

## **SUMMARY REPORT OF THE STDF WORKING GROUP MEETING**

**21 October 2011**

**WTO, Geneva**

### **1. Adoption of Agenda**

1. The meeting was chaired by Mr Thomas Westcot from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).
2. The Secretariat requested to add under agenda item 2. Operation of the Facility, a sub-item d) Election of chairperson and vice-chairperson. The agenda was approved with this amendment. A list of participants is provided in **Annex 1**.

### **2. Operation of the Facility**

#### **(a) Staffing issues**

3. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that Mr Pablo Jenkins had been selected to fill the post of Economic Affairs Officer (Grade 7) in the STDF Secretariat, following an internal recruitment process, and Ms Chenai Mukumba had been hired as a consultant to work on the STDF Virtual Library for a period of four months (September - December 2011).

#### **(b) Financial situation**

4. The Secretariat reported on the financial situation of the STDF and commented on the information and figures in the annotated agenda ([STDF/WG/Oct11/Annotated agenda](#)). The financial situation of the STDF is currently healthy and there is continued interest among donors to contribute to the STDF. The financial situation for the following years will be presented and discussed during the Policy Committee in December.

5. Denmark flagged that it will contribute to the STDF in 2011 (around US\$370,000). Shortly following the circulation of the annotated agenda, STDF contributions were also received from Germany and Japan. The Secretariat thanked all members for their contributions in 2011.

#### **(c) Policy Committee meeting 2011**

6. The Secretariat reported that the agenda for the Policy Committee meeting on Friday, 9 December 2011 had been circulated. The objective of this meeting will be to endorse the new Medium-Term Strategy and the revised STDF Operational Rules. The Working Group agreed to the draft agenda.

#### **(d) Election of chair-person and vice-chairperson**

7. The Secretariat noted that the current vice-chair of the Working Group (the OIE) would not be able to take up the position of chair in 2012. The Secretariat explained that there was therefore a need to elect both a chair and vice-chair for 2012 and requested that interested Members inform the Secretariat before the Policy Committee meeting in December 2011. The list of candidates will be circulated to the Working Group so that the views of other Members will be taken into account in the decision-making process.

### **3. High quality tools and information resources (output 1)**

#### **(a) Pilot testing work on the development and use of the MCDA methodology**

8. The Secretariat briefed the Working Group on STDF's MCDA work in Africa and introduced a background note for the continuation of this work in another region in 2012. A second pilot (following Mozambique in April 2011) was conducted in Zambia in the first week of July 2011. A regional training workshop was held on 16 and 17 August in Johannesburg to: (i) present the MCDA approach and draft guidebook developed by the consultant, Spencer Henson; (ii) share the experiences of the applications in Mozambique and Zambia; and (iii) train selected SPS experts in Africa on the MCDA approach. Preparations to apply the MCDA tool in Malawi, with the financial support of USAID, are underway.

9. Members expressed their support for the application of the MCDA framework in one additional country in 2012, in either Asia or Latin America, and for the organization of one regional workshop, within the context of the draft STDF Work Plan for 2012. Some Members proposed to carry out this work in Asia. Following a query, the Secretariat clarified that Belize had submitted a separate application to implement the MCDA methodology as a PPG. The WTO suggested to consider collaborating with IICA to assist in the dissemination of information on the MCDA methodology in Latin America at a regional level. The Secretariat requested the Working Group to provide written suggestions for the location of the next MCDA pilot test so that the final decision could be communicated by, or possibly before, the next meeting in March.

10. The African representative highlighted that the MCDA tool presented at the Johannesburg workshop provided a very useful perspective that reinforced the application of capacity evaluation tools for countries in Africa and suggested to incorporate this topic into the programme of the regional event with the African Union and the Regional Economic Communities. The Secretariat noted that AU-IBAR is interested to disseminate the MCDA approach to its network of stakeholders, and that it would provide information and guidance in this regard.

**(b) Planned global level event on international trade and invasive alien species**

11. The Secretariat informed the Working Group on the progress made in preparations for this seminar, to be held on Monday 9 July 2012, on the margins of the WTO SPS Committee meeting. Work has started on the identification of case studies to be presented at the meeting and discussions have taken place with the IPPC and OIE on the content of the background study and the consultant's terms of reference. The Seminar was announced on the news items on the STDF website. A dedicated webpage including background material and more information on the seminar will be prepared in the coming weeks. The seminar will be open to SPS delegates and external participants within the limit of seating capacity. A registration mechanism together with a provisional programme will be published closer to the event.

**(c) Proposed regional event with the African Union and RECs on their role and function in SPS**

12. The Secretariat introduced a background note on a proposed regional meeting, to be organized jointly with the African Union Commission (AUC) in the first half of 2012 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The purpose of the meeting would be to further discuss and agree on how to implement recommendations in the STDF study on Regional SPS Frameworks and Strategies in Africa, prepared for the AUC in 2010. In particular, the following issues would be addressed: (i) role and function of the AUC and the RECs in adding value to SPS coordination and capacity building initiatives at the continental, regional and national level; and (ii) institutional SPS framework in Africa relating to the AUC, its technical agencies and the RECs, including the establishment of a continental SPS working group.

13. The Working Group supported the proposal for the STDF Secretariat to work on this topic and emphasized that collaboration with the AUC could facilitate tangible progress in this area. Reservations were expressed on holding a high-level meeting without prior preparatory meetings. It

was noted that it would be more efficient and productive to organize a few technical meetings in order to prepare concrete proposals, such as a draft work plan to implement the recommendations of the STDF study or formulate the terms of reference for the continental SPS working group, before a high level meeting could be envisioned. Concrete expected results should be detailed.

14. Technical meetings could be held on the margins of other SPS-related events such as: (i) PAN-SPSO Phase II Steering Committee meetings which will likely include participation of the RECs and the three sisters; (ii) the EU-funded African Veterinary Governance Programme meeting to be launched in January 2012 at AU-IBAR back to back with the final evaluation of the Support Programme to Integrated National Action Plans for Avian and Human Influenza (SPINAP-AHI).

15. The Working Group agreed that the Secretariat would continue work on the background document together with the AUC and STDF partners, and report to the Working Group in March. The Secretariat should also envisage other possible financial/in-kind contributions.

**(c) STDF studies / publications**

16. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that two STDF publications: (i) SPS-Related Capacity Evaluation Tools: An Overview of Tools Developed by International Organizations (second edition); and (ii) Climate Change and Trade: The Link to Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards, had been completed, circulated via the STDF e-mailing list, and made available on the STDF website. Two other publications are currently under finalization: (i) Public-Private Partnerships in support of SPS capacity (with the Inter-American Development Bank); and (ii) National SPS Coordination Mechanisms (with the Natural Resources Institute).

17. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that the STDF film "Trading Safely" has been translated into Arabic, Chinese and Russian. DVDs are being produced and the new language versions are available on the STDF website.

18. Some Members expressed concern about the amount of time and effort that the Secretariat is spending on these studies/publications. Other Members, however, recognized that such publications are the next logical step to disseminate the results of collaborative cross-cutting thematic events and that it would be difficult to find another way to do so.

**4. Dissemination of experiences and good practices (output 2)**

**(a) STDF website / development of STDF Virtual Library**

19. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that the first phase of the Virtual Library, which consisted of the elaboration of functional specifications and the development of a prototype of the system, took place between August and September 2011. This work was done by an external consultant, in close consultation with WTO's IT Division. The budget allocated to the STDF Virtual Library was US\$75,000 and the first phase had cost approximately CHF 30,000. The second phase of the project, which will look at the final development of the system, will start in a few weeks. The project will be completed by early 2012 and the system will be presented to the Working Group for comments and suggestions.

20. In response to a query the Secretariat responded that in the past it had been able to identify the number of users accessing the STDF website per year and welcomed the suggestion to analyse regularly which are the most viewed pages, number of documents downloaded and other web statistics.

**(b) Preparation of STDF newsletter**

21. The Secretariat shared the results of a survey on the STDF newsletter circulated to the participants in the SPS Committee. The feedback received was positive but only 20 completed surveys were returned. About 90 per cent of respondents would prefer an electronic copy of the newsletter to a paper copy.

22. The Secretariat also informed the Working Group that it will be using "Survey Monkey", an online survey tool, to conduct its surveys in the future. The first experiment with this new service will be the creation of a survey on the STDF Newsletter to be sent electronically to the Working Group and to users of the STDF electronic distribution list.

**(c) (Planned) training / information sessions organized by partner**

23. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that since its last meeting in July 2011, it had participated in the following training / information sessions: (i) WTO/IDB Regional SPS seminar for Caribbean Countries (26-26 July, Barbados); (ii) WTO 2011 SPS Advanced Course (13 October, Geneva); and (iii) WTO Workshop on SPS Coordination at National and Regional Levels (17 October, Geneva).

24. The Secretariat was also requested to participate in three regional WTO SPS seminars on 15-18 November in Mali for French-speaking Africa; on 22-25 November in Kenya for English speaking Africa; and on 27-30 November in Qatar for Arab and Middle East countries. No invitations from other partners were received.

**(d) Reports to SPS Committee and Codex/OIE/IPPC meetings**

25. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that it had submitted reports on its activities to the 34<sup>th</sup> Codex Alimentarius Commission (July 2011) and to the WTO SPS Committee (October 2011) ([G/SPS/GEN/1114](#)).

**(e) Presentation by the Natural Resources Institute (NRI)**

26. Ulrich Kleih, Hanneke Lam, Diego Naziri and Andrew Edewa from the NRI gave two presentations on the following activities implemented under its "Agrifood Standards Programme": (i) the SPS Toolkit; and (ii) commodity-based trade and the results of a case study in Namibia. The Agrifood programme has three components: (i) Public sector standards (e.g. Impact assessment of notifications - case studies; the SPS toolkit to strengthen SPS coordination systems, assess the impact of SPS notifications, and analyse control measures); (ii) Private standards (e.g. GLOBALGAP; National Technical Working Groups; National Interpretation Guidelines) and; (iii) Commodity Based Trade (e.g. Namibia case study on the feasibility of meat exports from the Caprivi strip).

27. In response to queries, the NRI further clarified that the model presented could be used within a different context by different countries. It will be used in collaboration with local stakeholders for sustainability reasons. This model may contain overlaps with the work of other organizations at the lower level analysis but the main intention of this programme is to focus primarily on the overall coordination and communication of national SPS systems to subsequently recommend strategies as well as package project logical framework and action plans to hopefully result in projects. The programme will also look at the effects of control measures in the private and public sector in terms of additional income and costs with regards to how this is reflected in additional indicators.

28. The NRI further added that the toolkit does not only identify weak areas for support by donors but can also be used by policy makers to assist in budgeting and the allocation of budget to support their national programmes and SPS control area surveillance. The toolkit will be made

widely available and the information pertaining to a specific country will be made public given permission from local authorities.

**(f) Presentation by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)**

29. Ali Badarneh made a presentation on UNIDO's work in trade-related capacity building, national quality infrastructure and food safety. In response to queries from Members, Mr Badarneh clarified that UNIDO's mandate is clearly focused on food safety (not SPS in general) and that UNIDO is keen to improve coordination of its work with FAO. In an effort to achieve this, UNIDO and FAO had a productive meeting on the margins of the STDF Working Group. He highlighted that synergies could be found between UNIDO activities and STDF projects. For instance, UNIDO could provide funding for laboratories and equipment that STDF funding does not cover.

30. UNIDO clarified that it does not promote private standards but aims to assist producers to meet market access requirements regardless of the origin of these requirements. In addition UNIDO is working with the private sector to harmonize their food safety certification schemes. To this end, it - devised a global market protocol underpinned by Codex standards. Mr Badarneh highlighted that the UN system could play an important role in accreditation and bench-marking certification schemes.

**(g) Presentation of other initiatives of partners, donors and observer organizations**

31. The Secretariat introduced document [STDF/WG/Oct11/Compilation](#) and provided a brief overview of information submitted by Working Group members on their specific ongoing and planned SPS-related capacity building activities.

32. ITC provided additional information on its work with the EU on empowering the Africa private sector network to strengthen international competitiveness, which had been implemented in Uganda, Ghana and Kenya.

33. Germany informed the Working Group that it had attended the recent Partnership for Aflatoxin Control in Africa (PACA) meeting in Nairobi. UNIDO provided information about a large new project in Lao PDR that is funded by the Asian Development Bank and has an important food safety component.

**5. SPS issues and priorities in other programmes (output 3)**

**(a) Coordination with, and contribution to, related initiatives and programmes**

34. The Secretariat informed that the STDF provided comments on a DTIS update concept paper for Burundi and thanked the representative of Africa for his contribution. It also facilitated the conclusion of an agreement between FAO and UNOPS regarding FAO's implementation of EIF financed projects, which is relevant for the joint EIF/STDF funded project STDF/PG/329 in Nepal.

35. The Secretariat briefed the Working Group on its participation in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Global Aid for Trade Review in July 2011 where it disseminated documentation on the STDF. Several side-meetings with relevant organizations and beneficiaries were also organized. Preliminary discussions were held on the possible organization of an event in 2012 in Geneva, in close collaboration with WTO's Trade and Development Division, on SPS and Aid for Trade. However, as decided during the Working Group meeting on 20 October, the priorities for 2012 should be elsewhere, although members viewed that this work should be kept on the agenda and potentially be conducted in 2013.

36. The Secretariat highlighted that it intends to participate in the annual conference of the Trade Standards Practitioners Network (TSPN) on 30 November and 1 December 2011 in Washington D.C., which will focus on "Standards in South-South Trade and Opportunities for Advancing the

Sustainability Agenda". A background study on this topic is under development. Participation would also be used to organize several side-meetings with the World Bank, IDB, USDA/USAID, etc.

**(b) Discussion about the PAN-SPSO programme**

37. The Secretariat informed Working Group about its participation in the PAN-SPSO Steering Committee meeting in Mali in August 2011. The agenda included a draft evaluation report of PAN-SPSO phase I. The STDF, WTO and the Three Sisters were not interviewed during the field phase of this evaluation, however, they were able to provide comments on the draft report. The proposed phase II of PAN-SPSO is scheduled to start at the beginning of January 2012 and is currently under preparation (will be financed under Aid for Trade). The Secretariat intends to participate in a PAN-SPSO meeting in November 2011 to discuss and advise on phase II of the programme.

38. Members expressed their support of the PAN-SPSO project but expressed their concerns on the draft evaluation report with regards to, *inter alia*, the lack of information on what has been achieved by the programme and its sustainability.

39. The EC thanked the partners involved in the implementation of the PAN SPSO project for their contributions and support. The EC informed the Working Group that: (i) the evaluation carried out is an independent evaluation done by a consultant; and (ii) the second phase would be designed taking into account different types of inputs and comments received, the evaluation report being one input but not the only one. STDF Members were therefore encouraged to provide comments on the next phase of PAN-SPSO before the November meeting (to the EU delegation in Kenya which is responsible for the programme) in an effort to enable the formulation of the second phase to be completed before the end of the year.

**6. Improved capacity of PPG beneficiaries (output 4)**

**(a) Joint EIF/STDF training on project design and results-based management tools**

40. The Secretariat briefed the Working Group on an EIF training workshop on project design and results-based management tools in the Central African Republic (CAR), which was held from 1-4 August 2011. The workshop provided an opportunity to support the implementation of STDF/PPG/308, which focuses on the preparation of a project aimed at developing an SPS strategy and action plan for the country.

**(b) Overview of implementation of on-going PPGs**

41. The Secretariat introduced the overview document [STDF/WG/Oct11/Overview](#) which provides the implementation status of all ongoing PPGs. The representative of Chinese Taipei suggested that the Working Group should attempt to have a better geographical balance of projects and PPGs, in particular with regards to the Asia and Pacific region. The Secretariat responded by noting that the demand-driven approach was one of the basic principles of the STDF and that most of the applications did in fact come from Africa. However, donor Members from the Asia region could play a role in generating demand for STDF projects and PPGs and as such, the Secretariat said it could further engage in discussions with Japan, Australia and Chinese Taipei to see how this could be accomplished.

**(c) Presentation of applications not accepted for consideration**

42. The Secretariat gave an overview of the PPG application entitled "Strengthening the SPS system of Non-State Actors in Indonesia" (STDF/PPG/360). The Secretariat noted that the application was unclear in terms of its scope and objectives and would need to be reformulated. Since

this PPG focused on assistance in the fisheries area, the Secretariat shared this application with the EU as it is already financing projects in this sector.

**(d) Discussion of PPG applications**

43. The Secretariat briefly introduced the PPGs that were tabled for consideration by the Working Group.

***STDF/PPG/353 – Sustainable institutional capacity to meet SPS standards to safeguard public health and market access in St. Lucia***

44. The Working Group expressed concern that this proposal contained several inconsistencies in terms of sustainability and St. Lucia's ability to implement the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and its standards. However, there was unanimous agreement on the need for assistance. Therefore, the Working Group recommended that the request be revised and re-submitted for consideration at the next meeting. Some members highlighted that they would have a strong preference for linking the project to a regional framework such as that of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS).

***STDF/PPG/359 – Africa Joint Pesticide Residue Data Generation Project***

45. The Working Group approved this PPG request subject to three conditions. Firstly, it was recommended that the proposal to be developed through this PPG pay adequate attention to other pertinent capacity constraints and issues faced in Africa (such as residue monitoring and the implementation of good agricultural practices). Secondly, the Working Group recommended that efforts be made to clarify the role of AU-IBAR in the food safety area (related to plants) during PPG implementation, as well as in other appropriate activities and meetings. Indeed AU-IBAR is primarily responsible for animal-related issues. Under PAN SPSO, AU-IBAR has started working on food safety issues as there is no food safety institution at the continental level. The Working Group further agreed that it would be important to have a focused discussion within the AU to clarify and agree on responsibilities for food safety at the continental level. The planned STDF work with the AUC and the RECs could help in this regard. And thirdly, the Working Group agreed on the importance of actively encouraging collaboration with the FAO and the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR), the EU-funded "PIP Quality and conformity and Fruits and vegetables" Programme and pesticide companies in this PPG, as well as in the project to be developed.

***STDF/PPG/365 – Application of the Multi Criteria Decision Analysis Tool to inform SPS decision-making in Belize***

46. The Working Group decided to approve this request as a small project, rather than a PPG, in view of the nature of the work to be carried out and the expected outputs. While it was recognized that the outputs of the MCDA application in Belize would be useful to inform and guide future funding requests submitted to both donors and national authorities, there was agreement that the main purpose of the request was not to develop a project application *per se*.

47. The Working Group noted that Belize had already applied capacity evaluation tools in the area of food safety, animal and plant health. As a result, it agreed that efforts should be made to feed these results into the Multi Criteria Decision Analysis work in order to test how they complement and link to the MCDA framework.

**7. Improved capacity of project beneficiaries (output 5)**

**(a) Evaluation of completed projects**

48. The Secretariat reported that it had contracted the external evaluation for two projects: STDF/PG/133 (Building capacity to use the PCE tool in the Pacific) and STDF/PG/145 (Rwanda Horticulture Export Standards Initiative (RHESI)).

49. As was agreed at the June 2011 Working Group meeting, two more projects would be contracted in 2012 for external evaluation: STDF/PG/134 (Capacity building to improve fish trade performance of selected West African countries) and STDF/PG/246 (Development of an SPS Action Plan for Cambodia).

**(c) Overview of implementation of ongoing projects**

50. The Secretariat introduced document [STDF/WG/Jun11/Overview](#) which provides an overview of the implementation status of ongoing projects.

**Presentation of issues arising by Secretariat**

***STDF/PG/283 – Improve Mali's capacity to comply with international and private SPS standards in the mango sector***

51. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that it had received a second progress report for STDF/PG/286 covering the period of January to June 2011. The report noted that there had been certain delays in the implementation of activities mainly due to changes in the governmental procurement policy in Mali. The Secretariat also received a letter from the National Agency for Food Safety of Mali (ANSSA) requesting a six month extension until 16 November 2012 to complete project activities, due to this new policy, as well as end of the mango season. The Working Group approved this request.

***STDF/PG/302 – Support the competitiveness of cabbage in the Niayes region of Senegal***

52. The Secretariat noted that the EIF has indicated its inability to co-finance the project as agreed in July 2010, given that it does not fit within its new funding procedures. The beneficiary of this project, Senegal's Horticulture Union of the Niayes region (AUMN), submitted a letter to the Secretariat requesting funding for the total project (US\$524,000) and noted that it was ready to make the necessary modifications in order to accommodate the lack of co-financing from the EIF. The Working Group approved the funding of the entire project.

***STDF/PG/309 – Strengthening SPS capacity in Guinea-Bissau***

53. The Secretariat informed the Working Group of a joint STDF/World Bank mission to Guinea-Bissau from 13-16 September. The mission was conducted to follow-up on an SPS capacity building project that had been presented by the Government of Guinea-Bissau for joint funding by the STDF and the World Bank Trade Facilitation Facility (TFF) and approved by the STDF Working Group in October 2010.

54. The main objective of the mission was to review the project proposal with a view to align it with a major planned World Bank investment in the agribusiness sector in Guinea-Bissau and maximize synergies and impacts of both projects. As a result of the mission, the project proposal would be revised to focus on the cashew and fisheries sectors, identified as priorities by national stakeholders. According to the STDF operational rules, this project should be contracted by October 2011. Therefore, the Secretariat requested an extension to finalize the proposal and aimed to complete contractual arrangements before the next Working Group in March. The Working Group agreed to grant this extension.

**(d) Presentation of applications not accepted for consideration**



55. The Secretariat noted that three project applications (STDF/PG/362, STDF/PG/363 and STDF/PG/364) were not accepted for consideration as they did not meet the STDF's eligibility criteria. Additional details on the reasons for not tabling these applications are included in [STDF/WG/Oct11/Review](#).

**(e) Discussion of project applications**

***STDF/PG/333- Strengthening Veterinary Legislation in Cameroon***

56. The Secretariat introduced this application which was a re-submission of a proposal considered by the Working Group in October 2010. It was noted that the applicant had revised the proposal under the supervision of FAO's Animal Health Service, based on the recommendations made by the Working Group and the FAO/OIE mission. The Secretariat noted that the revised proposal had been substantially improved but that it still contained some budget flaws. The OIE representative highlighted that it does not support the proposal in the project to draft a manual to be used by other countries on how to use OIE's guidelines on veterinary legislation. It noted that this would be a duplication of already existing OIE guidelines.

57. FAO highlighted that the objectives were too ambitious and would be very difficult to complete within the established timeframe and resources. It was recommended that the applicant, FAO and OIE work together on the revision of the proposal for resubmission at a future meeting. The EC reminded that the EU financed the OIE for these legislation activities through the programme BTSF Africa. The financing will continue through the new programme "African Veterinary Governance" that should start in the coming months. Through this programme, funds will be available at the OIE to carry out legislation activities in all African countries.<sup>1</sup> As a consequence, the OIE should mention in the proposal that its contribution will be financed by the EU. The Working Group decided that the project be revised and resubmitted taking into account the comments made by STDF members.

***STDF/PG/343 - Competency development scheme for the cinnamon sector in Sri Lanka***

58. The Secretariat recalled that this proposal originated from a PPG awarded in March 2011 to the Spice Council of Sri Lanka (TSC) and implemented under the supervision of UNIDO. The Working Group was informed that the beneficiary had submitted a revised proposal shortly after the Secretariat's review had been circulated to STDF members. Although there hadn't been enough time to scrutinize the proposal, the revised version seems to have addressed many of the shortcomings that were highlighted in the review. Given this improved proposal as well as the current momentum of support in Sri Lanka for this initiative, the Working Group agreed to conditionally approve this project.

59. It was recommended that applicant revises the proposal prior to contacting mainly with regard to the following issues: (i) improve the reader-friendliness of the project document and better explain the shortcomings identified in the cinnamon value chain and the expected activities of the project (ii) provide more details on planned expenditure in the budget section (ii) work closely with FAO to identify a possible collaboration mechanism between FAO and UNIDO in the implementation of the project in order to benefit from FAO's expertise in the area of food safety related trainings; and (iv) adjust the budget accordingly.

***STDF/PG/337 - ASEAN Pesticide Residue Data Generation Project: Strengthening regional capacity to meet pesticides export requirements based on international standards***

---

<sup>1</sup> The Action Fiche describing this new programme is available under [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/documents/aap/2010/af\\_aap\\_2010\\_intra-acp.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/documents/aap/2010/af_aap_2010_intra-acp.pdf) (Annex 9).

60. The Secretariat noted that while this application focused on regional collaboration and capacity building in the area of pesticide data generation and field trials, the project would also contribute towards standard-setting. It was mentioned that this project is part of a larger global MRL initiative, with the involvement of USDA and FAO. The Secretariat recommended that this project be approved for funding on condition that: (i) letters of support are received from outstanding ASEAN countries prior to contracting; and (ii) the Working Group agrees to a small budget increase (US\$30,000) to enable the Secretariat of the Joint FAO/WHO Meetings on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) to deliver its important technical advisory role under the project (e.g. by visiting field trials and participating in project steering committee meetings).

61. The FAO representative agreed to discuss the Secretariat's suggestion with the JMPR Secretary. The EC representative noted that while collaboration with PIP should be encouraged wherever feasible, market competition issues may sometimes limit the options for collaboration in practice - as PIP is funded under the European Development Fund which should benefit ACP countries (African Caribbean and Pacific). The Working Group agreed to conditionally approve the project subject to receipt of the outstanding letters and FAO's confirmation regarding its technical advisory role.

#### ***STDF/PG/335 - Strengthening the phytosanitary capacity of the floriculture sector in Uganda***

62. The Secretariat recalled that this proposal originated from a PPG that had been approved by the Working Group in October 2010. The project aims to maintain and improve access of flowers from Uganda to the EU and other high end markets. The Secretariat recommended that the application be approved subject to: (i) clarification of the management structure and its reformulation in compliance with STDF terminology, (ii) clarification of the training content and revision of the budget accordingly, and (iii) minor modifications to the log frame.

63. Some members noted that the objectives and outputs did not fully correspond to the problems described and that the budget seemed low in relation to the number of activities that were being proposed. The IPPC representative highlighted the absence of an explanation as to how the national plant protection organization (NPPO) was going to deal with the private sector, since under the IPPC, non-governmental personnel may be authorized by the NPPO to carry out specific certification functions only under specific conditions. The African representative highlighted that the export certification system would require that the NPPO of Uganda works in consultation with the NPPO of the Netherlands to help define the critical intervention points. He also questioned the proposed role for CABI as implementing agency for the project. Several members suggested that strengthening the phytosanitary certification scheme in Uganda is a key priority.

64. Since some Members were concerned with aspects of the proposal that went beyond the conditions brought forth by the Secretariat, the Working Group agreed that the applicant revises and re-submits the proposal for the next meeting. The Secretariat noted that it would look into the possibility of hiring the consultant for a few more days in order to address several of the above-mentioned issues.

#### ***STDF/PG/358 - Regional Project on Veterinary Legislation for OIRSA Member States***

65. The Secretariat briefly introduced this proposal and noted that there were many weaknesses that needed to be addressed before a funding decision could be made, including: (i) better define the activities to be carried out, (ii) clarify certain budget issues, and (iii) substantially improve the logical framework.

66. The Working Group acknowledged the need for assistance in this realm at the regional level and stated that the project would benefit from joint collaboration between the OIE and FAO legal

experts. The Working Group recommended that the applicant revise and resubmit the proposal in close collaboration with OIE and FAO, for consideration at the next meeting.

**8. Decisions on financing and prioritizing**

67. The Secretariat reported that no decision on prioritization was required.

**9. Other business**

68. The Secretariat thanked the outgoing chair, Mr Thomas Westcot (USDA), for his excellent chairmanship.

69. The meeting closed at 5:10 p.m.

**ANNEX 1**

**STDF WORKING GROUP**

**21 October 2011**

**Room E**

**List of Participants**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organization/Mission:</b>	<b>e-mail address:</b>
Juliana ALMEIDA	IADB	<a href="mailto:jalmeida@iadb.org">jalmeida@iadb.org</a>
Edwin ARAGON	OIRSA	<a href="mailto:earagon@oirsa.org">earagon@oirsa.org</a>
Ali BADARNEH	UNIDO	<a href="mailto:a.badarneh@unido.org">a.badarneh@unido.org</a>
Marcus BARTLEY JOHNS	Australian mission Geneva	<a href="mailto:marcus.bartley.johns@dfat.gov.au">marcus.bartley.johns@dfat.gov.au</a>
Davinio P. CATBAGAN	Asian STDF Country Representative	<a href="mailto:da_aseclivestock@yahoo.com">da_aseclivestock@yahoo.com</a>
Renata CLARKE	FAO	<a href="mailto:Renata.Clarke@fao.org">Renata.Clarke@fao.org</a>
Barbara DOAN	Canada/CFIA	<a href="mailto:Barbara.Doan@inspection.gc.ca">Barbara.Doan@inspection.gc.ca</a>
Selma DOYRAN	CODEX	<a href="mailto:Selma.doyran@fao.org">Selma.doyran@fao.org</a>
Andrew EDEWA	Natural Resources Institute, UK	<a href="mailto:Ea24@gre.ac.uk">Ea24@gre.ac.uk</a> <a href="mailto:andrewedewa@gmail.com">andrewedewa@gmail.com</a>
Sofie H. FLENSBORG	Denmark	<a href="mailto:Soffle@um.dk">Soffle@um.dk</a>
Marlynne HOPPER	STDF	<a href="mailto:Marlynne.Hopper@wto.org">Marlynne.Hopper@wto.org</a>
Pablo JENKINS	STDF	<a href="mailto:Pablo.Jenkins@wto.org">Pablo.Jenkins@wto.org</a>
Wen Chieh JIEH	Chinese Taipei	<a href="mailto:Dale-jieh@yahoo.com">Dale-jieh@yahoo.com</a>
Jean KAMANZI	World Bank	<a href="mailto:JKamanzi@worldbank.org">JKamanzi@worldbank.org</a>
Stefanie KIRSE	GIZ, Germany	<a href="mailto:Stefanie.Kirse@giz.de">Stefanie.Kirse@giz.de</a>
Hiroaki KOJIMA	Japan	<a href="mailto:hiroaki_kojima@nm.maff.go.jp">hiroaki_kojima@nm.maff.go.jp</a>
Ulrich KLEIH	Natural Resources Institute, UK	<a href="mailto:u.k.kleih@greenwich.ac.uk">u.k.kleih@greenwich.ac.uk</a>
Hanneke LAM	Natural Resources Institute, UK	<a href="mailto:j.w.m.lam@gre.ac.uk">j.w.m.lam@gre.ac.uk</a>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organization/Mission:</b>	<b>e-mail address:</b>
Patricia LARBOURET	DG DEVCO European Commission	<a href="mailto:Patricia.larbouret@ec.europa.eu">Patricia.larbouret@ec.europa.eu</a>
Kenza LE MENTEC	STDF	<a href="mailto:Kenza.LeMentec@wto.org">Kenza.LeMentec@wto.org</a>
Daniel MARTINEZ	US. Mission to the WTO	<a href="mailto:Daniel.Martinez@fas.usda.gov">Daniel.Martinez@fas.usda.gov</a>
Tone MATHESON	Norway	<a href="mailto:tone-elisabeth.matheson@lmd.dep.no">tone-elisabeth.matheson@lmd.dep.no</a>
Chenai MUKUMBA	STDF	<a href="mailto:Chenai.Mukumba@wto.org">Chenai.Mukumba@wto.org</a>
Diego NAZIRI	Natural Resources Institute, UK	<a href="mailto:d.naziri@gre.ac.uk">d.naziri@gre.ac.uk</a>
David NOWELL	IPPC	<a href="mailto:Dave.novell@fao.org">Dave.novell@fao.org</a>
Maki OHIRA	MAFF, Japan	<a href="mailto:Maki.oohira@nm.maff.go.jp">Maki.oohira@nm.maff.go.jp</a>
Gillian MYLREA	OIE	<a href="mailto:g.mylrea@oie.int">g.mylrea@oie.int</a>
Washington OTIENO	African STDF Representative	<a href="mailto:Wotieno2000@gmail.com">Wotieno2000@gmail.com</a>
Simon PADILLA	STDF	<a href="mailto:Simon.Padilla@wto.org">Simon.Padilla@wto.org</a>
Ana PERALTA	IPPC	<a href="mailto:Ana.Peralta@fao.org">Ana.Peralta@fao.org</a>
Manon SCHUPPERS	SAFOSO	<a href="mailto:manonschuppers@safoso.ch">manonschuppers@safoso.ch</a>
Melvin SPREIJ	STDF	<a href="mailto:Melvin.Spreij@wto.org">Melvin.Spreij@wto.org</a>
Gretchen STANTON	WTO	<a href="mailto:Gretchen.Stanton@wto.org">Gretchen.Stanton@wto.org</a>
Yayoi TSUJIYAMA	Japan	<a href="mailto:Yayo.tsujiyama@nm.maff.go.jp">Yayo.tsujiyama@nm.maff.go.jp</a>
Antonieta URRUTIA	Latin America Representative	<a href="mailto:antonietaurrutia@vtr.net">antonietaurrutia@vtr.net</a>
Philippe VERGER	WHO	<a href="mailto:verger@who.int">verger@who.int</a>