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Overview

• Scope
• Country specificity
• International comparison
• Estimating outcome and impact
• Data collection
• SPS and sector level indicators
Need to clarify SPS scope

Three main options

1. Broad: All animal and plant health and food safety measures, regardless of relation to trade
2. Narrow: Export promotion from developing countries to premium markets
3. Only trade-related measures and capacities
Country specificity (1)

Needs and affordability of SPS capacities depend on

1. Size of country – area, population, economy, agriculture and food sector, volume of trade
   - Demand for SPS services and resources available increase with size
   - Lumpy basic facilities – economies of scale
   - Small countries – few products: need to be selective
   - Big countries – multi-use of capacities
Country specificity (2)

2. Urbanization – higher risks
   • Transport over long distances with different pest and disease situation
   • Producers and consumers don’t know each other

3. Product-market combinations
   • Differences in SPS pest and disease situations
   • SPS sensitive products
   • Differences in bio-security requirements
Country specificity (3)

4. Domestic income levels
   • High income societies more sensitive

5. Geo-political location
   • Membership regional grouping: EU, CIS, ASEAN

Conclusion: No size fits all
International comparison (1)

- Country level indicators exist for many areas: governance, corruption, investment climate, health etc
- International comparison of situation and performance important for policy makers

How to solve / mitigate country specificity?
1. Some indicators hardly sensitive: e.g. prevalence of strategy, work programs, manuals, SOPs, rule of law
2. Design indicators corrected for scale
3. Compare countries with similar characteristics

Note: Some indicators not useful for comparison, e.g. inter-temporal program achievements.
International comparison (2)

- Indicators for comparison need to be
  - robust
  - limited in number
- Important possible indicators cannot be measured directly: transparency, governance, cost of doing business, health status
- Robust composite indicators need to be aggregated from measurable sub-indicators
- Empirical work needed to test what works
- Use could be made of detailed technical indicators in PVS, phytosanitary and food safety tools
Estimating outcome and impact

• Causality has to be clear to assess future
• Attribution to SPS measures problematic, in particular if there are many factors
• Most problems estimating social and economic outcomes and impact
• Hence, at project level
  – preference for easy to measure technical outcomes and impact; and
  – link with benefits remains weak
Collecting information for indicators

- Preparatory assessment about availability and cost of data collection needed
- Three ways to assess data for baseline and periodic follow-up:
  1. Statistics and administrative records
  2. Surveillance among stakeholders and specialists
  3. Assessment by specialists
- Limited time and budget constrains adoption of indicators
Sectoral details

• Comprehensive SPS indicators useful, but
• disaggregation by sector (food safety, plant and animal health) desirable because of
  – Different characteristics
  – Different policy priorities