

Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

**WTO SUBMISSION TO THE OPEN-ENDED EXPERT WORKING GROUP
ON BUILDING NATIONAL PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY**

Note by the Secretariat¹

1. A background paper was submitted by the WTO for the Open-Ended Working Group on Development of an International Plant Protection Convention Capacity Building Strategy, held in Rome on 8-12 December 2008. The paper was prepared by the Standards and Trade Development Facility.
2. The paper identifies current flows of phytosanitary technical cooperation, examines how phytosanitary needs are evaluated and discusses how these can be mainstreamed into national development plans. The document is circulated to the SPS Committee for its information.

¹ This document has been prepared under the Secretariat's own responsibility and is without prejudice to the positions of Members or to their rights or obligations under the WTO.

WTO SUBMISSION TO THE OPEN-ENDED EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON BUILDING NATIONAL PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This background paper has been prepared as a contribution to the Open-Ended Working Group on Building National Phytosanitary Capacity. The paper has the following objectives:

- to outline the link between the capacity of national phytosanitary services to implement International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) and the participation of developing countries in international trade in plant products;
- to examine how phytosanitary needs are evaluated and discuss how these can be mainstreamed into national development plans;
- to identify current flows of phytosanitary technical cooperation and identify future trends, where possible; and
- to examine the role that the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF)² could play in assisting developing countries in designing and implementing national phytosanitary strategies.

2. Growth in global merchandise trade carries with it the risk of the spread of plant pests and diseases – particularly when trade is unregulated. The economic damage from plant pests and diseases can be severe for developing countries. Protecting plant health is a way to sustain productivity, secure agricultural revenues and help reduce poverty. Compliance with phytosanitary requirements facilitates access to export markets and builds confidence between trading partners. In general terms, phytosanitary systems play a supportive role in achieving Millennium Development Goals related to poverty alleviation and international trade.

3. The implementation of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) standards provides countries with the building blocks for effective phytosanitary systems. The use of ISPMs is an indispensable element of the trading system, as recognized by the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS). Capacity to implement IPPC standards is an important determinant of participation in international trade in products which carry phytosanitary risk.

4. Growing regulation of phytosanitary risks has potentially serious consequences for developing countries. Most developing countries export a diverse portfolio of processed and unprocessed primary-based products. Since the 1980s, horticultural products have been one of the fastest growing areas of agricultural exports, much higher than traditional exports (cotton, coffee, cocoa, etc.) from developing countries where export growth has slowed. By their very nature, horticultural products are often subject to a high degree of phytosanitary control. Trade measures applied due to phytosanitary risks may rapidly and negatively affect developing countries' trade performance in key export sectors. Against this background, participation by developing countries in IPPC is essential for the proper implementation of the SPS Agreement. Efforts to support participation in IPPC should be an essential component of broader efforts to strengthen the capacity of national phytosanitary services in developing countries.

5. As the provision of development cooperation becomes more aligned with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness so assistance is becoming more demand driven. A demand-driven approach relies on beneficiary countries to identify their own needs. Thus national phytosanitary

² See section VI below for more information on the STDF.

services need to ensure that the results of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation tool are translated into priorities at national level through such vehicles as the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP), national Aid for Trade strategies or through Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF) in least developed countries. The results of the PCE tool should be used to elaborate investment programmes in phytosanitary systems.

6. The role of IPPC in mainstreaming phytosanitary needs is crucial to provide countries with guidance on how to integrate their capacity building needs in broader development strategies to obtain the political support required. At international level, the IPPC should build the case for phytosanitary capacity building outside the boundaries of phytosanitary fora to help mobilize resources for technical assistance in this area. The STDF can play an important role in this regard by arguing for the mainstreaming of phytosanitary technical assistance through its linkages with initiatives such as the EIF and the Aid for Trade.

7. Estimating past, present and future assistance to strengthen plant health systems in developing countries is difficult. Data reported to the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) provides only a partial view of the total number of activities which are undertaken. Capacity building in the plant health area is often bundled into more general assistance programmes. The shortage of information may cause overlap between donor activities, lack of synergies, duplication of effort, and sub-optimal use of scarce resources.

8. In general, two aspects are currently missing with regard to strengthening national phytosanitary capacity: a strategic view on how to proceed and indicators to measure the impact of assistance on higher order objectives such as market access, reduction of production losses and poverty alleviation. The IPPC Open-Ended Working Group on Building National Phytosanitary Capacity provides an excellent opportunity to provide both the strategic vision and the indicators of impact.

II. PHYTOSANITARY COMPLIANCE AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

A. PLANT HEALTH AND TRADE

9. Global merchandise trade grew annually by 2.7 per cent between 2000-2007. Over the same period, export of agricultural products increased 13 per cent, reaching US\$1,128 billion in value - approximately 8 per cent of global merchandise trade. Growing volumes of global trade carries with it the risk of entry, establishment and spread of plant pests, plant diseases, and invasive species – particularly where such trade is unregulated.

10. ISPM N°15 "Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade" is a reminder that phytosanitary risks can arise from unforeseen interactions between plant pests and diseases and international trade generally, not just in plant products. Threats to plant health are numerous and diverse including pathogens (viruses, fungi, and bacteria) and pests (insects, weeds, etc.). This makes it challenging to control the introduction and spread of plant pests.

11. The economic damage inflicted by plant pests constitutes a vital threat to the poorest nations. In 2004, the infestations of desert locust in the main agricultural zones of Mauritania caused cereal production to drop by 44 per cent. A recent study on losses due to fruit fly (*Bactocera invadens*) in eight West African countries (Burkina Faso, Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, and Senegal) estimated them at between 30 and 85 per cent of total production.³ Losses of this magnitude

³ Stonehouse, J., Ritchie, M., Paqui, T., Ndiaye, M., Tchibozo, S., Dabire, R., Jobe, L., Billah, M. (2008) Study on the damages inflicted by fruit flies on West Africa fruit production and Action Plan for a coordinated regional response.

impact on food security, agricultural and household income. Production losses from plant pests and diseases limit the possibilities for trade growth and market access due to phytosanitary controls.

12. Protecting plant health is a way to sustain productivity, secure agricultural revenues and help reduce poverty. Compliance with phytosanitary requirements facilitates access to export markets and builds confidence between trading partners. In general terms, phytosanitary systems play a supportive role in achieving Millennium Development Goals related to poverty alleviation and international trade.

B. IPPC AND THE ARCHITECTURE OF GLOBAL TRADE

13. The WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement) allows countries to restrict trade when necessary to ensure food safety, or protect the health of animals and plants, subject to certain requirements. It encourages governments to base national SPS measures on international standards, guidelines, and recommendations. This process is often referred to as "harmonization". The SPS Agreement explicitly identifies the standards developed by the IPPC as those relevant to plant health.

14. The governing body of the IPPC, the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), approves International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). IPPC standards are instrumental in the implementation of the principles of the SPS Agreement with regard to plant health. For instance, ISPM N°1 "Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade", is used as the global quarantine standard which sets the basis of phytosanitary requirements for international trade. ISPMs such as ISPM N° 6 "Guidelines for surveillance", ISPM N° 9 "Guidelines for pest eradication programmes" and ISPM N° 14 "The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management" help plant health authorities establish pest control strategies.

15. ISPM N°2 "Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis" (the provision of accurate pest data to the importing country in support of market access requests) has become indispensable to facilitate and accelerate market access procedures. It is also a tool for the importing country to protect its agriculture from the introduction and spread of harmful pests.

16. The work of the IPPC is also of particular importance for recognition of equivalence. In 2005, the CPM adopted ISPM N° 24 "Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures". The IPPC has also developed a number of standards relevant to the recognition of the pest or disease status of trading partners including ISPM N° 4 "Requirements for the establishment of Pest Free Areas", ISPM N° 8 "Determination of pest status in an area"; ISPM N° 10 "Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites", ISPM N° 22 "Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence", ISPM N° 26 "Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)", and ISPM N° 29 "Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence".

17. The implementation of IPPC standards provides countries with the building blocks for effective phytosanitary systems. Application of ISPMs is an indispensable element of the trading system, as recognized by the SPS Agreement. Capacity to implement IPPC principles is an important determinant of participation in international trade in products which carry phytosanitary risk.

C. PLANT HEALTH MEASURES AND GLOBAL TRADE

18. The SPS Agreement obliges countries to notify new or amended SPS measures, not based on international standards, which may have a significant effect on trade. A total of 9,426 notifications

had been submitted to the WTO by 31 August 2008. In 2007 alone, 1,196 notifications were circulated.

Table 1: "Objectives" of notified SPS measures (June 2007-August 2008)

	Total for June 2007- August 2008	Share over 15 month period
Food Safety	670	35.2%
Animal Health	215	11.3%
Plant Protection	485	25.4%
Protect humans from animal (Zoonosis) / plant pest or disease	402	21.1%
Protect territory from other damage from pests	134	7.0%

19. Notifications related to plant protection account for a significant proportion of this total. For example, between June 2007 and August 2008, 25 per cent of notifications were related to plant health (Table 1). A further 7 per cent of notifications covered measures taken to protect the territory of the importing country from damage caused by pests. WTO Members are not required to notify measures based on an international standard although this is nonetheless recommended. Twelve per cent of all notifications referred to measures based on IPPC standards – or nearly half of the total notified for plant protection. This figure is a useful proxy for the use of IPPC standards by countries in international trade, in particular ISPM N° 15.

20. The WTO SPS Committee provides a forum for WTO Members to raise issues related to implementation of the SPS Agreement including specific measures of trade concern to WTO Members. Of the 261 specific trade concerns raised between 1995 and the end of 2007, 28 per cent were related to plant protection measures. In addition, of the ten dispute settlement panels established to examine SPS issues to date, five have been directly related to plant protection measures.

21. From the preceding analysis, it is clear that there is a growing inventory of measures taken by countries which affect trade in products which carry phytosanitary risk. Furthermore, the numbers above track only those new or amended measures which have been notified. The actual total of measures in force is undoubtedly higher. In this context of growing phytosanitary regulation, the role of IPPC standards in harmonization becomes ever more significant to trade.

22. Growing regulation of phytosanitary risks in international trade has potentially serious consequences for developing countries. Most developing countries export a diverse portfolio of processed and unprocessed primary-based products. Since the 1980s, horticultural products have been one of the fastest growing areas of agricultural exports, much higher than traditional exports (cotton, coffee, cocoa, etc.) from developing countries where export growth has slowed. By their very nature, horticultural products are often subject to a high degree of phytosanitary control. Thus trade measures applied due to phytosanitary risks may rapidly and negatively affect developing countries' trade performance in key export sectors.

III. DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTICIPATION IN IPPC

23. Articles 3.4 and 10.4 of the SPS Agreement encourage WTO Members to actively participate in the development of international standards, including in the work of the IPPC. A number of developing countries have identified their lack of effective participation in standard-setting as one of the difficulties they face with implementation of the SPS Agreement. Effective participation extends

well beyond physical presence in IPPC meetings. It requires the expertise to evaluate the effect of proposed standards and the capacity to implement standards when they are finally adopted.

24. The WTO's General Council identified participation of developing countries in international standard setting bodies among the problems relating to implementation of the SPS Agreement which required action. In October 2000, the General Council requested the WTO Director-General to:

- (a) encourage international standard setting organizations to ensure the participation of WTO Members at different levels of development and from all geographic regions, throughout all phases of standard development;
- (b) explore with the relevant international standard-setting organizations and relevant intergovernmental organizations financial and technical mechanisms to assist the participation of developing countries in standard-setting activities;
- (c) coordinate efforts with the relevant international standard-setting organizations to identify SPS-related technical assistance needs and how best to address these, taking into consideration the importance of bilateral and regional technical assistance in this regard.

25. WTO is supportive of efforts to facilitate the participation of developing countries in international standards setting bodies. The creation of the IPPC Trust Fund in 2003 was a welcome development. Against this background, it is useful to consider evaluations of the FAO/WHO Codex Trust Fund. These reports have concluded that greater participation has led to an awakening of interest at government level in Codex and its work, even in developing countries that had hitherto displayed little or no interest.⁴ This in turn has had positive spin-offs in increased cooperation between different agencies involved in food safety issues at the national level.

26. A general point made by the evaluations is that impact is maximized if participation in meetings is accompanied by training, e.g. on preparation of comments on draft standards, pre-meeting briefings, as well as reinforced coordination and networking opportunities at national and regional level.

27. Participation by developing countries in IPPC is essential for the proper implementation of the SPS Agreement. Efforts to support participation in IPPC should be an essential component of broader efforts to strengthen the capacity of national phytosanitary services in developing countries.

IV. MEASURING NATIONAL PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY

28. The Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation tool (PCE) has been applied in more than 60 countries world-wide. Its primary focus is to examine the capacity of National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) to implement ISPMs and their rights and responsibilities as outlined in the IPPC.

29. During CPM II in 2007, a review of the PCE was presented by CABI Africa⁵. The report noted the positive impact of the PCE on national strategic planning, budgetary allocations, legal

⁴ Connor R. (2006) "Initiative to explore linkages between increased participation in Codex and enhanced international food trade opportunities" and Slorach. S (2007) "Enquiry concerning the FAO/WHO Project and Trust Fund for Enhanced Participation in Codex".

⁵ Day R., Quinlan M., Ogutu W. (2006) Analysis of the Application of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Tool. Report to the Secretariat of the International Plant Convention.

frameworks, training, and awareness raising. Suggestions were made to further improve the use of the results of the PCE and to enhance the tool itself.

30. A key issue is to ensure that the PCE evaluation is used as a basis on which to mobilize support to strengthen national phytosanitary capacity. This requires mainstreaming phytosanitary capacity building needs into national development plans. To achieve this objective requires advocacy on the part of the national plant health services and coordination across ministries responsible for phytosanitary issues.

31. The PCE has a confidentiality clause which restricts the dissemination of results, unless waived by the NPPO of the country surveyed. Discussions held during an STDF workshop on capacity evaluation tools in March 2008 highlighted the limitations which confidentiality imposes on use of the PCE (and the OIE's Performance of Veterinary Services tool) from the perspective of furthering coordination of technical cooperation activities.

32. As the provision of development cooperation becomes more aligned with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness so assistance is becoming more demand driven. A demand-driven approach relies on beneficiary countries identifying their own needs. Thus national phytosanitary services need to ensure that their needs are translated into priorities at national level through such vehicles as the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP), national Aid for Trade strategies or through EIF in least developed countries.

V. PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY BUILDING

A. GLOBAL OVERVIEW

33. Three main sources of information have been used for this background report:

- the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS);
- the WTO/OECD Trade Capacity Building Database (TCBDB); and
- information collected by the STDF from reports to the SPS Committee on technical assistance activities and from the regional reviews of Aid for Trade.

34. The Development Assistance Committee of the OECD maintains statistics and reports on aid and other resource flows. These statistics concern developing countries and countries in transition and related matters, based principally on reporting by DAC members. Data is maintained on the CRS and other databases.

35. Table 2 below shows figures for assistance on plant and post-harvest protection and pest control between 2002-2006. Data reported is historical information on actual commitments and disbursements. Over the five year period, commitments and disbursement have averaged US\$25.36 million per year (actual disbursements have averaged US\$13.37 million).

Table 2: Data on commitments and disbursements reported to the OECD Creditor Reporting System on plant and post-harvest protection and pest control (US\$ millions)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Plant and post-harvest protection and pest control	16.27	20.03	42.7	28.86	18.96
Livestock/veterinary services	7.98	10.41	8.13	15.36	46.22

36. The definition used for reporting is narrow and probably does not include all assistance to plant health services. Plant health assistance may also be reported under other assistance codes, such as biosphere protection, biodiversity, trade policy regulation (SPS), agricultural research, food crop production, agricultural extension, education and training, forestry services. Thus in practice, the figures for reporting under this code to the CRS underestimate total plant health assistance. Plant health assistance is reported elsewhere in the CRS data sets and disaggregation is impossible.

37. In the CRS database, a total of 39 activities are reported from nine donors (Belgium, Denmark, EC, France, Germany, Netherlands, Portugal, UK, and US). Activities reported ranged from projects to tackle orange rust in coffee, to cost benefit analysis for plant health measures through to the EC's Pesticides Initiative Programme (PiP) (the largest programme in value terms).

38. Further detail can be added in the category of trade policy regulation (SPS) by looking at data reported to WTO/OECD Trade Capacity Building Database (TCBDB). This database uses the same data set as the CRS, but contains additional categories, including a category within SPS trade policy regulation covering plant health. In this category, an additional 99 activities have been reported over the period 2001-2006. Over the five year period, disbursement averaged US\$3.58 million per year.

Table 3: Data reported to the TCBDB on plant health regulation training (US\$ millions)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Plant and post-harvest protection and pest control	2.9	8.1	1.3	2.0	3.6

39. In practice, the level of aggregation in reporting in both the CRS and TCBDB means that it is doubtful if accurate figures on plant health capacity building can be generated. **The total combined figure of 138 activities and average figure of US\$28.94 million for plant health capacity building over the period 2002-2006 underestimates the real total.** For example, neither database contains information on activities reported by international organizations including the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA), the International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE), the Inter-American Institute for Co-operation on Agriculture (IICA) and the Regional International Organization for Plant Protection and Animal Health (OIRSA).

40. In an effort to elaborate an accurate overview of on-going plant health assistance activities and the financial flows involved data was been collected by the STDF from three main sources: submissions made by WTO Members to the SPS Committee, research work in three pilot regions (Central America, East Africa, and selected countries of the Greater Mekong Delta sub-region) and data from other sources.

B. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY WTO MEMBERS TO THE SPS COMMITTEE

41. In document G/SPS/GEN/726, information reported to the SPS Committee by Australia, the European Communities, the United States, and by the regional organizations IICA and OIRSA was compared with data reported to the TCBDB.

42. Assistance provided by Australia between 2007-2008 amounted to approximately \$US19.5m and targeted 36 countries mainly in the Asia-Pacific Region. Half of the projects (45 projects) funded were dedicated specifically to plant protection. Assistance was channelled mainly through the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR). Activities included Pest Risk Analysis training, pre-

harvest and post-harvest pest control training, pest detection and diagnosis, Integrated Pest Management, etc.⁶

43. The European Communities provides significant assistance in the SPS area. Tracking the full extent of the assistance provided is difficult as EC assistance through the 10th European Development Fund is based on strategy papers prepared at national and regional level. Much easier to collect are the various projects which contain plant health elements offered to different economic and geographic groupings of developing countries. EC projects included:

- The Pesticides Initiative Programme (PIP-COLEACP, 2003-08, total value €29.1m);
- Participation of African Nations in Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standard Setting Organizations (PAN-SPSO, 2008-10, total value €3.85m, implemented by AU-IBAR and AU-IAPSC);
- Strengthening Food Safety Systems Through Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Measures (2008-2012, estimated value US\$32m);
- ASEAN-EU Programme for Regional Integration Support (APRIS II) (2006-2009, €3.4m); and
- EC-funded Regional Integration Support Programme (RISP, 2005-12, total value €30m) for COMESA includes a component of capacity building to develop standards and meet international SPS requirements.

44. A total of 420 SPS related technical assistance projects were funded by the United States in 124 developing countries between 2006-2008 (total value US\$22,120,930).⁷ In addition, the United States provides support to key SPS policy objectives under the African Global Competitiveness Initiative (AGCI) through USAID's regional trade hubs. Several countries benefit from support to the agricultural sector through the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). Some of these projects include a phytosanitary component. For instance, the MCC compact in Mozambique includes a project aiming at reducing the spread of Lethal Yellowing Disease (LYD), improving productivity of coconut products, and encouraging diversification into other cash-crop production (total value US\$17.4m).

45. On the basis of additional information reported by WTO Members to the SPS Committee, the total number of activities for plant health rose to 479 over the period 2001-2006. However, only some 40 per cent of activities were reported with a value, thus it is not possible to estimate the total value of the plant health activities reported.

C. AID FOR TRADE RESEARCH WORK IN THREE PILOT REGIONS (CENTRAL AMERICA, EAST AFRICA, AND THE GREATER MEKONG DELTA SUB-REGION)

46. Results of the country surveys undertaken by the STDF in selected countries in the Greater Mekong Sub-Region (GMS), East Africa, and Central America as part of the regional reviews of Aid for Trade in 2007 and 2008 provide additional data on both the amount of assistance provided, and also the main drivers of that assistance.

⁶ G/SPS/GEN/717/Add.1 Technical assistance to developing countries provided by Australia.

⁷ G/SPS/GEN/181/Add.7. Technical assistance to developing countries provided by the United States of America.

47. In East Africa, support to national plant health systems in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda totalled US\$8 million over the period 2001-2006 - 22 per cent of total SPS-related assistance received. Uganda was the main beneficiary with assistance totalling US\$7.6 million over the survey period. Potentially a more financially important source of funding was projects run at a regional level. Within this category, Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda were eligible for assistance through EC projects benefiting ACP countries, African countries, and developing countries more generally which totalled US\$30.8m. This figure represented approximately 8 per cent of the total assistance offered at a supranational level for SPS capacity building.

48. In the GMS region, the global response to highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) is driving SPS assistance. Data was obtained for the GMS region for the period 2005-13. It shows that HPAI, and animal health issues more broadly, account for 64 per cent of all assistance programmed up to 2013. In contrast, plant health accounts for only 1.2 per cent of the total programmed amount. Noteworthy projects include two project in the GMS on building phytosanitary capacity funded by New Zealand (2005-2009, US\$1.35m) and Japan (2006-2009, US\$896,000).

49. Regional economic cooperation is also a driving force for SPS capacity building in the GMS countries. Implementation of the GMS Cross-Border Transport Agreement, the ASEAN Free Trade Agreement (AFTA) and establishment of an ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) are stimulating interest in regional cooperation projects. This is also reflected in the assistance given in the plant health area. Between 2001-2006, 15 plant health projects (US\$9.8 m) involving multiple countries from the region were run by regional institutions, primarily ASEAN and Asian Development Bank (ADB).

50. In Central America, the Dominican Republic-Central America Free Trade Agreement (DR-CAFTA) has proven an important driver for technical assistance in the region. For example, since 2005, the United States has supported collaboration between the United States and its CAFTA-DR partners through the CAFTA-DR SPS Capacity Building Program. The emphasis is to harmonize SPS regulations with the international standard setting bodies (Codex, IPPC, OIE) and increase export opportunities for plant, horticultural, and animal products regionally and internationally.

51. Activities funded have included training on mitigation of pests and diseases related to the export of peppers and tomatoes to the United States and biological control of quarantine fruit fly pest. Similarly, the Inter-American Development Bank is leading a regional project to provide assistance for small and medium-sized enterprises in Central America on technical requirements for gaining market access under DR-CAFTA. The project include various phytosanitary components such as training technicians on Pest Risk Analysis for selected products to strengthen national phytosanitary surveillance networks.

52. Another important driver of assistance in Central America is the EU-Central American Association Agreement. Currently, a regional programme is being set up by the European Communities to strengthen SPS capacity in the region.

53. Information generated by STDF work as part of the Regional Reviews of Aid for Trade highlight the important role played by regional cooperation projects in providing assistance in the plant health area. Many of these projects are related to regional economic integration initiatives (e.g. ASEAN, EAC, DR-CAFTA) or groupings of developing countries (e.g. ACP)

D. INFORMATION FROM INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

54. Neither the CRS or TCBDB database reports data on support received by developing countries from international organizations such as FAO, World Bank, United Nation's Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), United Nation's Development Programme (UNDP), and

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Instead, the CRS tracks the funding offered by donors to these organizations.

55. FAO's Technical Cooperation Programme provides support to countries in the phytosanitary area through implementation of projects aiming at enhancing a country's SPS compliance. These projects include the update of national legislation in conformity with the provisions of the SPS Agreement, reinforcing pest surveillance capacities of national authorities, strengthening pest management, and control capabilities through training of technicians on pest control techniques, improving phytosanitary inspection services, etc. FAO also provides training to Government officials on the work of the IPPC and on the implementation of ISPMs. FAO's Technical Cooperation website returns 826 entries for activities related to plant protection implemented since 2005.

56. Technical assistance for pest control is also offered through the Joint FAO/IAEA Programme of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture. Capacity building projects consist mainly in assisting developing countries in the implementation of national or regional (transboundary) area-wide integrated pest management programmes against major insect pests such as fruit flies and moths using a combination of cultural and genetic pest control techniques such as the Sterile Insect Technique. Projects on control of fruit flies are on-going in several countries including Egypt, Mauritius, Morocco, Senegal, Seychelles, South Africa, Tanzania, Israel, and Jordan as well as regional projects in Asia and Central America.

57. In general terms, assistance provided by the World Bank does not target specifically SPS measures but includes SPS capacity building as part of broader development projects. For instance, West Africa Agricultural Productivity Program (WAAPP) Support Project (2007-2011, total value of US\$51m) is based on a value chain approach for selected crops and covers aspects related to pest management. Likewise, the Agriculture Competitiveness Project for Vietnam (2008-2013, US\$75m) and the NELSAP Regional Agricultural Trade and Productivity Project in East Africa (2008-2013, US\$10m) encompass a component on farming practices which may include pest control.

58. Although partial, the information compiled on technical assistance trends seem to suggest that phytosanitary capacity building is generally provided as part of general support to agriculture or trade programmes. Support provided to national phytosanitary services often consists in training on policy aspects of compliance and increasingly on Pest Risk Analysis as this latter is perceived by countries as the most important constraint to trade. The major part of assistance provided as part of value chain projects consists in training at technical level to extension officers and farmers on Integrated Pest Management and Good Agriculture Practices.

59. From the preceding analysis it is clear that it is difficult to obtain an accurate view of on-going phytosanitary-related technical assistance. A general problem is that activities are under-reported by donor providers or reported as part of other activities. This lack of accurate information is problematic and may cause overlap between donor activities, lack of synergies, duplication of effort and sub-optimal use of scarce resources. Against this background, the development by IPPC of a concept paper and strategy for national phytosanitary capacity building will provide a welcome focus to phytosanitary capacity building.

E. MEASURING IMPACT OF PHYTOSANITARY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

60. One of the main conclusions of a recent STDF workshop on Good Practice in SPS-related Technical Cooperation related to the absence of indicators to measure the impact of SPS-related projects. Two suggestions were put forward in this regard: (i) the development of a framework to assess impacts quickly and relatively easily; and (ii) the development and use of impact indicators.

61. In assessing the impact of phytosanitary technical assistance, it is suggested that indicators be used which go beyond the immediate achievement of project objectives, e.g. training provided, etc. The IPPC concept paper and strategy for national phytosanitary capacity building should ideally include indicators related to the achievement of so-called higher order objectives, e.g. market access for a given product, increased revenues of a farming community from reducing production losses, impact on poverty alleviation, etc.

62. Integrating impact indicators into the IPPC concept paper and strategy for national phytosanitary capacity building will assist donors and national authorities to track progress over time and help mainstream phytosanitary capacity building needs into broader development assistance.

VI. STANDARDS AND TRADE DEVELOPMENT FACILITY

A. OVERVIEW

63. The STDF is a global programme in capacity building and technical cooperation established by the FAO, the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), the World Bank, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the WTO. Other international organizations such as the International Trade Centre (ITC), OECD, UNIDO, and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), donors and developing countries also participate.

64. The STDF has two main aims:

- to assist developing countries enhance their expertise and capacity to analyze and to implement international SPS standards, improving their human, animal and plant health situation, and thus ability to gain and maintain market access; and
- to act as a vehicle for coordination among technical cooperation providers, the mobilization of funds, the exchange of experience, and the dissemination of good practice in relation to the provision and receipt of SPS-related technical cooperation.

B. ADVOCACY

65. The STDF can play an important role in advocacy for phytosanitary capacity building. This role can be fulfilled through the existing linkages between the STDF and other wide-reaching initiatives such as the EIF and Aid for Trade. The STDF works actively with these initiatives to raise the profile of SPS issues within a broader development aid concept.

66. By organizing events under the umbrella of Aid for Trade such as the regional consultations, the STDF brings phytosanitary issues to the attention of an audience which may not otherwise be aware of the link between plant health and the ongoing efforts to use trade as an instrument for poverty eradication. Evidence brought by the STDF of lost market access and trade opportunities due to non-compliance with phytosanitary requirements provides the missing link between agricultural development, trade and poverty. The importance of assisting developing countries in building the capacity of their phytosanitary systems in order to reduce the threats caused by plant pests on international trade is also highlighted in STDF contributions to Aid for Trade events. By making the case for SPS compliance within a broader dialogue like Aid for Trade, the STDF assists in the mobilization of resources dedicated to the plant health area.

67. The STDF is also actively working with the EIF to put a greater emphasis on the SPS needs in the Diagnostic Trade Integration Study (DTIS) for LDCs. Most of the DTIS recognize SPS measures as one of the major constraints to trade expansion in agricultural products. However, little attention is

given to putting LDC's SPS capacity building needs among the priorities in the action matrices. The STDF can assist in making SPS needs feature more prominently in the updated DTIS. One approach to consider could be the development of national SPS strategies and prioritized action plans based on cost-benefit analysis and informed by the results of capacity evaluation tools where relevant. This allows the mainstreaming of phytosanitary needs in broader development strategies and poverty reduction programmes.

68. A good example of coordination and mainstreaming of phytosanitary capacity building is STDF's work on fruit fly in West Africa. The aim of this work is to provide an opportunity for national and regional organizations, donors and other stakeholders to discuss mechanisms to control fruit fly and mobilize funds for a multi-year Action Plan to tackle this problem.

C. COORDINATION ACTIVITIES

69. Increasing importance is being placed on the STDF fulfilling its promise as a coordination mechanism and centre of good practice. STDF's initiatives aim at streamlining technical assistance resources by avoiding duplication of efforts and enhancing information sharing between the various actors. In addition, tracking technical assistance flows contributes to a better distribution of resources among the three sectors of SPS, i.e. food safety, animal health, and plant protection, and between regions and countries.

70. As part of its co-ordination mandate, the STDF has organized a series of thematic events for delegates of the SPS Committee and participants from developing countries. A workshop on SPS-related capacity evaluation tools developed by international organizations took place in Geneva on 31 March 2008 and an information session on private standards on 26 June 2008. In collaboration with the OECD the STDF held a workshop on good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation in October 2008.

D. STDF AS A SOURCE OF FUNDING

71. Developing countries often face difficulties in articulating their needs into "bankable" projects. Through project preparation grants (PPGs), STDF can provide countries with assistance to turn good ideas into projects. For instance, the STDF recently approved a PPG aiming to assist member countries of the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council to draw up a strategy for phytosanitary capacity building. The strategy to be developed will take into account the IPPC's global capacity building strategy and will ensure synergies and complementarities are found. One of the objectives of the strategy will be to enhance effective participation of African NPPOs in the CPM and their ability to implement the ISPMs.

72. Through project grants (PG), the STDF can assist developing countries in the enhancement of their national phytosanitary capacity. STDF funding gives priority to projects seeking to address phytosanitary issues in order to gain or maintain market access. The STDF has funded a total of nine projects worth over US\$3.5m and four PPGs in the area of plant health.
