outputs completed according to timeline Regular on time reports to STDF Secretariat Final report published in relevant languages and delivered to needed countries	Published project reports Free access to the final report (Activity 3.3)	Key partners such as Reference Group members and relevant international organisations actively participate in the planned activities

 $^{^2}$ See the CIDT Handbook on Project Identification, Formulation and Design, available on the STDF website, for guidance on the preparation of logical frameworks.

	to donor community			
Activities	For each output, below stated several activities are conducted. Some activities under outputs 1 and 2 are implemented in parallel, followed by activities under output 3. 1.1- identifying experts and establishment of the Steering Committee 1.2 - developing an in-country survey plan and selecting a consultant to draft the report 1.3 - conducting the survey in respect of selected interested Members which includes visits in case of developing countries 1.4 - drafting a report of the survey results 1.5 - validation of the relevant part of the report by surveyed countries, which includes a workshop in the case of developing countries 2.1 - Defining research framework and selecting a consultant 2.2 - Drafting the report 3.1 - Convening Steering Committee of experts who are in charge of veterinary certification in their national veterinary services and experts on e-	Milestones and budget for each activity is summarised in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 respectively. The Project is proposed for a 3-year period: basically first 18 months are for survey, research and analysis followed by recommendation development and publication.	Published final report (Activity 3.3)	Key partners such as Reference Group members and relevant international organisations actively participate in the planned activities

certification in other SPS areas or relevant international organisations		
3.2 draft recommendations (to national veterinary authorities, OIE and future donors)		
3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1,2 and 3 in relevant languages		

APPENDIX 2: Work Plan³

Activity	Responsibility	Year 1			Year 2				
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Output 1 Development and implementation of a survey among interested Member Countries									
Activity 1.1- identifying experts and establishing a Steering Committee	OIE								
Activity 1.2 –developing an in-country survey plan and selecting a consultant to draft the report	OIE, Steering Committee								
Activity 1.3 - conducting the survey in respect of selected interested Members which includes visit in case of developing countries	OIE, interested Members of Reference Group (surveyed countries)								
Activity 1.4 - drafting a report of the survey results	OIE								
Activity 1.5 – validation of the relevant part of the report by surveyed country which includes workshop in case of developing countries	OIE, surveyed countries								
Output 2 Research of on-going work on e- certification in other SPS areas and analysis of the commonalities and differences									
Activity 2.1 – Defining research framework and selecting a consultant	OIE, Steering Committee								

 $^{^{\}rm 3}$ Please shade or otherwise indicate when the activity will take place.

Activity 2.2 – Drafting the report	Selected consultant under the supervision of OIE and Reference Group				
Output 3 Development of recommendations on how to move forward					
Activity 3.1 convening meetings of Steering Committee	OIE, Reference Group				
Activity 3.2 draft recommendations (to OIE and to possible donors)	Steering Committee under the supervision of OIE and Reference Group				
Activity 3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1,2 and 3 in relevant languages					

APPENDIX 3: Budget (US\$)4

The following table provides an example to illustrate the budget can be prepared on the basis of outputs identified in the logframe and the activities needed to achieve these outputs.

	STDF	In-kind	Other
Output 1: Development and implementation of a survey among interested Member Countries			
Activity 1.1: identifying experts and establishing a Steering Committee			
Activity 1.2: developing an in-country survey plan and selecting a consultant to draft the report	\$26,400	\$3,600 (Japan)	
10 participants - International DSA (4 days @ 400 per day) = 1,600 - travel expense 2,000 from outside Europe (5 countries and WB) and 500 from within Europe (WCO, CEFACT, FAO and EU)			
Inviting 3 industry representatives - DSA (2 days@ 400 per day) = 800 - travel expense 500 from Europe		\$3,900 (relevant industry organisations)	
Activity 1.3: Conducting the survey in respect of selected interested Members which includes visit in case of developing countries			
6 in-country surveys in developing countries by one experienced e-veterinary certificate expert, and one single window practice expert and one local expert			
2 International experts / developing country (1 for veterinary certification, 1 for single window practice)	\$21,600	\$3,600 (Zimbabwe,	\$21,600 (WB)
 International DSA (4 days @ 400 per day) = 1,600 travel expense 2,000 Local DSA (3 days @ 200 per day) = 600 Translation of documents (3 countries @ 1,000) 	\$3,000	Swaziland, Nigeria, Cambodia, Malaysia, Paraguay)	
6 in-country survey in developed countries - DSA (2 days @ 400 per day) = 800		\$4,800 (Australia, UK, France, Chile, Singapore, Japan)	
Activity 1.4 - drafting a report of the survey results -expert fee 10 days $@400 = 4,000$	\$ 4,000		
Activity 1.5 – validation of the relevant part of the report by surveyed countries			

 $^{^{\}rm 4}$ Use the headings in the budget table above as a basis to prepare a budget table, preferably as an Excel chart.

- stakeholder workshop to review the relevant part of the report for validation in 6 surveyed developing countries DSA (50 @ 20 people) = 1000 Output 2 Research of on-going work on ecertification in other SPS areas and analysis of the commonalities and differences Activity 2.1 - Defining research framework, gathering relevant information and selecting a consultant (this activity is conducted at the same meeting as Activity 1.2 with additional experts from IPPC and Codex) - DSA (2 days @ 400 per day @ 2 members) - Travel expense to Paris (500 @ 2 experts) Activity 2.2 - Drafting the report - expert fee 10 days @ 400 = 4,000 Output 3 Development of recommendations on how to move forward Activity 3.1 - Convening two meetings of the Steering Committee (3 developing and 3 developed Members and 4 International Organisations representatives) - International DSA (4 days @ 400 per day) = 1,600 - travel expense 2,000 for outside Europe (5 countries and WB) and 500 for from Europe (WCO, CEFACT, FAO and EU) Activity 3.2 draft recommendations Activity 3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1,2 and 3 - Translation to French and Spanish, and local languages of Reference Group members) 5,000 @ 4 - printing				
certification in other SPS areas and analysis of the commonalities and differences Activity 2.1 - Defining research framework, gathering relevant information and selecting a consultant (this activity is conducted at the same meeting as Activity 1.2 with additional experts from IPPC and Codex) - DSA (2 days @ 400 per day @ 2 members) -Travel expense to Paris (500 @ 2 experts) Activity 2.2 - Drafting the report -expert fee 10 days @ 400 = 4,000 Output 3 Development of recommendations on how to move forward Activity 3.1 - Convening two meetings of the Steering Committee (3 developing and 3 developed Members and 4 International Organisations representatives) - International DSA (4 days @ 400 per day) = 1,600 - travel expense 2,000 for outside Europe (5 countries and WB) and 500 for from Europe (WCO, CEFACT, FAO and EU) Activity 3.2 draft recommendations Activity 3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1,2 and 3 -Translation to French and Spanish, and local languages of Reference Group members) 5,000 @ 4	countries	\$ 6,000		
gathering relevant information and selecting a consultant (this activity is conducted at the same meeting as Activity 1.2 with additional experts from IPPC and Codex) - DSA (2 days @ 400 per day @ 2 members) -Travel expense to Paris (500 @ 2 experts) Activity 2.2 - Drafting the report -expert fee 10 days @ 400 = 4,000 Output 3 Development of recommendations on how to move forward Activity 3.1 - Convening two meetings of the Steering Committee (3 developing and 3 developed Members and 4 International Organisations representatives) - International DSA (4 days @ 400 per day) = 1,600 - travel expense 2,000 for outside Europe (5 countries and WB) and 500 for from Europe (WCO, CEFACT, FAO and EU) Activity 3.2 draft recommendations Activity 3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1,2 and 3 - Translation to French and Spanish, and local languages of Reference Group members) 5,000 @ 4	certification in other SPS areas and analysis of			
- DSA (2 days @ 400 per day @ 2 members) -Travel expense to Paris (500 @ 2 experts) Activity 2.2 - Drafting the report -expert fee 10 days @ 400 = 4,000 \$ 4,000 Output 3 Development of recommendations on how to move forward Activity 3.1 - Convening two meetings of the Steering Committee (3 developing and 3 developed Members and 4 International Organisations representatives) - International DSA (4 days @ 400 per day) = 1,600 - travel expense 2,000 for outside Europe (5 countries and WB) and 500 for from Europe (WCO, CEFACT, FAO and EU) Activity 3.2 draft recommendations Activity 3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1,2 and 3 -Translation to French and Spanish, and local languages of Reference Group members) 5,000 @ 4	gathering relevant information and selecting a consultant (this activity is conducted at the same meeting as Activity 1.2 with additional experts from IPPC and	\$2,600		
-expert fee 10 days @ 400 = 4,000 \$ 4,000 Output 3 Development of recommendations on how to move forward Activity 3.1 - Convening two meetings of the Steering Committee (3 developing and 3 developed Members and 4 International Organisations representatives) - International DSA (4 days @ 400 per day) = 1,600 - travel expense 2,000 for outside Europe (5 countries and WB) and 500 for from Europe (WCO, CEFACT, FAO and EU) Activity 3.2 draft recommendations Activity 3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1,2 and 3 - Translation to French and Spanish, and local languages of Reference Group members) 5,000 @ 4	- DSA (2 days @ 400 per day @ 2 members)			
Activity 3.1 - Convening two meetings of the Steering Committee (3 developing and 3 developed Members and 4 International Organisations representatives) - International DSA (4 days @ 400 per day) = 1,600 - travel expense 2,000 for outside Europe (5 countries and WB) and 500 for from Europe (WCO, CEFACT, FAO and EU) Activity 3.2 draft recommendations Activity 3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1,2 and 3 - Translation to French and Spanish, and local languages of Reference Group members) 5,000 @ 4 \$10,000 (Japan)	, ,	\$ 4,000		
Activity 3.1 - Convening two meetings of the Steering Committee (3 developing and 3 developed Members and 4 International Organisations representatives) - International DSA (4 days @ 400 per day) = 1,600 - travel expense 2,000 for outside Europe (5 countries and WB) and 500 for from Europe (WCO, CEFACT, FAO and EU) Activity 3.2 draft recommendations Activity 3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1,2 and 3 -Translation to French and Spanish, and local languages of Reference Group members) 5,000 @ 4 \$52,800 \$7,200 (Japan)				
(3 developing and 3 developed Members and 4 International Organisations representatives) - International DSA (4 days @ 400 per day) = 1,600	Activity 3.1 - Convening two meetings of the			
- travel expense 2,000 for outside Europe (5 countries and WB) and 500 for from Europe (WCO, CEFACT, FAO and EU) Activity 3.2 draft recommendations Activity 3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1,2 and 3 -Translation to French and Spanish, and local languages of Reference Group members) 5,000 @ 4 \$10,000 (Japan)	(3 developing and 3 developed Members and 4	\$52,800		
Activity 3.3 publish the final report of Activities 1,2 and 3 -Translation to French and Spanish, and local languages of Reference Group members) 5,000 @ 4 \$10,000 (Japan)	- travel expense 2,000 for outside Europe (5 countries and WB) and 500 for from Europe (WCO,			
and 3 -Translation to French and Spanish, and local languages of Reference Group members) 5,000 @ 4 \$10,000 (Japan)	Activity 3.2 draft recommendations			
-Translation to French and Spanish, and local languages of Reference Group members) 5,000 @ 4 \$10,000 (Japan)				
-printing	-Translation to French and Spanish, and local	\$10,000		
	-printing			
Project contribution \$130,400 \$33,100 \$21,600	Project contribution	\$130,400	\$33,100	\$21,600
Overhead fee \$15,648	Overhead fee	\$15,648		
Grand total \$146,048 \$33,100 \$21,600	Grand total	\$146,048	\$33,100	\$21,600

OIE: Implementation Organisation

As the implementation organisation, the OIE will provide technical, financial and administrative oversight to the project. One staff member will be designated as the project manager who will work with the support of Financial Directorate to manage the grant.

Primary responsibilities of the project manager include:

- 1. Provide oversight to project implementation and financial/administrative management of the project
- 2. Serve as primary contact point for interaction with STDF
- 3. Serve as primary contact point for interaction with the Reference Group members
- 4. Take initiative regarding commencement of each activity in consultation with the Reference Group
- 5. Provide periodic progress reports to the Steering Committee
- 6. Ensure compliance with STDF and OIE regulations

Reference Group:

The Reference Group consists of certain OIE Members, notably five applicant members, that indicate interest in e-veterinary certification

Primary responsibilities of the Reference Group include:

- 1. Provide technical input on all activities of the project in support of the OIE when consulted
- 2. Be responsible for identification of its own in-country stakeholders when requested
- 3. Be responsible for providing feedback to the OIE's quarterly report for project monitoring purposes (please see IV.16. and V.2)
- 4. Provide in-kind contributions according to Appendix 3

Steering Committee:

A Steering Committee is created as Activity 1.1. It consists of six experts of the Reference Group members (three from developing countries and three from developed countries) who are in charge of veterinary certification in their respective national veterinary services and experts on e-certification in SPS areas or trade facilitation from relevant international organisations (OIE, World Customs Organisation, UN/CEFACT, World Bank, FAO, Codex and IPPC⁵).

Primary responsibly of the Steering Committee is:

- 1. In consultation with the OIE, develop in-country survey plan (Activity 1.2) and research framework (Activity 2.1)
- 2. In consultation with the OIE, select an expert(s) for report drafting (Activity 1.4 and Activity 2.2)
- 3. Based on the products from output 1 and output 2, develop draft recommendations to national veterinary authorities, the OIE and possible future donors.
- 4. oversee implementation and management of the project and provide guidance as needed
- 5. ensure the project's outputs and direction is consistent with other on-going efforts related to electronic certification and trade facilitation

⁵ Note the Project budget does not include funding for attendance at Steering Committee meetings of IPPC or the Codex Secretariat or their representatives.

Consultants

One international consultant is recruited for Activity 1.4. and one for Activity 2.2. (possibly a single individual). Consultants should be well familiar with administrative procedures of international trade of animal and animal products, including both paper-based and electronic certification procedures. The consultant for Activity 2.2. should also be knowledgeable about plant heath certification and food safety certification.

Responsibilities of the Activity 1.4. consultant include:

- Review and analyse the survey results provided from 12 in-country surveys (6 in-country surveys of developing countries and another 6 of developed countries)
- Draft a report providing a comprehensive picture of the state of play of e-veterinary certification (taking into account existing and previous reports on similar activities) where it has been introduced as well as of paper-based certification and gaps in technical/administrative infrastructure to introduce e-certification.
- Respond requests from the Reference Group to be included in the report.

Responsibilities of the Activity 2.2 consultant include:

- Review the information provided by the OIE and relevant international organisations from Activity 2.1
- Analyse such information according to the research framework developed by Activity 2.1.
- Draft a report identifying commonalities and differences between other SPS areas and veterinary certifications and how to make use of experience of non-veterinary areas.

ANNEX II

Arbitration clause

- 1. Any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to the interpretation, application or performance of this Contract, including its existence, validity or termination, which was not solved amicably in accordance with Article 16 of this Contract, shall be settled by final and binding arbitration in accordance with the Permanent Court of Arbitration Optional Rules for Arbitration Involving International Organizations and Private Parties, or the Permanent Court of Arbitration Optional Rules for Arbitration Involving International Organizations and States, whichever is applicable, as in effect on the date of this Contract.
- 2. The number of arbitrators shall be one.
- 3. The language to be used in the arbitral proceedings shall be English.
- 4. The place of arbitration shall be Geneva, Switzerland.
- 5. Unless the parties agree on the name of an arbitrator within one month of the request for arbitration by either party, the appointing authority shall be the International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, The Hague, The Netherlands.