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Aims

• Sensitize the SPS community about the importance of managing for results and the need for indicators.

• Identify, pilot test and refine an indicative set of indicators to measure the performance of a national SPS system.

• Develop guidance materials to help measure the performance of a national SPS system.
Synergies and linkages with:

- STDF/OECD work on good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation
- Other STDF work (including on SPS action planning, use of economic analysis, etc.)
- Aid-for-Trade Initiative through focus on monitoring results at an operational, issue-specific level
STDF Work Plan on SPS Indicators (2010-11)

In collaboration with the OECD:

- Draft working paper on SPS indicators. Discuss. Revise.
- Technical working meeting, 1 July 2010.
- Pilot testing activities in selected countries.
- Possibility to organize 2nd technical working meeting.
- Revise working paper and produce guidance materials.
Scope and focus of our work

- **Aims to** identify indicators that can be used to track and measure the performance of a national SPS system (*macro* level).

- Does **not** attempt to develop indicators for specific SPS projects or programmes (*micro* level).

- Does **not** aim to duplicate or replicate sector-specific indicators (OIE PVS, PCE tool, etc.).
**Approach**

- Based on the logical framework’s results chain and OECD terminology.
- Expect this to be a long-term, iterative and participatory process.
- View the resulting indicators as a starting point for adaptation by countries to suit their conditions.
- Facilitate country ownership of SPS capacity building and priority setting.
What do we mean by a national SPS system?

Enabling environment
- Rule of law
- Good governance
- Trade facilitation
- Other market requirements
- Investment climate
- Logistics, infrastructure

Regional / international framework
- Regional bodies / economic communities
- ISSBs (Codex, OIE, IPPC)
- WTO
- Trading Partners

Governance
- Trade facilitation
- Other market requirements
- Investment climate

Trade
- Rule of law
- Good governance
- Enforcement

National SPS System
Gov’t Agencies
- FS
- AH
- PH
- Trade

External support

Consumers

Private sector

Research

Trading Partners
Functioning, resourced and transparent SPS system with capacity to ensure food safety, animal and plant health (incl. ability to meet int’l SPS requirements)

Contribute to national development objectives (e.g. ↑ employment, income generation, ↓ poverty, improved public health)
Purpose (medium-term): Functioning, resourced and transparent national SPS system

- Gov’t agencies, private sector, consumers and donors understand importance of meeting SPS requirements.
- SPS decision-making is collaborative and transparent.
- Policy, legal and regulatory framework for SPS management.
- Stakeholders have capacity to carry out roles based on national legislation, SPS strategy, action plans, etc.
- National agencies able to engage with trading partners, int’l standard-setting bodies, regional bodies, WTO, etc.
Expected benefits

- Enhance synergies and effectiveness in reporting, monitoring and evaluation (especially given often fragmented state of SPS information).

- Potential as tools to support SPS policy and decision-making.

- Support monitoring of SPS action plans.
Purpose of today’s meeting

• Discuss the use of a logframe approach to measure the performance of a national SPS system.

• Discuss the purpose, outcomes and indicators in the draft working paper.

• Make recommendations to advance this work on SPS indicators.
Break-out Sessions
Break-out sessions

• Group 1: Room A – Kenza Le Mentec
• Group 2: Room B – Melvin Spreij
• Group 3: Room C – Kees van der Meer
• Group 4: Room D – Panos Antonakakis
• Group 5: Room D – Sheelagh O’Reilly
Break-out sessions – Questions to discuss

• Are the purpose (medium-term outcome) and five outcomes in the draft logframe complete and coherent?
  – Are there any obvious gaps? Anything missing in the outcomes? If so, identify the gaps and define the missing outcome(s).
  – Rank the outcomes in priority?
  – Could a logframe – with outcomes and indicators similar to these – assist in the development and/or strengthening of the SPS system in your country?
Break-out sessions – Questions to discuss

• Select the outcomes that your group ranked as first and/or second priority. Discuss the indicators proposed in the draft working paper to measure this outcome(s).
  – Consider their practicality, data availability / gaps, etc.?
  – Are there any missing indicators? If so, what?