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SPS challenges and opportunities prior to the project

- Specific **trade regulations** of countries within the region were very **diverse**. That generated **obstacles and costs** to international trade and limited the development of this industry.

- High % of **rejections** or delays of import/export shipments because of differences in the text of documents and certificates.

- The **topic** of “animal feed” in the region was getting higher importance due to the direct impact on safety and quality of animal origin protein.

- Latin America produced a significant **volume** of total animal **feed** produced in the world (13,6%).
The project

**Objective:**
To contribute to regulatory harmonization, the safety of animal feed and regional integration, through public-private cooperation based on the recommendations of the competent international organizations

**Outputs:**
- Development of coordination and liaison mechanisms between public and private actors in the animal feed sector (Technical Committee and working plan)
- Development and approval of key tools to promote regulatory equivalence/harmonization (Complete harmonization of 4 tools/procedures; Comparative study of 10)
- Strengthening technical capacity of public and private actors in the regional animal feed sector (large scale online training program on Feed Quality & safety)
Main characteristics

- 4 years (3 original + 1 year extension). February 2014 - March 2018.
- Total Budget: USD $2,48 million - STDF contribution: USD $1,05 Million
- Beneficiaries: 10 countries (Regional Project)
- Multi-stakeholder Project (Governments, Private associations, International organizations)
- International organizations Partners: FAO, OIE, IICA
- **IMPLEMENTING PARTNER:** Feedlatina *(Private association of the animal feed sector)*
- Project’s Governance: Steering committee, Technical committee, Focal points
Objective:
To assess the overall relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact of the Project STDF/PG/345, regarding its contribution to market access improvement, quality of regulations, and quality of animal feed products.

Method (Qualitative – quantitative):
- Desk study of documents related to the Project
- Semi structured interviews to 25 representatives from all stakeholders (9 private associations, 12 government officers, 4 international organizations)
- Survey on efficacy of training program (21% of answers for questionnaires sent)

Evaluation criteria (STDF evaluation guidelines):
→ Relevance
→ Effectiveness
→ Efficiency
→ Impact
→ Sustainability

Lessons learned
Recommendations
MAIN FINDINGS
• Project was relevant

• It contributed solving several of the main trade problems related to sanitary regulations that the beneficiary countries had faced in previous years
  • E.G. Delays and rejections of imports as a result of differences in criteria for issuing and analyzing sanitary documents and certificates between exporting and importing countries of the region

• It contributed to develop the topic as a specific working area in each country (Structure and work of the Veterinary service; Technical capacity and coordination of the private sector)

• It harmonized key trade regulations for animal feed and solved the most important practical barriers.
EFFECTIVENESS

• The project was very effective in achieving public-private coordination and liaison between the national regulatory authorities and private companies.

• Remarkable work and cooperation between countries (benchmarking).

• Good technical collaboration with specialized International Organizations involved (IICA, FAO, OIE)

• Development of harmonized norms: Good.
  - 16 trade tools/procedures agreed as important
  - 4 key trade tools totally harmonized (Goal: 4)
  - 11 procedures with comparative analysis (Goal: 10)

• Development of technical capacity: Good enough
  • 74% registrations in available courses, 76.1% successfully completed
  • Great impact (in people and organizations).
  • Validated a massive online method for training (in a scenario before pandemic)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements where harmonization was seen as useful</th>
<th>Tool or Procedure</th>
<th>Comparative study</th>
<th>Harmonization proposal</th>
<th>Implement guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Glossary of terms</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Labelling</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Free sale certificate</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Origin certificate</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Declaration of GMP</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Samples no commercial value</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Product lifespan extension</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Registration for producers</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Registration GMP</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Additives</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Medicated feed</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Residues and contaminants</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 GMO</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Exemption of registration</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Co-products</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Functional ingredients</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Not used nowadays

date

Effectiveness in developing harmonized regulations
### PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Performed</th>
<th>Successfully completed</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMP</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>98%‐59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACCP</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>98%‐13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td><strong>1,216</strong></td>
<td><strong>900</strong></td>
<td><strong>685</strong></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People who participated: 467

### EFFECT

**Effectiveness in developing technical capacities**

Source: Specific survey carried out during ex-post evaluation

#### Effect of course on your knowledge

- **COMPANIES**
  - Few knowledge: 11%
  - Medium knowledge: 25%
  - Lots of new knowledge: 67%

- **GOV**
  - Few knowledge: 25%
  - Medium knowledge: 50%
  - Lots of new knowledge: 24%

- **WHOLE GROUP**
  - Few knowledge: 18%
  - Medium knowledge: 59%
  - Lots of new knowledge: 24%

#### Effect of course on your organization’s performance

- **COMPANIES**
  - Low influence: 0%
  - Medium influence: 25%
  - High influence: 78%

- **GOV**
  - Low influence: 25%
  - Medium influence: 50%
  - High influence: 24%

- **WHOLE GROUP**
  - Low influence: 12%
  - Medium influence: 65%
  - High influence: 24%

82% positive effect on knowledge; 88% positive organizational effect = Very effective training program
EFFICIENCY

• High efficiency: All results reached according to the Schedule (3 years + 1 year extension) and budget.
  The original planning within 3 years was not realistic, so it was a right decision to authorize 1 additional year (with the same Budget)

• Some weaknesses:
  - Efficiency in performance of general analysis/ decision-making meetings: More achievements could have been obtained with a better use of time
  
  - Efficiency in execution of the large-scale training program: It was not carried out according to the planned schedule, and that situation affected somehow performance and achievements.
• **It increased the relative importance of the topic:** Produced a strengthening in structure, staff, budget of official services in several countries

• **It improved and facilitated international market access:**
  - Agreements produced simpler access to trade
  - Trade costs were reduced because of a significant decrease on shipment rejections and shorter time for solving trade problems.

• **It produced improvements in local regulations in several countries:** particularly in norms about GMP

• Harmonized key trade regulations for animal feed and simplified procedures = **huge positive impact for SMEs**
• Partially successful
• Despite all planned activities were carried out during the project, some changes in the organizational priorities of the implementing partner led to a non-continuity of expected post-project activities.
• Only a small interaction among stakeholders remained, based on personal friendship / networking

• Main Causes:
  - Weaknesses in the implementation model: The private association changed priorities (as organization) which affected its take about the Project.
  - Late search for a back-up organization that was able to be the central coordinator for the expected post-project regional activities.
CONCLUSIONS

1) Project’s significant contribution:
   a) to facilitate trade of animal feed products (permanent solutions to critical trade problems;
   b) to create technical regional capacity in Feed quality and safety

1) Remarkable commitment of all stakeholders during Project implementation. However, stakeholders considered that even more could have been done in terms of harmonization.

2) PP dialogue: Despite having different priorities at the beginning, a prior process of dialogue to identify and agree on common objectives is a very effective method to ensure smooth project implementation.

3) Innovative management model (private organization as the only implementing partner) showed high effectiveness and efficiency but demonstrated risks in terms of sustainability (that was the Project’s weakest point).
KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STAKEHOLDERS

For Official Veterinary Services

1) To pick-up and re-start coordinated regional work. Take advantage of the networking produced by the project, and ask for support to international organizations (e.g. OIE)

2) To implement improvements of national regulations based on the comparative studies made by the Project

3) To keep the effort in training programs on animal feed safety and quality. To assess the possibility of making courses for officers from private companies compulsory.

For Feedlatina and Int. Organizations

• For FEEDLATINA: To reactivate coordination with international organizations and countries (Revise current method and give space and responsibility to gvt officers on the creation of agreed harmonized regulations)

• For OIE or IICA: Regardless of FEEDLATINA’s decision about a reactivation plan, OIE and IICA could assess the possibility of generating a program that brings together representatives of regulatory agencies in the field of animal feed, to continue the collaborative work of improving and harmonizing regulations started in the project.
GENERAL RECOMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE SIMILAR PROJECTS

• High value can be gained through implementation by a relevant private sector association with the necessary expertise, interest and capacity, in SPS projects based on a public-private partnership approach (e.g. results-driven approach, efficiency, rapidity). However, it should be conditioned to a very close and strategic collaboration with relevant regional/international partners during the whole implementation period and beyond.

• In a PPP model, stakeholders have to be involved as real strategic partners in project planning and implementation (for instance through an empowered Project Steering Committee or other mechanism).

• Post-project sustainability plan

  • The stability of the implementing partner over time must be accurately assessed at the outset and, if any risk is foreseen, some measures to strengthen it, must be included.

  • Despite the importance of a clear commitment from institutions with a project, it is highly positive to invest resources in fostering a strong personal and institutional network among representatives (participants). That becomes a powerful engine for an effective implementation of all the activities.
Thank you
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