

Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

**EVALUATION OF THE STANDARDS AND TRADE
DEVELOPMENT FACILITY (STDF)**

Note by the Secretariat¹

1. An independent evaluation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) was completed on 14 November 2008. The evaluator was Dr Stuart Slorach, formerly of the Swedish National Food Administration, and former chair of the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission and the European Food Safety Authority's Management Board.
2. Dr Slorach's final evaluation report is circulated to the SPS Committee for information and can also be downloaded on the [WTO SPS gateway](#). A first evaluation of the STDF was completed in December 2005.

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.

STDF 248 - Final Report

REPORT OF A REVIEW OF THE STANDARDS AND TRADE DEVELOPMENT FACILITY (STDF)

by

Stuart A. Slorach

14 November 2008

Dr Stuart A. Slorach, Stubbängsvägen 9A, SE-125 53 Älvsjö, Sweden

This document has been prepared under the author's own responsibility and is without prejudice to the positions of the STDF partners, donors, secretariat, beneficiaries or others.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express his thanks to Mr Michael Roberts, Secretary of the STDF, and the other members of the STDF Secretariat for their rapid response to all his requests for documents and other information and for arranging the programmes for his visits to the World Trade Organization and the interviews with the STDF stakeholders. In addition, he would like to thank all those who responded to the questionnaires and supplied information for the review in other ways.

Table of Contents

Glossary of Acronyms.....	6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
Evaluation.....	7
Recommendations	9
I. INTRODUCTION	11
Objective of the evaluation.....	11
Independence of the evaluator	11
II. METHODOLOGY	12
III. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	12
Performance of the STDF Secretariat.....	12
<i>Overall performance of the Secretariat</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Coordination</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Project development and implementation</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Funding of the STDF</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Facility operation</i>	<i>17</i>
Performance of the STDF partners, donors, observers and representatives of developing countries.....	18
<i>Partners</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Observers</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Representatives of developing countries</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Donors and funding</i>	<i>20</i>
Coordination activities of the STDF and their impact	21
Project development and implementation activities and their impact.....	23
Operational Plan 2008-2009 and Medium-term Strategy	27
IV. CONCLUSIONS	28
V. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	31
Appendix 1: Terms of reference for the review of the STDF for the review of the STDF	34
Appendix 2: List of persons responding to questionnaires and interviewed	38
Appendix 3: List of documents	40
Table 1: Responses from 19 developing countries to the questionnaire on the performance of the STDF secretariat.....	45
Table 2: Seven donors' responses to the questionnaire on the performance of the STDF secretariat	46
Table 3: Responses of FAO, OIE, WB, WHO, ITC & UNCTAD to the questionnaire on the performance of the STDF secretariat	47
Table 4 : STDF-funded Project Preparation Grants (PPGs) and projects by area	48
Table 5. Contributions received by the STDF by September 2008 (CHF)	49

Glossary of Acronyms

CAC	Codex Alimentarius Commission
CRS	Creditor Reporting System (OECD)
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DTIS	Diagnostic Trade Integration Studies (IF)
EIF	Enhanced Integrated Framework
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IICA	International Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
IF	Integrated Framework for Trade-Related Assistance to Least Developed Countries
IFIF	International Feed Industry Federation
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
ITC	International Trade Centre
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OIE	World Organisation for Animal Health
OLIEs	Other Low Income Economies
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
PVS	OIE-PVS Tool for the Evaluation of Performance of Veterinary Services
SADC	South African Development Community
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary
STDF	Standards and Trade Development Facility
TCBDB	Trade Capacity Building Database
TSPN	Trade Standards Practitioners Network
UEMOA	West African Economic and Monetary Union
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WHO	World Health Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The objective of this evaluation was to review the performance of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF). This is the second external review of the STDF; the first review was completed in December 2005. Performance was to be measured against the aims established for the Facility. The evaluation was carried out as a "desk study" supplemented by survey questionnaires and interviews with the STDF Secretariat and stakeholders, including partner and observer organizations, donors and developing country representatives.

Evaluation

2. The overall performance of the STDF is judged to be good and in many important areas very good. It carries out an important role that no other single body would be able to accomplish and the participation of the five partner organizations, the donors and the observer organizations means that it has ready access to expertise in a large number of SPS- and development-related areas.

3. The performance of the Secretariat is highly rated, except by the OIE and WHO, two of the five partners. The Secretariat's resources were earlier inadequate to perform the wide range of tasks it was given and the situation was not sustainable. The current increased staffing level is considered adequate for its current needs. The STDF makes efficient and effective use of its resources by arranging many of its activities back-to-back with or together with meetings organised by other organizations.

4. The Secretariat's contacts with broader cooperation programmes, in particular the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF) and Aid for Trade, have improved and the Aid for Trade regional workshops are judged to be very useful. The three regional reviews in Central America, East Africa and a sub-group of ASEAN countries have been successful in identifying SPS-related needs and raising the profile of the STDF. The STDF's work on the overview of the SPS needs and assistance to eight LDCs is still ongoing, but the reports presented so far show that it is doing a good job.

5. There is a need for the Secretariat to improve its information to donors on its contacts with the EIF and Aid for Trade and to improve coordination with organizations working specifically in the SPS area. The STDF is working closely with a large number of organizations to promote a coordinated response to the spread and control of various fruit fly species of economic importance in West Africa and this may well lead to one of the biggest coordinated actions so far involving the STDF. The STDF recognises the importance of involving both public and private sectors in work to help developing countries to meet SPS-related standards, but it needs to establish closer contacts with the Trade Standards Practitioners Network (TSPN), so that duplication of effort can be avoided and synergies between the STDF and the TSPN explored.

6. The Secretariat's contacts with most of the STDF partners, observers, donor members and beneficiary representatives is good or very good, but there is an urgent need to improve relations with the OIE, WHO and UNCTAD.

7. There is still considerable room for improvement in the Secretariat's reporting on technical cooperation activities of bilateral and multilateral donors and developing countries. Its dissemination of information on the STDF and its projects via the SPS Committee, the website and the STDF Newsletter is generally good. However, there is considerable room for improvement of the website to make it more comprehensive, up-to-date and user-friendly. There is also a need to make the STDF's existence and activities more widely known and to raise its profile. Responsibility for doing this should be shared by the Secretariat and the partners, donors, observers and recipient countries.

8. The Secretariat's identification and dissemination of good practices in the request, provision and receipt of SPS-related technical cooperation has improved and the recent workshop provided a very useful summary of its work in this area. The three regional workshops have been very useful in enhancing collaboration between donors active in these regions and the organization of further such workshops should be a priority, since they can play an important role in stimulating cooperation between countries in a region with similar SPS-related needs.

9. The Secretariat's assistance in helping to identify possible projects and in preparing applications for Project Preparation Grants (PPGs) is highly rated and much appreciated by developing countries lacking in technical and other expertise needed to develop such proposals. Since the beginning of 2006, the STDF has been successful in attracting a large number of project (80) and PPG (31) applications and it has laid down a set of criteria for evaluating their eligibility for STDF funding. It now has a rich portfolio of projects and PPGs covering a wide range of SPS-related issues, from broad basic projects aimed at stimulating awareness at the national level of the importance of being able to meet SPS-related requirements to narrower, more technical projects aimed at finding solutions to specific problems preventing access of a product to international markets.

10. The Secretariat's review of applications for STDF funding is judged to be good, except by the OIE, WHO and UNCTAD. Which projects should be funded is currently the subject of considerable debate within the Working Group and it is important that this issue be dealt with by the Policy Committee as soon as possible. Among the issues that need discussion are the current Operational Rules on funding of projects proposed by countries other than LDCs/OLIEs, funding of projects proposed by STDF partners or implementing organizations and prioritisation when there is a shortage of funds. There is currently an imbalance between the number of projects/PPGs being funded by the STDF in different areas, with considerably fewer animal health projects being funded than projects in the other areas. This is due in part to the fact that fewer applications have been received in this area. It is up to the Policy Committee to decide if this imbalance should be allowed to continue and, if not, what action should be taken to remedy it.

11. The Secretariat's project administration and follow-up is generally good but there is a need for better information to stakeholders, including donors, on the results of such follow-up. The Secretariat's contacts with agencies implementing and/or overseeing the implementation of STDF-funded projects are generally good but there is a need for better information flow between the Secretariat and some implementing agencies.

12. The STDF is currently facing serious funding constraints and is unable to fund all the projects it approves, at least not at the time it approves them and in some cases not at all. More effort should be made to broaden the donor base and to try to get longer-term commitments from donors.

13. The documentation, preparation for and servicing of Working Group and Policy Committee meetings is generally regarded as good and the financial administration gives rise to no concerns. At Working Group meetings information items on the agenda are discussed before those on decisions on project/PPG funding. In the opinion of this reviewer this order should be reversed.

14. The impact of the six STDF projects that have been the subject of an *ex post* evaluation was reviewed. The first resulted in the development and testing of a tool to evaluate national veterinary services, which has subsequently been used in many developing countries. The second, an OIE Training for Trainers project, was run successfully and largely met its objectives. The third, aimed at assisting developing countries in the implementation of an IPPC standard on regulating wood packaging material in international trade, was very successful and achieved the overall STDF goals. Two other projects on the development of tools for plant pest risk analysis were completed successfully. The sixth project, aimed at capacity building for implementation of the Codex Alimentarius Code of Good Practice for Animal Feeding, was only partly successful. The lessons

learnt from the *ex post* evaluations have led to improved STDF project proposal review and project cycle management.

15. Although the STDF is just less than halfway through the current biennium, it seems to be well on track to complete the activities shown in the Operational Plan 2008-2009, providing the funding situation can be improved to at least meet the funding target of 5 million US\$ per year. Apart from the recommendations given below, this reviewer sees little reason to change the Medium Term Strategy of the STDF (2007-2011).

Recommendations

16. The following recommendations are made with the aim of further improving the performance of the STDF:

- As soon as possible, and preferably at its meeting in December 2008, the Policy Committee should review the current Operational Rules regarding the funding of projects involving the partners. In addition, it should review and clarify its policy regarding the funding of projects in countries other than LDCs and OLIEs, and at different stages of development, in particular the issue of prioritisation when funds are insufficient. There is currently an imbalance between the number of projects/PPGs being funded by the STDF in different areas, with considerably fewer animal health projects being funded than projects in the other areas (SPS in general, plant health and food safety). The Policy Committee should decide whether this situation should be allowed to continue and, if not, what action should be taken to remedy it. In addition the Committee should decide whether or not improving public health should be regarded as a separate area or regarded as an indirect effect of improvements in the other areas, in particular food safety.
- The Secretariat should renew and intensify its efforts to expand the current donor base and to obtain longer-term funding commitments from donors. If increased funding cannot be obtained, the Policy Committee should discuss whether to assign a greater proportion of funding to PPGs and coordination activities.
- The STDF Working Group members and observers and their organizations should renew their efforts to supply the Secretariat with the names of suitably qualified persons to carry out *ex post* evaluations of completed STDF-funded projects.
- All participants should provide brief information on their on-going and planned SPS-related activities to the Secretariat in advance of Working Group meetings and this information should be included in the working documents for the meeting. Any Working Group participant having doubts about technical issues in project/PPG applications should inform the Secretariat of this in advance, so that such issues can be resolved before the meeting, if possible. Agenda items requiring decisions should be dealt with during the early part of meetings, rather than towards the end.
- All the partners, and in particular the WTO, and the STDF donors and observers should make a greater effort to increase the visibility of and to promote the STDF. The WTO should approach the OIE and WHO with a view to concluding agreements for implementation oversight services in support of the STDF, as has already been done with FAO, the ITC and the World Bank.
- In choosing organisations to implement or oversee the implementation of its projects, the STDF should give preference to those with relevant qualifications and experience in the area

covered by the project and a proven track record in such work. Furthermore, it would be an advantage to use organizations that have already good contacts with the relevant national bodies. In addition, the STDF should seek ways to broaden its current base of implementing organizations.

- As a matter of priority, the Secretariat should update, expand and improve its website, including the introduction of a search tool, taking into account the comments in paragraph 26 of the present report. The newly started Newsletter should be evaluated after a period of 2-3 years. The STDF Secretariat should introduce an on-line system to enable it to better manage the various activities for which it has responsibility, in particular tracking progress in the various projects from the initial application to the receipt of the final report. This should include a system to automatically alert the Secretariat to upcoming deadlines for contracting and interim and final project reports. Furthermore, it should improve its document identification and handling system and ensure, amongst other things, that the cover page of each STDF document shows the date on which it was finalised/adopted and the author(s). The Secretariat should examine ways to ensure close cooperation between itself and the newly established EIF Secretariat. It should also expand its information to stakeholders on its contacts with the broader cooperation programmes, in particular the EIF and Aid for Trade. Furthermore, it should expedite its production of a compendium of SPS-related assistance providers. The Secretariat should establish closer contacts with the TSPN and provide STDF stakeholders with information on TSPN activities, so that duplication of effort can be avoided and synergies between the STDF and the TSPN explored.
- The Secretariat should develop plans for further regional workshops, similar to the three already held, in other regions, including West and Southern Africa. It should also ensure that the results of the recent workshop on good practices in the request, provision and receipt of SPS-related technical assistance are disseminated to all relevant stakeholders. The Secretariat should improve its information to stakeholders, in particular donors, on its follow-up of ongoing projects.

I. INTRODUCTION

Objective of the evaluation

1. The objective of this evaluation is to review the performance of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) in accordance with paragraph 92 of the STDF Operational Rules (STDF 139 rev.1), which stipulates that the Facility shall be evaluated every four years by an external reviewer appointed by the World Trade Organization (WTO) after consultation with the STDF Working Group. This is the second independent review of the STDF; the first review (STDF 76 add.1) was completed in December 2005.
2. Performance shall be measured against the aims established for the Facility, which are:
 - to assist developing countries enhance their expertise and capacity to analyze and to implement international sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) standards, so improving their human, animal and plant health situation, and thus ability to gain and maintain market access; and
 - to act as a vehicle for co-ordination among technical co-operation 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 co-operation.
3. In judging the performance of the STDF against its stated objectives, the following factors, *inter alia*, shall be considered: a) conclusions raising from the 2006 evaluation of the STDF; b) impact of project and project preparation activities; c) impact of coordination activities; d) performance of the Secretariat and e) performance within the STDF of the STDF partners, observers, donors and representatives of developing countries, notably in respect of their tasks and responsibilities as agreed in the Operational Rules.
4. In drawing conclusions on the performance of the STDF, the reviewer was invited to provide comments on the activities established in the Medium Term Strategy for the STDF (2007-11) and any changes which the reviewer considers appropriate to meet the stated objectives of the Facility.
5. The full terms of reference for this review are attached as Appendix 1.

Independence of the evaluator

6. I submitted my *Curriculum vitae* (CV) to the STDF Secretariat and it was circulated to members of the STDF Working Group prior to my appointment by the WTO as the evaluator. Since retiring from the Swedish National Food Administration at the end of 2005 after more than 30 years service, I have worked as an independent consultant. I have never been employed by or carried out work for the WTO, the World Bank, the International Trade Centre (ITC), the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) or the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). My earlier occasional work as a short-term consultant or temporary adviser to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) is shown in my CV. I was Chairperson of the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) from 2003-2005 and I carried out an evaluation of the FAO/WHO Project and Trust Fund for Enhanced Participation in Codex ("Codex Trust Fund") under contract to the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) in 2007. I have never been employed by the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), but have been a member of its Animal Production Food Safety Working Group since 2004 and its Chair since 2005.

II. METHODOLOGY

7. The evaluation was carried out as a "desk study" supplemented by survey questionnaires and interviews with the STDF Secretariat in Geneva and stakeholders, including partner and observer organizations, donors and developing country representatives. The evaluation has been organised around the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and lessons learned. A large number of documents, including the Medium Term Strategy (STDF 154), the Operational Rules, Operating Plans 2007 and 2008-2009 (STDF 163 and 198), Funding Strategy (STDF 186), Annual Report 2007 (STDF 208), First Evaluation Report, minutes of STDF Policy Committee and Working Group meetings and documentation on projects (including *ex post* evaluations and status reports) and Project Preparation Grants (PPGs), agreements between the WTO and implementing/oversight organizations and other issues were provided by the STDF Secretariat.

8. I visited the WTO in Geneva on 8-10 September and obtained further information from the STDF Secretariat and the WTO staff involved in the STDF. During the period 6-10 October 2008, I visited the WTO and took part in the Workshop on Good Practice held on 6 October, had brief interviews with STDF stakeholders, including representatives of beneficiaries, donors, partners and implementing/oversight organizations on 7-9 October and took part in the meeting of the STDF Working Group held on 10 October. I also met representatives of WHO at the WHO headquarters in Geneva on 9 October. At the invitation and expense of OIE, I had discussions with the Director-General of the OIE and OIE staff at the OIE headquarters in Paris on 16 October.

9. Views on the performance of the STDF Secretariat and of the STDF in general were also collected via questionnaires sent out by the STDF Secretariat at my request by e-mail on 23 September 2008 to a large number of stakeholders and also given or sent by me directly to certain stakeholders later.

10. Further information was collected via telephone interviews with stakeholders and the Secretariat. A list of persons who provided information, including those who responded to the questionnaires, is given in Appendix 2 and a list of documents is given in Appendix 3.

11. A draft report was circulated to the STDF partners, observers, donors and representatives of developing countries for comment on 24 October. Comments were received from several donors (Denmark, Germany, UK and USA), the STDF Secretariat and the OIE. Comments were received after the deadline from the European Commission and will be circulated separately by the Secretariat. The final version of the report was submitted to the STDF Secretariat on 14 November 2008.

III. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Performance of the STDF Secretariat

12. The tasks of the STDF Secretariat are defined in paragraph 18 of the Operational Rules of the STDF. Details of its tasks in grant allocation are given in paragraph 65 of the same Rules. The WTO appoints the Secretary from its staff to head the Secretariat, and appoints or contracts other staff for the Secretariat as necessary, funded directly by the Facility. The Secretariat is bound by the legal and fiduciary rules of the WTO and the Trust Fund which supports the Facility's activities.

13. The success of the STDF is dependent on the active participation and cooperation of many different stakeholders, including the partners, donors, observers, beneficiaries and implementing organizations, but a key factor in achieving its stated goals is an effective and efficient Secretariat. For this reason the performance of the Secretariat is evaluated first in this report.

14. One of the conclusions of the first external review of the STDF in 2005 was that the Secretariat was understaffed, considering the wide range of tasks it had been allotted. Since then the staff has been gradually increased and now comprises the Secretary of the STDF (financed by the WTO) and three full-time professionals, one half-time professional and a full-time secretary. The half-time professional shares his time equally between the STDF and the WTO Trade and Development Division, working primarily on the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF).

15. The present evaluation of the Secretariat's performance is based mainly on the information gathered from stakeholders via a questionnaire and interviews, interviews with members of the Secretariat and examination of the documents provided. The responses to the questionnaire on the Secretariat's performance are summarised in three tables. Table 1 shows the responses received from 19 developing countries and developing country organizations. Table 2 shows the responses received from seven of the donors and Table 3 shows the responses received from the STDF partners (except the WTO, which only supplied oral comments), the ITC and the UNCTAD. Only responses giving an opinion on the question posed are shown. Comments made on the issues raised in the questionnaires are not included in the tables, but many of them are taken up below. In the following analysis, the evaluation of the Secretariat's performance has been divided into the following areas: overall performance, coordination, project development and implementation, funding and facility operation.

16. Some of the STDF documents provided by the Secretariat were undated and the authorship was not always clear from the cover page. The cover of the document with the latest version of Operational Rules does not show when they were adopted and many of the project progress reports are undated. This information is available from the Secretariat, but would be better included on the cover page of the documents themselves.

17. At present the STDF Secretariat does not have an on-line system to facilitate its management of the large number of activities for which it has responsibility, in particular document management and tracking progress in STDF projects, from the initial application to the receipt of the final report and the *ex post* evaluation. Since the number of projects and documents to be managed is constantly increasing, the introduction of such a system would help to increase the efficiency of the Secretariat. It should include a means to automatically alert the Secretariat to upcoming deadlines for *inter alia* contracting and interim and final project reports.

Overall performance of the Secretariat

18. All but one of those responding to the question on the overall performance of the Secretariat judged it to be good or very good and the other deemed it to be satisfactory. This high rating was confirmed in interviews with many stakeholders who stated that the Secretariat was performing well and responded rapidly and professionally to questions put to it. One of the donors (Denmark) commented that the fact that the people involved are professional, dedicated and motivated makes a huge difference. Another donor (Germany) commented that the secretariat is composed of very dedicated natural networkers. Although the overall performance of the Secretariat is highly rated, there is room for improvement in some areas, as discussed in more detail below.

19. WHO commented that the activities of the Secretariat are too much trade-orientated and there is a need to pay more attention to public health considerations. This comment reflects WHO's dissatisfaction with the fact that it considers that no public health projects have been approved by the STDF so far. It may also explain why it has hitherto played a less active role in the STDF than some of the other partners. However, trade and public health considerations do not necessarily conflict with each other. Increased access to international markets through improvements in food safety in developing countries can benefit public health in both the exporting and importing countries. Furthermore, increased access to international markets for other products from developing countries may bring public health benefits in such countries as a result of more rapid economic development.

An analysis of the project areas which have been funded by the STDF is given below (see paragraph 76).

Coordination

20. An overview of the STDF participation in the Aid for Trade initiative to date is provided in document STDF 253. The Secretariat's performance as regards contacts with broader cooperation programmes, in particular the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF) and Aid for Trade initiatives was deemed to be good or very good by all but one respondent, who considered it to be satisfactory. Such contacts are very important for the future of the STDF, in particular for identifying SPS-related needs of developing countries and helping them to articulate these needs in the form of applications for "bankable" projects, i.e. projects that can be funded by the STDF itself or funding arranged through the STDF's contacts with bilateral or multilateral funding organizations.

21. One donor (Sweden) commented that the STDF should ensure that EIF reports can be used in formulating relevant SPS-related projects. Another donor (USA) commented that, although it is clear that the STDF does interact with broader programmes, more information on this would be welcome. A third donor (UK) commented that contacts had improved a lot since September 2007 and the Aid for Trade regional workshops. A fourth donor (European Commission) commented that at the Geneva level work in this respect appears to be progressing. For real impact, improved efforts need to take place at the country level with the government/donor coordination mechanisms already in place on trade-related assistance/private sector development. In order to comply with aid effectiveness principles projects/preparation grants should be discussed first in these fora. Another donor (Canada) commented that the Secretariat clearly has contact with these higher level programmes, given this work is also largely housed in the WTO. However, coordination with organizations working specifically in the area of SPS is of greater importance and could be improved

22. The Secretariat's performance as regards contacts with the STDF partners, observers, donor members and beneficiary representatives was judged by most, but not all, respondents to be good or very good: five regarding it as only satisfactory and one of the partners (OIE) considered it to be poor (see next paragraph). One donor (European Commission) commented that there was still room for improvement, but this is ongoing and it is normal that this takes time. Another (Canada) commented that e-mail updates are timely and useful, in particular in preparing for meetings. Another (Germany) commented that the Secretariat has actively sought opportunities for exchange of views and possibilities for exploiting synergies through cooperation in developing countries.

23. The OIE considers that the Secretariat has been unduly influenced by certain donors that have pushed the STDF towards a narrowly focussed "ideology" that is not consistent with the aims of the STDF as set out in the Operational Rules. The OIE considers that this direction has been particularly evident in recent times and refers specifically to discussions within and decisions taken by the Working Group in 2007 and 2008, and in particular to the handling of two project applications (STDF 219 "Improving the capacity of veterinary services to carry out essential functions" and STDF 265 "Compartmentalisation in Brazil").

24. The Secretariat's reporting on technical cooperation activities of bilateral and multilateral donors and developing countries was considered to be good or very good by most respondents but again six deemed it to be only satisfactory and one considered it to be poor. One donor (USA) commented that the STDF provides as much information as it receives and it is more the lack of information sharing from donors that is inhibiting the STDF's greater sharing of information. A similar comment was made by two other donors (UK and European Commission). Another donor (Germany) commented that reporting takes place, but is too fragmented. Activities need more targeted presentation, e.g. in thematic sessions (the private standards event was a good approach). A developing country representative commented that there was a need for improved information to

countries. Another donor (Canada) questioned whether this is (or should be) the Secretariat's responsibility.

25. The Secretariat's dissemination of information on the STDF and STDF projects via the SPS Committee was judged to be good or very good by all but one of the respondents, who considered it to be satisfactory. One donor (UK) commented that the dissemination appears to be good, bearing in mind the limited scope for innovation within the WTO protocol.

26. The Secretariat's dissemination of information on the STDF and STDF projects via the website and the STDF Newsletter was considered to be good or very good by all but four of the respondents, who considered it to be satisfactory. One donor (USA) commented that the restricted STDF website had been up and running for only a short time. Information on the site for the past three Working Group meetings has been very good and it would be helpful if the STDF could post older documents that are useful to donors. A second donor (UK) commented that Newsletters could perhaps be more regular. A third donor (European Commission) commented that the website lacked some easy-to-use tools, e.g. a search tool. Another donor (Germany) commented that some information is not available on the website and neither has it been made available on request (e.g. report STDF 20). Information is generally very bulky. Fact sheets summarising the main elements and findings would be helpful. A developing country representative commented that the work of the STDF is not well known in the South African Development Community (SADC) region. The ITC commented that web pages dedicated to the STDF projects could be added to the website and that that information about ongoing/upcoming SPS assistance relevant to the SPS project/sector is useful. One of the beneficiaries (Sri Lanka) suggested that relevant documents should be uploaded onto the website to enable various stakeholders to download them from the Internet. In order to keep stakeholders informed, an e-alert system could be activated. The Newsletter should also be made available not only on the website, but also as a printed copy to all stakeholders.

27. The Secretariat's performance as regards identification and dissemination of good practices in the request, provision and receipt of SPS-related technical cooperation was judged to be good or very good by 19 respondents, satisfactory by three and poor by one (UNCTAD). One donor (European Commission) commented that this was work in progress, is ongoing and is a very good initiative, meeting a genuine need. Further efforts should be made in order to take this forward with findings disseminated at the level of those who design and implement technical assistance – at the level of governments/donors.

28. The Secretariat's performance in organising regional workshops and consultations aimed at improving coordination between STDF stakeholders was considered to be good or very good by 21 respondents, satisfactory by six, poor by two and very poor by one. One donor (USA) commented that the three regional workshops have been very useful for its collaboration with other donors on projects. Another donor (European Commission) commented that the teething trouble stage has clearly passed now and this activity is core to the STDF coordination work. Trans-boundary issues/lessons learned which can be transferred to neighbouring countries are key elements to focus on. A donor (Canada) commented that the workshops had been well organised and wondered whether their impact had been adequately assessed. The ITC commented that official invitations to observers should be sent out two months before the meetings. A donor (Germany) commented that regional workshops were useful as a awareness-building exercise and that it was a good approach to organise joint efforts in tackling common problems, e.g. fruit fly, in a region.

Project development and implementation

29. The Secretariat's performance as regards identification of possible projects in the area of food safety, animal and plant health for funding was judged to be good or very good by 14 respondents, satisfactory by 9, poor by two and very poor by one (UNCTAD). As pointed out by one of the

respondents, the question should more correctly have been "Help in identifying possible projects in the area of food safety, animal and plant health for funding", the task given to the Secretariat in the Operational Rules. The evaluator apologises for this error. One donor (USA) commented that the STDF review of capacity needs in the three regions (Central America, East Africa and South East Asia) and its funding of PPGs provide donors with solid projects to implement with recipient countries. Another donor (European Commission) commented that there was room for improvement on the basis of clearer selection criteria. They should be more clearly based on demand/discussions locally (e.g. positive recent result in this respect in Cambodia where consultations took place locally) and on issues where the STDF has real value added as compared with standard technical assistance projects. Another donor (Germany) commented that partner organizations are still over-represented, only a minority of projects is really innovative and ownership of developing countries needs to be enhanced. A developing country representative commented that there was a need for more input from FAO, OIE and WHO in this work. FAO commented that the aim of this area is very important and STDF is following the matter effectively. One of the donors (Canada) commented that STDF is intended to be responsive to requests from developing countries. The East African Community commented that involvement of experts to do needs analysis is very good, since most would-be recipients of support may feel the need but are not equipped to properly and technically elaborate on the exact need.

30. The Secretariat's performance as regards assistance to LDCs and others in preparing applications for Project Preparation Grants (PPGs) was judged by 11 of the developing country respondents to be good or very good, whereas two considered it to be satisfactory and one poor. Four donors judged the performance to be good or very good and one rated it as satisfactory. The responses from the partners, the ITC and the UNCTAD were spread evenly over the range from very good to poor. One donor (USA) commented that the PPGs and STDF technical guidance appear to be useful mechanisms to assist LDCs overcome their lack of expertise in developing proposals. Another donor (European Commission) commented that they welcome the circulation of the evaluation reports of the STDF for both PPGs and funding applications. In respect of PPGs it would encourage the STDF evaluators to take up direct contact with key local actors so as to better judge whether PPGs should proceed or not. Another donor (UK) commented that the Secretariat provides significant levels of support and this had increased since more staff had come onboard. The ITC commented that it was interested in getting more information so that it, as an observer, can promote this specific STDF assistance. Sri Lanka commented that further training should be given to ensure proper completion of grant applications.

31. During the period 2006-October 2008 the Secretariat has reviewed 111 applications for STDF funding (80 projects and 31 PPGs). This work was rated as good or very good by 10 of 12 responding developing countries, all seven donors and FAO, the World Bank and the ITC. However, it was rated poor by WHO and OIE and very poor by UNCTAD. WHO commented that there was a need to pay more attention to consumer health and food safety issues. The OIE has commented that the Secretariat is not consistent in dealing with some applications from partner organizations and applications to repeat successful IPPC and OIE workshops in other countries are treated inconsistently.

32. One donor (USA) commented that STDF reviews have consistently identified good elements of the proposals and the concerns, inconsistencies and lack of information needed to evaluate the merits of the proposals. Another donor (European Commission) commented that the process has improved significantly and welcomed the circulation of the evaluation reports of STDF. An analysis of projects in terms of their compliance with aid effectiveness/Paris Declaration obligations should also be conducted. This should include information as to whether the projects were suggested locally/proposed by the implementation agency, numbers of projects implemented by Govt themselves rather than using TA, use of local TA etc, etc. Another donor (Canada) commented that the Secretariat's comments on proposals are comprehensive and useful. Another (Germany)

commented that screening of applications through the Secretariat is very useful. Paying more attention to meaningful indicators would make the review even better.

33. The Secretariat's performance as regards project administration and follow-up was considered to be good or very good by 15 of 20 respondents, satisfactory by four and poor by one developing country. One donor (Canada) commented that they were uncertain to what extent projects are being monitored after approval and would appreciate further reporting that provides insight into follow-up activities as well as success of projects (besides evaluation reports).

34. The Secretariat's contacts with agencies implementing and/or overseeing the implementation of STDF-funded projects was rated as good or very good by 14 respondents, satisfactory by 7 and poor by one. One developing country organisation (Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)) commented that they were having difficulty with IPPC due to staff problems at the IPPC. FAO commented that more flexibility was needed and implementing agencies need to be involved in planning of project components. Furthermore, there is a need to have a system for implementing professionals, at the individual level, to be able to revise the programme even after the approval of the project. One donor (Canada) commented that oversight of executing agencies should be balanced to ensure that potential for slippage of projects is minimized and budget is being effectively disbursed.

Funding of the STDF

35. The Secretariat's contacts with current donors to the STDF Fund were considered to be good or very good by all seven donors and by most of the other respondents. One donor (USA) commented that it was completely satisfied with the flow of information and quick response by the STDF on projects.

36. The Secretariat's performance on identification of other potential donors to the STDF Fund was judged to be good or very good by most respondents, but a few rated it as only satisfactory. One donor (Sweden) commented that there is an urgent need for more work to widen the donor base. Another (European Commission) commented that work in progress on the DVD can meet these PR concerns. A third donor (UK) commented that STDF had been proactive in contacting new donors and visiting them.

Facility operation

37. The Secretariat's documentation for the Working Group and Policy Committee meetings was rated as good or very good by all respondents except two, one donor (Sweden) and one developing country who both rated it satisfactory. Another donor (USA) commented that the website for Working Group members has been a great help in ensuring donors have all the documents. Another donor (European Commission) commented that the documentation for meetings was very detailed, perhaps too detailed. Another donor (Canada) commented that the documents were provided in a timely manner and are useful. However, some areas could be improved.

38. The Secretariat's preparation for and servicing of Working Group and Policy Committee meetings was considered to be good or very good by all the responding STDF partners, ITC, UNCTAD, four of six donors and 11 of 12 developing countries. One donor (Sweden) commented that the Secretariat's ambition to provide the latest available information collides with the need to give meeting participants adequate time to consider issues prior to meetings. Another donor (USA) commented that STDF provides professional service for the meetings. The agenda is clearly set, documents are shared with members, the meetings are well run and the follow up is timely. The USA supports early and firm deadlines for the submission of documents for upcoming meetings, followed by STDF distribution of documents with adequate lead times for review. Another donor (European Commission) commented that documents (understandably) come rather late and there is always a rush

to get all stakeholders consulted. Another donor (UK) commented that the preparations had improved and were now timely. Another (Germany) commented that the restricted area on the website is a good idea, but there are still lots of documents sent by e-mail, which requires cross-checking. Information comes in a more timely manner now than in the past.

39. The Secretariat's performance in the area of financial administration was rated as good or very good by almost all the respondents, the other rating it as satisfactory.

40. The Secretariat's financial reporting was considered to be good or very good by four of six responding donors, the other two rating it as satisfactory. Almost all of the other respondents rated it as good or very good with just two of 15 rating it as only satisfactory. However, it would be more transparent if the amount of funds committed, but not disbursed, at the end of each financial year was shown in the annual report. The practice of maintaining each donor's funds in a separate account and each year showing the amount still unspent causes some problems for some donor country representatives seeking to obtain further funds at the national level and is otherwise of little value.

Performance of the STDF partners, donors, observers and representatives of developing countries

41. The tasks of the partners, donors, observers and representatives of developing countries are given in paragraph 18 of the Operational Rules.

42. The partners, donors, observers and representatives of developing countries have supported the STDF by providing their time to prepare for, attend and follow-up STDF meetings. The costs of the developing country representatives are covered by the STDF, but the others cover their own costs. They are all involved in reviewing project and PPG applications and progress in the implementation of approved projects/PPGs. Furthermore, they share information on their ongoing and planned STDF-related activities. This information sharing could be improved if information was provided to the Secretariat in advance of Working Group meetings and included in the working documents: additional information could then be provided on request at the meeting itself.

43. In order to ensure effective use of the limited time in Working Group meetings, any participant having doubts about technical issues in project/PPG applications should inform the Secretariat of this in advance, so that such issues can be resolved before the meeting, if possible. The agendas of Working Group meetings include both information and decision items, including decisions on funding of PPGs and projects. In this reviewer's experience, it is better to deal with items requiring decisions during the early part of meetings, to enable as full participation as possible in the discussions prior to making the decisions, rather than towards the end of the meeting, which is the current practice at STDF Working Group meetings.

44. The success of the STDF depends to a large extent on the active participation and cooperation of all the partners, donors, observers and representatives of developing countries in its work, including the discussions at Working Group meetings. According to paragraph 15 of the Operational Rules, all decisions of the Working Group should be taken by consensus. It is important that this rule is followed and that controversial issues are resolved in the Working Group in a satisfactory manner and that all parties understand the reasons for and accept the decisions made there. In cases where the current Operational Rules are considered to be unclear or in need of revision in the light of experience or new developments, the matter should be referred to the Policy Committee.

45. The STDF is a relatively young organization and still unknown to many people working in the areas of animal and plant health and food safety and in the development community. Although information about the STDF is disseminated via the SPS Committee and the Facility has its own website and now a Newsletter, there is a need to make its existence and activities more widely known

and to raise its profile. Responsibility for doing this should be shared by the STDF Secretariat and the partners, donors, observers and recipient countries.

Partners

46. FAO's responsibilities and expertise cover a wide range of areas, including animal and plant health and food safety, and it has supported the STDF by implementing or overseeing the implementation of 13 STDF projects and two PPGs. It has also developed proposals for STDF projects.

47. With its focus on animal health and zoonoses, OIE has supported the STDF by implementing or overseeing the implementation of three projects and one PPG and by developing proposals for STDF projects. It also provides opportunities for the STDF to inform OIE members of its activities. (In the STDF context, the OIE has a special situation compared to the other partners insofar as it is both an STDF partner and an SPS-related standard setting organization.)

48. The World Bank has been involved in the implementation of an STDF project and in discussions about the funding of projects, including the ongoing discussions on how best to tackle the fruit fly problem in West Africa.

49. WHO, with its focus on food safety and public health, has been involved in implementing a PPG and in developing proposals for STDF projects.

50. The WTO has provided support to the STDF by implementing or overseeing the implementation of 8 STDF projects and 16 PPGs. The WTO also provides its members with updates on the operation of the STDF and related matters at SPS Committee meetings. It also provides information via workshops, etc. to its members on their rights and obligations under the WTO Agreements, including the SPS Agreement.

51. Among the partners, the WTO has particular responsibilities *vis-a-vis* the STDF, since it houses the Secretariat, appoints and finances the STDF Secretary and appoints or contracts other staff. It is also largely responsible for the financial administration of the STDF. The WTO charges the STDF an overhead of 13% for the services it provides (CHF 470,168 in 2007). These services include office and meeting room facilities, IT, telephone, human resources (HR), accounting, translation, interpreting and printing services. The WTO staff dealing with the STDF accounts claim that the total cost of the services provided exceeds the overhead that the WTO receives. This reviewer has not examined this claim in detail, but it appears that the WTO is providing adequate support to the STDF for the funds it receives. If any of the donors or partners is of a different opinion, they can, of course, request more detailed accounts of the costs of the services the WTO supplies to the STDF.

52. The WTO has developed a Trade Capacity Building Database (TCBDB) which includes, amongst other things, information on SPS-related technical assistance and is now giving high priority to efforts to improve reporting on such assistance and its sub-categories food safety, animal health and plant health. OECD has a reporting role through the Creditor Reporting System for Aid for Trade. Both these activities are dependent on input from a large number of donors and others involved in SPS-related technical assistance to try to make the information as complete and up-to-date as possible. The TCBDB is potentially of great use to the STDF in its coordination activities, but this potential has yet to be realised. One reason for this may be a lack of compatibility between the TCBDB approach and donors' reporting systems.

Observers

53. The three international standard setting bodies specifically recognised by the SPS Agreement, the Codex Alimentarius Commission ("Codex"), the IPPC and the OIE, have also provided support to the STDF. The Codex Secretariat has arranged for the STDF Secretariat to provide information about the STDF and its activities in connection with meetings of the Codex Regional Committees. The IPPC has implemented two STDF projects and is involved in the planning and implementation of others. Regarding the OIE, see paragraph 47.

54. The UNCTAD has supported the STDF by implementing or overseeing the implementation of two projects and two PPGs and the ITC has supervised the implementation of one STDF project.

Representatives of developing countries

55. The representatives of the developing countries play an important role in providing input into the Working Group and Policy Committee and thereby trying to ensure that the prioritisation and overall direction of the STDF work programme is in line with developing country priorities, rather than being partner- or donor-driven - no easy task.

Donors and funding

56. As can be seen from Table 5, the World Bank provided funding for the STDF in 2003 and 2004 and the WTO provided funds during the period 2003-2006. However, since 2006 the STDF has been entirely dependent on contributions from other donors for its work. Several donors (Denmark, The Netherlands, Sweden and the UK) have given multi-annual contributions, others (Canada, Germany, Italy and the USA) have hitherto contributed twice and others (Australia, European Commission, Finland, France, Ireland, Norway and Switzerland) have hitherto made a single contribution. In addition to contributing to the STDF Fund, some donors have agreed to fund projects that the STDF has approved but been unable to fund at the time. For example, the ComMark Trust, with funding from the UK Department for International Development (DFID), funded STDF project 66 on improved SPS compliance for Mozambique horticulture exporters in regional and international markets. It should also be borne in mind that, in addition to the above financial contributions from donors, STDF projects are partly financed (10%-30% depending on whether the recipient is an LDC/OLIE or not) by contributions from the recipient countries and by in kind contributions from other sources, e.g. Canada contributed to STDF projects 37 and 120.

57. During the period 2006 to the present (November 2008), STDF funding has been requested for a total of 80 projects and 31 PPGs, in all amounting to over 35 million US\$. Approval was granted for 29 projects and 18 PPGs to a total cost of just over 8 million US\$.

58. The STDF has as a goal that at least 40% of its funding for projects/PPGs shall go to LDCs or OLIEs. This figure has been clearly exceeded, with 58% of the project funding (45% of the number of projects) and 73% of the total number of PPGs going to such countries during the period 2006-2008.

59. Breakdown of the approved projects and PPGs by geographical region shows that 71% of the PPGs and 39% of the projects have gone to Sub-Saharan Africa, 10% of the PPGs and 19% of the projects to South and Central America and the Caribbean, 10% of the PPGs and 11% of the projects to East Asia and smaller percentages to other regions. In addition, 25% of the projects can be classified as global. There are, however, a number of LDCs which, for various reasons, have not yet been able to become beneficiaries of STDF project funding.

60. The STDF is currently facing serious funding constraints, with insufficient resources to fund all currently approved projects. There is an immediate funding shortfall of CHF 2.97 million. In mid-October 2008 it had approximately CHF 1.67 million available in resources against approximately CHF 3.93 million in approved outstanding commitments, excluding funding of the Secretariat staff (an additional CHF 0.72 million per annum). The STDF has set a target of 5 million US\$ for annual contributions and this was achieved in 2005 and 2007, but contributions in 2006 totalled only ca. CHF 2.7 and only ca. CHF 1.2 million have been received so far in 2008 (see Table 5).

61. The STDF is in some ways a victim of its own success. As it has become better known, it has attracted larger numbers of good quality applications for funding of projects and PPGs and has approved increasing numbers of them. However, it is unable to fund all the projects it approves, at least not at the time it approves them and in some cases not at all. This leads to delays in implementing approved projects, resulting in frustration and other problems in countries which have invested resources in making the applications and preparing to implement projects. Having already invested resources in developing a well-functioning process to assist developing countries to elaborate sound project applications, it would be a pity if financial constraints meant that the potential could not be realised. It would be especially valuable for the functioning of the STDF, in particular in planning its future activities and avoiding delays in the implementation of projects, if donors could commit themselves to make multi-annual contributions and the Secretariat is trying its best to encourage this. The donor base is presently quite narrow, being concentrated mainly to Europe (especially Northern Europe) and North America and it would be a great advantage if it could be widened. However, even if the STDF achieves its target of CHF 5 million in annual contributions to the Fund, the mobilisation of project funds from sources other than the STDF Fund, including multilateral, bilateral and regional sources, is probably going to play an increasing role in funding projects approved by the STDF in the future.

Coordination activities of the STDF and their impact

62. The coordination role of the STDF covers several areas, including the development and dissemination of tools to assess SPS-related needs and national capacities, the development of methods to be used to prioritise activities when resources are inadequate (which is always the situation in developing countries) and assistance to developing countries in assessing their needs and capacities. It also covers mobilising funding for projects and other activities to assist developing countries to comply with SPS-related standards, thereby gaining and maintaining access to international markets. This work is carried out through collaboration between the Secretariat, partners, donors, observers and recipient countries.

63. The STDF also helps to identify and disseminate good practices in the request, provision and receipt of SPS-related technical assistance and an SPS/STDF/OECD workshop on this subject was held at the WTO on 6 October 2008 back-to-back with an SPS Committee meeting (see docs. G/SPS/GEN/871, 872, 874). The STDF plans to prepare a short publication to disseminate the findings of the good practice research and the workshop more widely.

64. On 31 March 2008 STDF organised a workshop on SPS-related capacity evaluation tools (see docs. G/SPS/R/48 and G/SPS/GEN/821) back-to-back with an SPS Committee meeting. The workshop focussed on tools that have been developed by international organizations, including a Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool, the OIE Tool for the Evaluation of Veterinary Services (OIE PVS Tool) and FAO Guidelines to Assess Capacity-Building Needs for National Food Control Systems. Other more generic approaches were also discussed, including the FAO Biosecurity Toolkit, the World Bank's report on "Food Safety and Agricultural Health Standards, Challenges and Opportunities for Developing Country Exports" and IICA's Performance, Vision, Strategy approach., the UNIDO work on "Conformity Assurance Infrastructure", WHO's work on developing a diagnostic tool for analysis and assessment of trade and health and Convention on Biodiversity work on a

national capacity self assessment tool. The workshop was also informed about the STDF project on "Cost-benefit analysis and SPS-related investment" being piloted by Peru and Uganda (STDF project no. 20). The Workshop recommended, among other things, a) improved coordination to reduce duplication in capacity evaluation and follow-up activities, b) making the findings of completed and planned capacity evaluations more widely available and, c) greater efforts to identify ways to monitor the impact of capacity evaluations in generating results.

65. A first phase overview of the SPS needs and assistance of eight LDCs (Benin, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Lesotho, Mozambique, Rwanda, Senegal and Yemen) has been produced by the Secretariat at UNIDO's request (see document STDF 270) and presented at a preparatory Expert Working Group meeting on 8-9 September 2008 in Kigali, Rwanda. The overview had three objectives: a) to identify SPS-related needs and constraints faced by the countries surveyed, b) to identify ongoing and planned SPS technical cooperation initiatives of multilateral and bilateral donors and, c) to identify areas where future cooperation activities might be focussed and examine actions to mobilise further support. The report is based on a review of existing needs assessments, notably the Diagnostic Trade Integration Studies (DTIS) prepared by the Integrated Framework (IF), the STDF's own Aid for Trade research and other reports. A final report will be presented at the LDC Ministerial Conference to be held on 19-20 November 2008 in Cambodia. This work is still in progress, but the draft overview already produced shows that the STDF work on identifying SPS-related needs and assistance is progressing well.

66. Under the umbrella of Aid for Trade, the STDF is working closely with the World Bank, the European Commission, the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture, the Economic Commission of West African States, the West African Economic and Monetary Union, the Pesticides Initiative Programme and other stakeholders to promote a coordinated response to the spread and control of various fruit fly species of economic importance in West Africa. This is a good example of an issue which affects many countries in Africa, with severe effects on trade in fruit and in some cases on food security. Many donors are involved and it may well lead to one of the biggest coordinated actions so far involving the STDF. An STDF meeting is planned for early 2009 to consider positive experiences from elsewhere in the world in fruit fly control, mobilise development partners around a common regional control plan and examine implementation modalities for a concerted regional action for the management of fruit flies in West Africa.

67. Although the STDF can assist developing countries to assess their SPS-related needs, it is the countries themselves that should decide on the priority to be given to work to meet these needs as part of their overall development plans and "own the process". From the point of view of sustainability, it is an advantage if projects and other work designed to meet SPS-related needs can be integrated into comprehensive national programmes aimed at improving animal and plant health and food safety, rather than being isolated, stand-alone projects.

68. Since the production of and international trade in animals and plants and products thereof and foodstuffs is largely in the hands of private operators and legislation and control is the responsibility of the public sector, it is important that both public and private sectors are involved in work to meet SPS-related standards in order to gain and maintain access to international markets. This is recognised by the STDF in its work and it encourages participation of both sectors in its projects and other activities.

69. Private standards have come to play an increasing role in international trade in some commodities. Developing countries able to comply with SPS-related (i.e. Codex, IPPC and OIE) standards may still find difficulty in accessing some international markets if they cannot meet the additional requirements set by private organizations, for example the large importers/wholesalers/retailers who dominate parts of the food trade in some countries. The advantages and disadvantages of private standards have been the subject of much discussion in recent

years in many international fora, including the SPS Committee, which has been discussing the issue since June 2005 and held a workshop on it in June 2008.

70. Although one of the main aims of the STDF (see paragraph 2 in the present report) is to "assist developing countries enhance their expertise and capacity to analyze and to implement international sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) standards" i.e. Codex, IPPC and OIE standards, it has been recognised that ability to meet private standards can be an important factor in gaining access to international markets. According to the STDF Operational Rules, projects which are in part aimed at assisting developing countries to meet private standards are eligible for STDF funding, subject to certain conditions.

71. The Trade Standards Practitioners Network (TSPN) is a network of organisations which has as its mission to improve the effectiveness of initiatives that support developing country capacity building and participation in the implementation of trade-related social, environment and sanitary/phytosanitary standards (including both public and private standards) and related measures through information sharing, policy research and capacity building. Several organizations involved in the TSPN (e.g. FAO, UNIDO, World Bank and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ)) are also involved in STDF activities. Since the aims of the STDF and the TSPN in some areas are similar, there is obviously a risk for overlap and duplication of effort. Therefore it is important that the STDF Secretariat establishes and maintains close contact with the TSPN secretariat and provides STDF stakeholders with information on ongoing and planned TSPN activities so that duplication of effort can be avoided. Synergies between the STDF and the TSPN should be actively sought for the benefit of developing countries and the effective use of the available resources.

72. The overall conclusion from the present review of the STDF coordination activities is that they are developing well and are already having an impact in some areas. These include a) the activities to identify, develop and disseminate tools to assess SPS-related needs and evaluate national capacities, b) the regional workshops and consultations, organised in Central America, East Africa and the Mekong Delta, which have been very useful in enhancing collaboration between donors in the regions, and, c) the workshop on good practices in the request, provision and receipt of SPS-related technical assistance. The STDF has also been successful in coordinating with donors to help fund some STDF-approved projects that it has been unable to fund itself. In addition, although still at an early stage, the work on assessing the needs and assistance in eight LDCs and on promoting a coordinated response to the fruit fly problem in West Africa is progressing well and shows promise for the future. Coordination is one of the two principal aims of the STDF and it is primarily in this area, rather than acting simply as a project funder, that its future probably lies, since here it has a comparative advantage and can play a unique role in assisting developing countries in the future.

Project development and implementation activities and their impact

73. Since the beginning of 2006, the STDF has been successful in attracting a large number of project (80) and PPG (31) applications from different sources and, in its Operational Rules, it has laid down a set of criteria for evaluating their eligibility for STDF funding.

74. The STDF has approved a rich portfolio of projects and PPGs covering a wide range of SPS-related issues, from broad projects aimed at *inter alia* stimulating awareness at the national level of the importance of being able to meet SPS-related requirements in order to gain and maintain access to international markets to narrower, more technical projects aimed at finding solutions to specific problems preventing access of a product to international markets, e.g. STDF project 114 on an aflatoxin management system in Brazil nut production.

75. Over the years since its inception, the focus in the STDF has changed from funding projects initiated mainly by the partners to funding projects and PPGs initiated mainly by beneficiary countries. In 2003, 5 projects submitted by partners were approved for funding, 4 were approved in 2004 and 2 in 2005, but none have been approved since 2006. Furthermore, the STDF is now facilitating, often by means of PPGs, the development of good "bankable" projects that it cannot fund itself (due to budgetary constraints) but can help to fund by mobilising funds from multi- or bilateral donors.

76. The projects and PPGs can be broadly divided into the following areas: SPS in general, plant health, animal health and food safety. Table 4 shows such a division of the projects and PPGs approved so far. As can be seen from the table, the total number of projects and PPGs for the areas SPS in general, plant health and food safety are similar (about 20), whereas the number related to animal health is less than half that number. According to the Secretariat, this is due to the fact that relatively few applications have been received for animal health projects, but the approval rate for such applications is as high, or even higher, than that for applications for projects in other areas. WHO has complained that no public health projects have been approved by the STDF. However, a large number of projects and PPGs related to food safety have been approved and there is an obvious connection between food safety and public health. It is up to the Policy Committee to decide whether the STDF should strive to obtain a different balance between the above areas and, if so, how this can be achieved. Furthermore, the Committee should decide whether or not improvements in public health should be regarded as a separate area or regarded as an indirect effect of improved food safety. In this connection it should be emphasised that the STDF focuses on SPS-related issues and not on human, animal or plant health in general.

77. Initially the STDF suffered from delays in the implementation of projects, sometimes extending over six months or more and, although the situation has improved, there are still some delays. There are several reasons for this, including lack of funding at the time the project is approved, delays in deciding on the organization to implement and/or oversee the implementation of the project, slow internal processes in those organizations and practical problems at the recipient country level. It is desirable to reduce these delays, but this is dependent on obtaining increased and timely funding, more rapid decision making in the Working Group and accelerated internal processes at the implementing organization and recipient country level.

78. Following the previous external evaluation of the STDF in 2005, better rules were introduced in 2006 to steer the work of the STDF and the criteria for funding of projects and PPGs have been tightened. The present evaluator considers that the current Operational Rules (doc. STDF 139 rev.1) provide a good general basis for operation of the Facility. However, in view of the dissatisfaction recently expressed by two of the five partners (OIE and WHO) there is reason for the Policy Committee to revisit some of the details concerning the rules for project funding to clarify some issues, including the support to be given to countries at different stages of development and funding of projects involving the partners.

79. It has been suggested by one of the donors (Sweden) that decisions on approval of PPGs could be delegated by the Policy Committee to the Secretariat, since this could speed up the process and the funds involved are relatively small (20-30,000 US\$ per PPG). The Secretariat could review the applications for PPGs and check that they complied with all the criteria laid down by the Policy Committee in the Operational Rules (as it already does), approve the PPG and inform the Working Group as soon as it had done so. An alternative would be for the Secretariat to circulate proposals for approving PPGs electronically to members of the Working Group for their approval. However, this reviewer is doubtful whether the Working Group and Policy Committee are prepared to accept this transfer of responsibilities at the present time.

80. Hitherto, much of the STDF Working Group's discussions on projects and PPGs has centred around reviewing and approving applications and initiating project implementation and only 12 projects have been completed so far and six have been the subject of an *ex post* evaluation. During the next few years more and more projects will be completed and therefore the Working Group will need to devote more of its time to the monitoring and evaluation aspects of projects and ways to measure their impact.

81. Several of the projects initiated earlier were proposed by STDF partners and were global in nature. In contrast, most of the newer projects have been initiated by developing countries and are aimed at tackling more specific SPS-related problems affecting a single country (e.g. Project 48 on shea and cashew nuts in Benin, Project 69 on seafood products in Yemen and Project 114 on aflatoxin management in Brazil nut production) or a region (e.g. Project 171 on establishing an East African Phytosanitary Centre and Project 255 on the regional initiative on the fight against fruit flies in West Africa). The STDF has been successful in assisting developing countries to prepare sound project proposals through the use of PPGs. To date 15 STDF approved projects have been developed in this way (project numbers 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 69, 113, 116, 126, 127, 145, 146, 155, 170 and 171 – please note that the project numbers are in most, but not all, cases the same as the PPG number). These developments are consistent with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

82. The WTO has already concluded agreements with FAO, ITC and the World Bank, but not OIE or WHO, for oversight services in support of the STDF. Since OIE and WHO can also be involved in the oversight of the implementation of STDF projects, it is desirable that they too have similar agreements with WTO.

83. Assessment of the impact of STDF-funded projects/PPGs is difficult for a number of reasons. Firstly, only a few projects have so far been subject to an *ex post* evaluation. To date, 12 STDF-funded projects have been completed (STDF nos. 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 37, 56, 89 and 120), but only 6 have been the subject of an *ex post* evaluation (nos. 14, 15, 37, 56, 89 and 120). Secondly, few data are available to evaluate if there has been any impact on market access, international trade volumes, public health or poverty alleviation. Thirdly, where improvements have been achieved it is usually the result of the work of many actors and it is difficult to separate the impact of STDF activities from those of others. Having said that, the following is an attempt to evaluate the impact of some of the STDF projects and other activities.

84. Project STDF 14: Development of the OIE-PVS Capacity Evaluation Tool: Performance of Veterinary Services supported OIE in the development and institutionalisation of a tool for the evaluation of national veterinary services. The STDF funding of this project constituted only a small proportion of the total costs. According to the *ex post* evaluation, the project's immediate objectives were achieved. STDF funding is intended to support, among other things, the implementation of pilot projects that are innovative, can be replicated in other countries and/or have a regional component. The subsequent use of the PVS tool in many other developing countries through funds donated by the World Bank and other donors can be regarded as proof of the impact of the original seed funding by the STDF. Information about the PVS tool for evaluation of national veterinary services, which play a key role in improving animal health and the safety of foods of animal origin, was one of the tools discussed and recommended at the STDF workshop on SPS-related capacity evaluation tools held in March 2008 (see paragraph 63).

85. According to the *ex post* evaluation, Project STDF 15: OIE Training for trainers, was run successfully and largely met its objectives. The training provided was the right answer to both beneficiary needs and the institutional context at the time. The project's activities and outputs were delivered as planned, on time and within budget, while important cost and other synergies were created by the combination of ongoing WTO training with the project's activities. The training appears to have made a real difference to the awareness levels and day-to-day work of participants.

The benefits of the project were found to continue after the end of the training, both at the individual participant level and at the institutional level. The evaluator concluded that the main lessons to be drawn from this project were the need for a sustained training effort towards the achievement of long-term results and the need to pursue in parallel other critical success factors, such as good governance and capacity improvements. On the basis of the findings, it was recommended to the STDF and the wider donor community to *inter alia* continue funding training activities, to further focus the content of future training and to explore possible synergies between training activities on a project-by-project basis. A further proposal for such training was submitted to the STDF (STDF 219), but this was not approved, since it was considered that such training is the responsibility of the OIE and OIE should use its own resources to fund it or seek funding elsewhere. OIE disagrees with this conclusion and considers that the STDF has been inconsistent in dealing with proposals on training in the areas of animal health and plant health.

86. According to the *ex post* evaluation, the objectives of STDF Project 37: Assistance to developing countries in the implementation of International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) 15 (Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade), a standard adopted by the IPPC in March 2002, were achieved and the increase in implementation of the standard could, at least partly, be attributed to the workshop and the training materials. Thus the project achieved the overall STDF goals, in particular measurable effect on market access, improved domestic, and where applicable regional, SPS situation and poverty reduction were achieved. The evaluation pointed out that providing opportunities for information exchange and interactive learning was a highly effective and sustainable means to achieve capacity building. However, more attention needed to be paid to dissemination of training materials, which in this case had not reached part of the target group.

87. STDF Project 56: Capacity Building for Implementation of the Codex Alimentarius Code of Good Practice for Animal Feeding supported the International Feed Industry Federation (IFIF), in collaboration with FAO, in preparing a detailed Feed Manual for the industry (to be translated into five languages) to support the uniform implementation of the Codex Alimentarius Code of Good Practice for Animal Feeding, and in offering workshops and training to feed producers and industries in developing countries. The *ex post* evaluation concluded that the intended outputs were only partly achieved, as various elements in the project had not materialised. In particular, the Feed Manual was (and still is!) under development, despite the fact that the project has been terminated. At a joint IFIF/FAO meeting in Rome in October 2007 both organizations agreed to establish a work plan to finalise the manual expeditiously, but this work has still not been completed. Here there is a need for the STDF Secretariat to follow up this matter and ensure that the Feed Manual is finalised as soon as possible and distributed to relevant stakeholders. Although this project did not achieve all of its objectives, benefits were obtained through the workshops which increased awareness of the feed industry to the Guidelines and also helped the industry in some developing countries to better organise itself to implement the guidelines.

88. The lessons learnt from the *ex post* evaluations of STDF-funded projects nos. 14, 37 and 56 and the associated recommendations of the Secretariat are summarised in STDF document 205. The recommendations have been or are being implemented by the STDF and this has led to improved project proposal review and project cycle management. The present evaluator agrees with the conclusions drawn in STDF 205 and the recommendations.

89. Project 89 supported the FAO/IPPC International Plant Health Risk Analysis Workshop, held in Niagara Falls, Canada on 24-28 October 2005 and Project 120 supported the Plant Health Risk Analysis Regional Workshop, held in Chennai, India, 5-9 March 2007. The *ex post* evaluations of these two STDF Projects were carried out together as they both had, as a core component, the development of a package of training material for pest risk analysis under the IPPC. The same

consultant also carried out a preliminary evaluation of the IPPC "Training material on pest risk analysis based on IPPC standards".

90. The evaluation of Project 89 concluded that the workshop had been very successful and that the participants (73, over 50%, of them from developing countries) were hugely satisfied with it. The majority of the aims of the workshop were achieved and responses to a follow-up questionnaire indicated that the participants had disseminated the information they had received and used it in their work when they returned to their home countries. The evaluation of Project 120 also indicated that the workshop in India had been successful and achieved most of its aims. The IPPC training material on pest risk analysis based on IPPC standards includes a package of material for a five-day training course, consisting of three manuals (one each for participants, group exercises and instructors), Powerpoint presentations and speakers notes. The training package provides a comprehensive introductory course to plant health risk analysis, but need to be further developed so that they may be tailored to different audiences.

91. The evaluator's overall conclusion was that the projects had been successfully delivered on time and, as far as could be assessed, within budget and recommended that the further development of IPPC pest risk analysis training should be supported.

92. In addition to the above ex post evaluations of STDF projects which provide documented evidence of the impact, some general information about the positive effects of ongoing STDF projects has been obtained from brief interviews several developing country representatives during 6-8 October 2008. Several of the interviewees have reported that a positive side-effect of the initiation of STDF-funded projects has been much better coordination at the national level between the different government departments and agencies concerned with SPS issues. In some cases this has led to the creation of national coordination committees involving both the public and private sector. In others increased awareness at the political level of the importance of complying with SPS-related standards in order to gain access to foreign markets has led to activities to modernise legislation and to the allocation of greater resources to strength national infrastructure for the control of animal and plant health and food safety.

93. It is considered to be outside the terms of reference of the present review to carry out *ex post* evaluations of all the other completed STDF projects. Such evaluations are planned and provision for such evaluations must now be made part of all approved STDF projects. However, evaluation of completed projects is currently being delayed due to the lack of appropriately qualified and independent consultants to carry out the work. The STDF Secretariat is attempting to solve this problem, but needs more input from the Working Group members and observers and their organisations.

Operational Plan 2008-2009 and Medium-term Strategy

94. The Medium Term Strategy of the STDF (2007-2011) is presented in document STDF 154 and the Operating Plan 2008-2009 in STDF 198 rev.2.

95. Although the STDF is just less than halfway through the its current biennium, it seems to be well on track to complete the activities shown in the Operational Plan 2008-2009, providing the funding situation can be improved to at least meet the funding target of 5 million US\$ per year. Apart from the recommendations given below, this reviewer sees little reason to change the Medium Term Strategy of the STDF (2007-2011).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

96. The overall performance of the STDF is judged by almost all stakeholders to be good and in many important areas very good. It carries out an important role that no other single body would be able to accomplish. The participation of the five partner organizations, the donors and the observer organizations means that it has access to expertise in a large number of SPS- and development-related areas, including the secretariats of three standard setting bodies (Codex, the IPPC and the OIE) specifically recognised by the SPS Agreement.

97. The performance of the Secretariat is highly rated by virtually all stakeholders (except the OIE and WHO, two of the five partners) and by this reviewer. It works as a team with good internal communication and networking abilities, has established a reputation for responding rapidly and professionally to questions addressed to it and is perceived as hard-working, dedicated and motivated. These characteristics are important for the Secretariat of an organisation trying to coordinate with a large number of different stakeholders with different fields of interest and priorities. Although it has hitherto worked both effectively and efficiently, the Secretariat's resources were earlier inadequate to perform the wide range of tasks it was given under the Operational Rules and the situation was not sustainable. The current increased staffing level is considered adequate for its current needs.

98. One way in which the STDF makes efficient and effective use of its resources is by arranging many of its activities back-to-back with or together with meetings organised by organizations such as the WTO (SPS Committee), Codex, the OIE and the IPPC, thus saving considerable expenditure on travel and at the same time reaching large numbers of people who might otherwise be difficult to reach. However, the STDF could liaise more with donors and participate more often in their meetings.

99. The Secretariat's contacts with broader cooperation programmes, in particular the EIF and Aid for Trade, have improved since last year and the Aid for Trade regional workshops and are now judged to be very useful. The three regional reviews in Central America, East Africa and a sub-group of ASEAN countries have been successful in identifying SPS-related needs and raising the profile of the STDF. The STDF's work with the overview of the SPS needs and assistance to eight LDCs is still ongoing, but the reports presented so far show that it is doing a good job.

100. There is a need for the Secretariat to improve its information to donors on its contacts with EIF and Aid for Trade and to improve coordination with organizations working specifically in the SPS area. Up to now, there has been close contact between the STDF Secretariat and the EIF since a member of its staff has worked 50% of his time for the STDF and the remainder for the EIF. However, this situation has recently changed with the creation of a separate EIF Secretariat, albeit administratively housed in WTO, and it is important that the close cooperation between STDF and EIF be maintained.

101. The STDF is working closely with a large number of organizations to promote a coordinated response to the spread and control of various fruit fly species of economic importance in West Africa. This is a good example of an issue which affects many countries in Africa, with severe effects on trade. Many donors and developing countries are involved and it may well lead to one of the biggest coordinated actions so far involving the STDF.

102. The STDF recognises the importance of involving both public and private sectors in work to help developing countries to meet SPS-related standards in order to gain and maintain access to international markets and it encourages participation of both sectors in its activities. However, it needs to establish close contacts with the TSPN and provide STDF stakeholders with information on TSPN activities, so that duplication of effort can be avoided and synergies between the STDF and the TSPN can be explored.

103. The Secretariat's contacts with most of the STDF partners, observers, donor members and beneficiary representatives is good or very good, but there is an urgent need to improve relations with OIE, WHO and UNCTAD.

104. The Secretariat's reporting on technical cooperation activities of bilateral and multilateral donors and developing countries has improved, but there is still considerable room for improvement. The Secretariat has promised to produce a compendium of SPS-related assistance providers, but this work has hitherto received low priority and the compendium has not yet been produced.

105. The Secretariat's dissemination of information on the STDF and STDF projects via the SPS Committee has generally been good. It is important that the Secretariat makes good use of the fact that SPS Committee meetings attract representatives of a large number of countries and provide a golden opportunity for the STDF to spread information about its work and projects.

106. The Secretariat's dissemination of information on the STDF and STDF projects via the website and the STDF Newsletter is generally good, bearing in mind that the website has been running for a relatively short time and the Newsletter was only started in 2008. However, there is considerable room for improvement of the website to make it more comprehensive, up-to-date and user-friendly, particularly for French and Spanish speakers. In addition to documents on STDF projects and other STDF activities, the website could also contain information about the work of bilateral and multilateral donors in SPS-related areas, e.g. the compendium, when it is produced. The Secretariat should give priority to improving the website, since it is a very important source of information for stakeholders and can be even more important if improved. A comprehensive, up-to-date and user-friendly website could take some of the information supply load off the shoulders of the Secretariat. Stakeholders want to be able download as many STDF documents, both current and those produced earlier, as possible from the website.

107. The Newsletter is new for 2008 and is much appreciated by stakeholders, especially for the information it contains about ongoing and planned SPS-related activities of the STDF and its partners. It provides a useful way of spreading information not only to those already involved in the STDF, but also to a wide range of organizations, including potential donors, that the STDF should interest in its work.

108. The STDF was established relatively recently and still unknown to many people working in the areas of animal and plant health and food safety and in the development donor community. Although information about the STDF is disseminated via the SPS Committee and the Facility has its own website and now a Newsletter, there is a need to make its existence and activities more widely known and to raise its profile.

109. The Secretariat's identification and dissemination of good practices in the request, provision and receipt of SPS-related technical cooperation has improved in recent years and the workshop held at WTO on 6 October 2008 on Good Practices in SPS-related Technical Assistance provided a very useful summary of its work in this area. It is important that the conclusions from the workshop are widely disseminated, especially to those responsible for planning and implementing technical assistance. However, the identification of good practices is an area that needs much more development and is dependent on input from many sources outside of the Secretariat.

110. The Secretariat's performance in organising regional workshops and consultations aimed at improving coordination between STDF stakeholders is good. The three regional workshops, organised in Central America, East Africa and the Mekong Delta, have been very useful in enhancing collaboration between donors active in these regions. The organization of further such workshops should be a priority for the STDF and several beneficiary countries in other regions, e.g. West Africa and Southern Africa, would certainly welcome such workshops. Such workshops have also an

important role to play in stimulating cooperation between countries in a region with similar SPS-related needs.

111. The Secretariat's work in helping to identify possible projects in the area of food safety, animal and plant health for STDF funding is appreciated by many developing countries. However, in line with importance of development country ownership of technical assistance projects emphasised in the Paris Declaration, it is important that the Secretariat's role is, through discussion at the national level, to help developing countries to identify projects in areas which they have given priority, rather than to promote projects that it considers should be given priority (either of its own conception or that of partner organizations).

112. The Secretariat's assistance to LDCs and others in preparing applications for Project Preparation Grants (PPGs) is highly rated and much appreciated by developing countries lacking in technical and other expertise needed to develop such proposals.

113. Since the beginning of 2006, the STDF has been successful in attracting a large number of project (80) and PPG (31) applications and it has laid down a set of strict criteria for evaluating their eligibility for STDF funding in its Operational Rules. The STDF has now a rich portfolio of projects and PPGs covering a wide range of SPS-related issues, from broad basic projects aimed at stimulating awareness at the national level of the importance of being able to meet SPS-related requirements to narrower, more technical projects aimed at finding solutions to specific problems preventing access of a product to international markets.

114. The Secretariat's review of applications for STDF funding is judged to be good by almost all stakeholders (except OIE, WHO and UNCTAD) and by the present evaluator. The Secretariat reviews each project and PPG application to check that it is complete and fulfils the criteria laid down by the Policy Committee. The results of the review are presented in detail in working documents provided to participants in each Working Group meeting as a basis for the discussions and decisions on the funding of projects/PPGs. In addition to presenting the results of its review of the funding applications, the Secretariat also proposes that the Working Group should approve certain applications and discuss or reject others. However, it is important to note that it is the Working Group and not the Secretariat that makes final decisions on funding. Which projects should be funded is currently the subject of considerable debate within the Working Group, which may have negative effects on the working of the STDF as a whole, and it is therefore important that the issue be dealt with by the Policy Committee as soon as possible. Among the issues that need discussion are the current Operational Rules on funding of projects proposed by countries other than LDCs/OLIEs, funding of projects proposed by STDF partners or implementing organizations and prioritisation when there is a shortage of funds.

115. There is currently an imbalance between the number of projects/PPGs being funded by the STDF in different areas, with considerably fewer animal health projects being funded than projects in the other areas (SPS in general, plant health and food safety). According to the Secretariat, this is due in part to the fact that fewer applications in the animal health area have been submitted. It is up to the Policy Committee to decide if this imbalance should be allowed to continue and, if not, what action should be taken to remedy it.

116. The Secretariat's project administration and follow-up is generally good but there is a need for better information to stakeholders, including donors, on the results of such follow-up. The Secretariat's contacts with agencies implementing and/or overseeing the implementation of STDF-funded projects are generally good but there is a need for better information flow between the Secretariat and some implementing agencies on issues such as the revision of projects after they have been approved by the Working Group.

117. The STDF is currently facing serious funding constraints and is unable to fund all the projects it approves, at least not at the time it approves them and in some cases not at all. This causes delays in implementation and frustration among those who have produced good project proposals. More work needs to be done to broaden the donor base and also to try to get longer-term commitments from donors. The Secretariat is making considerable efforts to obtain further contributions from current donors and also working intensively to identify other potential donors to the Fund. The DVD now under development may help in this respect, when it is finalised.

118. The documentation for Working Group and Policy Committee meetings is generally regarded as good, but the Secretariat should consult with the participants of these meetings to see if there are ways of making it even better. The Secretariat's preparation for and servicing of Working Group and Policy Committee meetings has improved and is now good. However, in some cases the documents arrive rather late, which makes it difficult for some participants to prepare adequately for meetings. One way to address this issue may be to push back the final date for submission of applications beyond the current 45 day deadline – perhaps to 60 days. Working Group meetings include both information and decision agenda items and the information items are discussed before decision items. In the opinion of this reviewer this order should be reversed

119. The financial administration is carried out jointly by the STDF and in-house WTO financial services and according to WTO financial rules and gives rise to no concerns. The financial reporting is considered by most stakeholders to be good. However, it would be more transparent if the amount of funds committed, but not disbursed, at the end of each financial year was shown in the annual report. The practice of maintaining each donor's funds in a separate account and each year showing the amount still unspent causes some problems for some donor country representatives seeking to obtain further funds at the national level and is otherwise of little value.

120. The six STDF projects that have been the subject of an *ex post* evaluation were reviewed. One of them (STDF 14) resulted in the development and testing of a tool to evaluate national veterinary services and this has subsequently been used in many developing countries. STDF project 15 (OIE Training for Trainers) was run successfully and largely met its objectives. A project (STDF 37), aimed at assisting developing countries in the implementation of an IPPC standard on regulating packaging material in international trade, was very successful and achieved the overall STDF goals. Two other projects (STDF 89 and 120) on the development of tools for plant pest risk analysis were successfully completed. The fifth project (STDF 56) aimed at capacity building for implementation of the Codex Alimentarius Code of Good Practice for Animal Feeding, was only partly successful. The lessons learnt from the *ex post* evaluations have led to improved STDF project proposal review and project cycle management.

121. Although the STDF is just less than halfway through the current biennium, it seems to be well on track to complete the activities shown in the Operational Plan 2008-2009, providing the funding situation can be improved to at least meet the funding target of CHF 5 million per year. Apart from the recommendations given below, this reviewer sees little reason to change the Medium Term Strategy of the STDF (2007-2011).

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

122. It is recommended that the Policy Committee as soon as possible, and preferably already at its meeting in December 2008, reviews the current Operational Rules regarding the funding of projects involving the partners. In addition, it should review and clarify its policy regarding the funding of projects in countries other than LDCs and OLIEs, and at different stages of development, in particular the issue of prioritisation when funds are insufficient.

123. There is currently an imbalance between the number of projects/PPGs being funded by the STDF in different areas, with considerably fewer animal health projects being funded than projects in the other areas (SPS in general, plant health and food safety). It is recommended that the Policy Committee decide whether this situation should be allowed to continue and, if not, what action should be taken to remedy it. In addition the Committee should decide whether or not improving public health should be regarded as a separate area or that improvements in public health should be regarded as an indirect effect of improvements in the other areas, in particular food safety.

124. It is recommended that the Secretariat renew and intensify its efforts to expand the current donor base and to obtain longer-term funding commitments from donors. If increased funding cannot be obtained, the Policy Committee should discuss whether to assign a greater proportion of funding to PPGs and coordination activities.

125. *Ex post* evaluation of completed STDF-funded projects is an important part of the assessment of the results and impact of STDF's work, but is currently being delayed due to the lack of suitably qualified independent consultants to carry out the task. Therefore it is recommended that the STDF Working Group members and observers and their organizations renew their efforts to supply the Secretariat with the names of suitably qualified persons to carry out such evaluations.

126. In order to improve information exchange and to make more efficient use of the time at Working Group meetings, it is recommended that a) all STDF partners, donors and observers provide brief information on their on-going and planned SPS-related activities to the Secretariat in advance of Working Group meetings and this information be included in the working documents for the meeting; b) any Working Group participant having doubts about technical issues in project/PPG applications should inform the Secretariat of this in advance, so that such issues can be resolved before the meeting, if possible and, c) agenda items requiring decisions should be dealt with during the early part of meetings, rather than towards the end of meetings, which is the current practice.

127. It is recommended that all the partners, and in particular the WTO, and the STDF donors and observers make a greater effort to increase the visibility of and to promote the STDF.

128. It is recommended that WTO approaches OIE and WHO with a view to concluding agreements for implementation oversight services in support of the STDF, as has already been done with FAO, the ITC and the World Bank.

129. It is recommended that, in choosing organisations to implement or oversee the implementation of its projects, the STDF gives preference to those with relevant qualifications and experience in the area covered by the project and a proven track record in such work. Furthermore, it would be an advantage to use organizations that have already good contacts with the relevant national bodies, which should facilitate both project implementation and institutional follow-up. In addition, it is recommended that the STDF seek ways to broaden its current base of implementing organizations.

130. It is recommended that, as a matter of priority, the Secretariat update, expand and improve its website, including the introduction of a search tool, and taking into account the comments in paragraph 26 of the present report. The newly started Newsletter should be evaluated after a period of 2-3 years.

131. It is recommended that the STDF Secretariat should introduce an on-line system to enable it to better manage the various activities for which it has responsibility, in particular tracking progress in the various projects from the initial application to the receipt of the final report. This should include a system to automatically alert the Secretariat to upcoming deadlines for contracting and interim and final project reports. Furthermore, it should improve its document identification and handling system and ensure, amongst other things, that the cover page of each STDF document shows the date on

which it was finalised /adopted and the author(s). The system currently used for SPS Committee documents could be used as a model. Draft documents should be clearly identified as such and copies of important e-mails should be included in the documentation system.

132. It is recommended that the Secretariat examine ways to ensure close cooperation between itself and the newly established EIF Secretariat. It should also expand its information to stakeholders on its contacts with the broader cooperation programmes, in particular the EIF and Aid for Trade. Furthermore, it should expedite its production of a compendium of SPS-related assistance providers.

133. It is recommended that the Secretariat should establish closer contacts with the TSPN and provide STDF stakeholders with information on TSPN activities, so that duplication of effort can be avoided and synergies between the STDF and the TSPN explored.

134. Regional workshops should be a core activity of the STDF and it is recommended that the Secretariat develop plans for further regional workshops similar to the three already held, in other regions, including West and Southern Africa. It should also ensure that the results of the recent workshop on good practices in the request, provision and receipt of SPS-related technical assistance be disseminated to all relevant stakeholders.

135. It is recommended that the Secretariat improve its information to stakeholders, in particular donors, on its follow-up of ongoing projects.

Appendix 1: Terms of reference for the review of the STDF for the review of the STDF

Objective

1. The objective of the evaluation is to review the performance of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) in accordance with the STDF Operating Rules.²

Background

2. The STDF was formally established in August 2002 as a partnership and a Trust Fund by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), the World Bank, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). In 2005, membership was expanded to include donors contributing funds to the STDF as well as representatives of developing country beneficiaries. In 2007, observer status was granted to the International Trade Centre (ITC), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).

3. The STDF is funded through voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund established under the financial regulations and rules of the WTO. The STDF Secretariat is located at the WTO and bound by its legal and fiduciary rules. The STDF Policy Committee decides on policy and strategy. The STDF Working Group is responsible for preparing and approving work programmes, approval of grants, oversight of the Secretariat, etc.

4. A first independent evaluation of the operation of the Facility was completed in December 2005. The evaluation concluded that:

- the STDF had proven successful in attracting resources and approving projects, but faced challenges in securing sustained donor financing;
- it had actively exploited synergies with other programmes (notably the Integrated Framework);
- it had exceeded the target to devote 40 per cent of Facility resources to projects in LDCs or OLIEs; and
- the STDF Secretariat needed to be strengthened given the very wide range of roles undertaken and to reconsider its project management functions.

5. To respond to conclusions of the evaluation, in December 2006 the Policy Committee adopted a Medium Term Strategy (2007-11) for the STDF accompanied by a revised set of Operational Rules. To implement the Strategy, operating plans were developed and adopted for 2007 and 2008-09, respectively, and an annual target level of funding was established at US\$5 million.

Evaluation criteria

6. Performance shall be measured against the aims established for the Facility. The aims of the STDF are:

- to assist developing countries enhance their expertise and capacity to analyze and to implement international sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) standards, so improving their

² Paragraph 92 of the Operational Rules (document STDF 139, as amended) stipulates that the Facility shall be evaluated every four years by an external reviewer appointed by the WTO after consultation of the STDF Working Group.

human, animal and plant health situation, and thus ability to gain and maintain market access; and

- to act as a vehicle for co-ordination among technical co-operation 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 co-operation.

7. In judging the performance of the STDF against its stated objectives, the following factors, *inter alia*, shall be considered:

Conclusions raising from the 2006 evaluation of the STDF;

- Impact of project and project preparation activities. Impact should be judged on the following criteria, *inter alia*:
 - Ex post evaluations of completed projects;
 - Status reports of on-going projects; and
 - Success in securing funding for projects developed from project preparation grant activities.
- Impact of co-ordination activities. Impact should be judged on the following criteria, *inter alia*:
 - Ability of STDF Aid for Trade activities to identify SPS needs, co-ordinate actions of donors and mobilize additional resources; and
 - Development of the STDF into a forum for the exchange of experience and the dissemination of good practice in relation to the provision and receipt of SPS-related technical co-operation.
- Performance of the Secretariat, *inter alia*:
 - Implementation of the Medium Term Strategy (2007-11) and related Operating Plans (2007, 2008-09);
 - Ability to attract resources for the Facility;
 - Administration of the Facility;
 - Servicing meetings of the Working Group and Policy Committee; and
 - Strengthening linkages established with related programmes, notably the Integrated Framework and the Aid for Trade Initiative;
- Performance within the STDF of the STDF partners, observers, donors and representatives of developing countries, notably in respect of their tasks and responsibilities as agreed in the Operational Rules.

8. In drawing conclusions on the performance of the STDF, the consultant will be invited to provide comments on the activities established in the Medium Term Strategy for the STDF (2007-11) and any changes which the consultant considers appropriate to meet the stated objectives of the Facility.

Methodology

9. The evaluation shall be conducted as a "desk study" supplemented by survey questionnaires and (telephone) interviews with the STDF team in Geneva, partner and observer organizations, donors

contributing funds to the STDF, as well as developing country representatives. In particular, the consultant will be invited to attend the STDF Working Group meetings in the week 6 October. The consultant shall also formally present the report to the meeting of the Policy Committee in the week of 15 December. Project beneficiaries and implementing organizations should also be contacted.

10. Where applicable, the evaluation shall be organized around standard evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and lessons learned.

11. Relevant documentation shall be made available to the evaluator by the STDF Secretariat upon request. This includes *inter alia* the following documents:

- Medium Term Strategy (STDF 154)
- Operational Rules (STDF 139, as amended)
- Operating Plans 2007 and 2008-09 (STDF 163 and 198)
- Funding Strategy (STDF 186)
- Annual report 2007 (STDF 208)
- First evaluation report (December 2005)
- Minutes of STDF Policy Committee and Working Group meetings
- Documentation on projects, including ex post evaluations, on-going status reports, agreements, exchanges of letters, etc.
- Any other documentation as may be required

Reporting

12. The evaluation report shall be in English and no longer than 30 pages. Additional information shall be confined to annexes. The report shall have the following outline:

- Executive summary (max .3 pages)
 - Overview of the report, highlighting the main conclusions and recommendations
- Introduction (max. 1 page)
 - Objective of the evaluation
 - Indication of independence of the evaluator from the STDF, partner and observer organizations, donors contributing funds to the STDF, developing country representatives, and project beneficiaries
- Methodology (max. 1 page)
 - Explanation of the methodology used and description of sources of information and stakeholders consulted
- Findings and analysis (max. 20 pages)
 - Findings and analysis for each of the evaluation criteria
 - Overall judgement covering relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the STDF programme
- Conclusions and recommendations (max. 5 pages)
 - Main conclusions following from the findings and analysis
 - Recommendations, i.e. actionable proposals for the future development of the STDF

Timing and dissemination

13. The evaluator shall circulate a draft report for comment to the STDF Working Group by no later than Friday 24 October 2008. On the basis of comments received, a final draft shall be delivered to the WTO Secretariat by Friday 7 November. The final evaluation report shall be submitted and presented to the STDF Policy Committee meeting to be held in the week of 15 December 2008.

14. Following endorsement by the Policy Committee, the report shall be made publicly available through circulation to the WTO Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Committee), the STDF website, and other fora, as appropriate.

Appendix 2: List of persons responding to questionnaires and interviewed

Name	Organization/Country
Questionnaire responders	
Takeuchi Masami	FAO (Partner)
Sarah Kahn	OIE (Partner)
John E. Lamb	World Bank (Partner)
Awa Aidara-Kane	WHO (Partner)
Katie Kavanagh	Canada (Donor)
Sofie Hermann Flensburg	Denmark (Donor)
Hans Joostens	European Commission (Donor)
Vera Dienemann	Germany (Donor)
Margareta Davidson-Abdelli	Sweden (Donor)
Tim Leyland	UK (Donor)
Joe Hain	USA (Donor)
Carlos Correa Messuti	Uruguay. Representative of the developing countries
Larry R. Lacson	Philippines. Representative of the developing countries
Jennifer Rathebe	Commark. Representative of the developing countries
Ludovica Ghizzoni	International Trade Centre (ITC)(Observer)(STDF 69)
Djidiak Faye	UNCTAD (Observer) (STDF 65)
Sidney Suma	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
Henry Moriya Bertoni	Paraguay (STDF 19)
Khadijah Kassachoon	Common Market for Eastern & Southern Africa(COMESA)
Peter Muvara	Rwanda (STDF 145)
Jean Martin Etoundi	Cameroon (STDF 255)
Lilakshini de Mel	Sri Lanka
Shree Ram Ghimire	Nepal (STDF 170)
Bakoué Jean Paul Karama	Burkina Faso (STDF 255)
Jorge Mario Gómez Castillo	Guatemala
Medhat El-Helepi	East African Community (EAC)
H.K. Catherine Hounwanou	Benin
Alhoussynou Moctar Hanne	Senegal (STDF 255)
Shasi Sareen	Food Safety Asia
Woan-Ru Lee	Chinese Taipei
Mohamed Sidibé	Mali
Magda González Arroyo	Costa Rica
Other persons supplying information	
Harsha V. Singh	WTO (Partner)
Anabel Gonzalez	WTO (Partner)
Valentine Rugwabiza	WTO (Partner)
Gretchen Stanton	WTO (Partner)
Bernard Vallat	OIE (Partner)
Gaston Funes	OIE (Partner)

Name	Organization/Country
Jürgen Schlundt	WHO (Partner)
Kazuaki Miyagishima	Secretary of the Codex Alimentarius Commission
Jeffrey Jones	IPPC Secretariat (STDF 255)
Kees Van Der Meer	World Bank (Consultant)
Spenser Henson	University of Guelph (Consultant)
Jean Baptiste Bahama	InterAfrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR)
Bruce Mukunda	Common Market for Eastern & Southern Africa(COMESA)
Sothoeun Suon	Cambodia (Aid for Trade Asia)
Souklatsamy Vongsack	Lao PDR (Aid for Trade Asia)
Bui Thi Cuc	Viet Nam (Aid for Trade Asia)
Daniel Orellana	USDA (Aid for Trade Central America)
Ricardo Molins	International Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture(IICA)
Edmundo Toro Vallecillo	Honduras (Aid for Trade Central America)
Samuel Moreno Peralta	Panama (Aid for Trade Central America)
Bernard Nizigiyimana	Burundi (STDF 113)
Dieudonné Simbakira	Burundi (STDF 113)
Ousmane Bah	Guinea (STDF 65)
Zalhata Dahalane	Comoros (STDF 242)
Aboubakar Diarra	Mali (STDF 146+ 255)
Mohamed Sidibé	Mali (STDF 146+ 255)
Amnath Bipin Menon	India (STDF 120)
Chanchal Chand Sarkar	India (STDF 120)
Henry Moriya Fujikatsu	Paraguay (STDF 19)
Claudia Luz Solano Ore	Peru (STDF 20)
Ibrahim Samie	Sierra Leone (STDF 191+ 255)
Daniel Eklu	ECOWAS (STDF 255)
Jean-René Cuzon	West African Economic and Monetary Union (STDF 255)
Kolado Bocoum	West African Economic and Monetary Union (STDF 255)
Aichatou Mamadou	Niger (STDF 255)
Anut Visetrojana	Thailand
Yawo Sefe Gogovor	Togo (STDF 255)
Ali Mohamed al Habshi	Yemen (STDF 69)
Monica Olsen	Sweden (STDF 114)
Steinar Svanemyr	Norway (Donor)

Appendix 3: List of documents

Document reference and title
STDF Documents
STDF Working Group Meeting Report, 14 May 2003
STDF 25 Working Group Meeting Report, 12-13 November 2003
STDF 32 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 10-11 March 2004
STDF 42 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group and Policy Committee Meeting, 9 and 10 September 2004
STDF 43 Summary Report of the STDF Donor Roundtable Meeting, 10 September 2004
STDF 60 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 9 March 2005
STDF 112 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 6-7 September 2005
STDF 76 add.1 Review of the STDF - Triple Line Consulting – 1 December 2005
STDF 128 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 3 February 2006
STDF 131 Overview of STDF Accounts and Activities at Year End 2005
STDF 139 Rev.1 Operational Rules of the Standards and Trade Development Facility – December 2006
STDF 150 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 8-9 June 2006
STDF 154 Medium Term Strategy (2007-2011) - December 2006
STDF 162 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 16-17 October 2006
STDF 163 Standards and Trade Development Facility Operating Plan 2007
STDF 167 Summary Report of the STDF Policy Committee Meeting, 18 December 2006
STDF 175 (Aid for Trade)
STDF 183 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 2 March 2007
STDF 184 Overview of STDF Accounts and Activities at Year End 2006
STDF 186 STDF Funding Strategy. Background Note
STDF 196 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 29 June 2007
STDF 198 rev.2 Operating Plan 2008-2009
STDF 199 Overview of PPG and project grant applications for consideration at the STDF Working Group
STDF 199 add.1 Overview of PPG and project grant applications accepted for consideration at the STDF Working Group
STDF 205 Evaluation of STDF Projects – Lessons Learnt
STDF 207 Overview of implementation status of ongoing projects and PPGs, (October 2007)
STDF 208. Standards and Trade Development Facility, Annual Report 2007
STDF 212 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 7-8 November 2007
STDF 213 Summary Report of the STDF Policy Committee Meeting, 9 November 2007
STDF 229 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 4 April 2008
STDF 247 Overview of PPG and project grant applications for consideration at the STDF Working Group
STDF 247 add.1 Overview of PPG and project grant applications <u>not</u> accepted for consideration at the STDF Working Group
STDF 248 Terms of reference. Review of the STDF
STDF 249 STDF Working Group meeting 26 June 2008. Annotated agenda
STDF 252 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 26 June and 27 June 2008

Document reference and title
STDF 253 STDF and the Aid for Trade 2008-09. Discussion document
STDF 269 final STDF Working Group. Friday 10 October 2008. Agenda
STDF 270 Overview of SPS needs and assistance in eight Least Developed Countries
STDF 271 Overview of PPG and project grant applications for consideration at the STDF Working Group
STDF 272 Overview of PPG and project grant applications <u>not</u> accepted for consideration at the STDF Working Group
STDF 273 Overview of the status of implementation STDF projects and PPGs
STDF 274 Draft agenda for STDF Policy Committee meeting on 16 December 2008
STDF 275 STDF Working Group. Friday 10 October 2008. Annotated agenda
STDF 277 Summary Report of the STDF Working Group Meeting, 10 October 2008
STDF Newsletter
STDF Newsletter Vol. 1, Issue 1 - March 2008
STDF Newsletter Vol. 1, Issue 2 - June 2008
STDF Newsletter Vol. 1, Issue 3 - October 2008
Projects
STDF 005 Project Documentation (STDF Database)
STDF 009 Project Documentation (Asia Pacific)
STDF 010 Project Documentation (Turkey and Uganda)
STDF 013 Project Documentation (Mali, Ethiopia and Djibouti)
STDF 014 Project Documentation (Latin America & Caribbean)
STDF 015 Project Documentation (Mali, Thailand, Egypt, CIS, Latin America)
STDF 019 Project Documentation (Sri Lanka and Paraguay)
STDF 020 Project Documentation (Peru and Uganda)
STDF 037 Project Documentation (Global)
STDF 048 Project Documentation (Benin)
STDF 056 Project Documentation (Global)
STDF 062 Project Documentation (Cameroon)
STDF 065 Project Documentation (Guinea)
STDF 069 Project Documentation (Yemen)
STDF 079 Project Documentation
STDF 089 Project Documentation (Global)
STDF 100 Project Documentation (Cape Verde)
STDF 108 Project Documentation (Latin America and Caribbean)
STDF 113 Project Documentation (Burundi)
STDF 114 Project Documentation (Brazil)
STDF 120 Project Documentation (India)
STDF 126 Project Documentation (Tanzania)
STDF 127 Project Documentation (Benin)
STDF 133 Project Documentation (Pacific)
STDF 134 Project Documentation (Benin, Mauritania, Senegal, Sierra Leone and The Gambia)
STDF 145 Project Documentation (Rwanda)
STDF 146 Project Documentation (Mali)

Document reference and title
STDF 170 Project Documentation (Nepal)
STDF 171 Project Documentation (Kenya and East Africa)
STDF 173 Project Documentation (APEC Countries)
STDF 230 Project Documentation (Mozambique)
STDF 238 Project Documentation (Guatemala)
Project/PPG applications
STDF 116. Grant application form. Development and implementation of a traceability system in the livestock sector in Costa Rica
STDF 155 Grant application form. Market-oriented training service on standards application (MOTSSA) - Nicaragua
STDF 172 Grant application form. Expanding Nigeria's SPS capacity for seame seeds and shea nuts
STDF 219 Grant application form. Enhancing governance of veterinary services through improving their capacity to carry out essential functions
STDF 254 Grant application form. Mycotoxin prevention and control measures in Turkey for dried figs, hazlenuts and chilli peppar
STDF 255 Grant application form. Regional initiative on the fight against fruit flies in West Africa.
STDF 256 Grant application form. Capacity building for implementation of SPS compliant hygienic meat practices - Pakistan
STDF 257 Grant application form. Fish smoking installation - Surinmae
STDF 258 Grant (PPG) application form. ASEAN seminar-workshop on Codes of Practice for good animal feeding
STDF 259 Grant application form. Improve safety and quality for fresh vegetables through the value chain approach in Viet Nam
STDF 260 Grant application form. Estimating the Global Burden of Foodborne Diseases - WHO
STDF 261 Grant (PPG) application form. Lao PDR – establishment of a reference laboratory for enteric diseases
STDF 262 Grant (PPG) application form. Renforcement du controle des maladies animals et preparation à l'accès des viands sahéliennes aux marchés des pays de l'Afrique du Nord
STDF 263 Grant application form. Up-grading kakuuto ostrich mixed farm - Uganda
STDF 264 Grant application form. Feasibility study of establishing the FICC Codex Cell for Indian food processing SMEs
STDF 265 Grant application form. Brazil compartmentalization
STDF 266 Grant application form. Model program for SPS standards application and WTO-related negotiations - Brazil
STDF 267 Grant application form. Devising a national GAP programme and a commercial GAP standard in the Philippines.
STDF 268 Grant (PPG) application form. Strengthening the institutional framework for SPS management systems in Tanzania

WTO Documents	Date
G/SPS/GEN/371 The Standards and Trade Development Facility	18 February 2003
G/SPS/GEN/423 Operation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility	26 August 2003
G/SPS/GEN/486 Operation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) and Work Plan for 2004	21 April 2004
G/SPS/GEN/523 Adoption of the Standards and Trade Development Facility Business Plan, Call for Proposals and 2005 Workplan	21 October 2004
G/SPS/GEN/545 Review of Standards Related Issues Identified in the Integrated Framework Diagnostic Trade Integration Studies	28 February 2005
G/SPS/GEN/572 Update on the Operation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility	22 June 2005
G/SPS/GEN/595 Update on the Operation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility	7 October 2005
G/SPS/GEN/648 Update on the Operation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility	24 March 2006
G/SPS/GEN/718 Update on the Operation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility	31 July 2006
G/SPS/GEN/726 Overview of SPS-Related Technical Assistance Reported to the WTO/OECD Trade Capacity Building Database	4 October 2006
G/SPS/GEN/748 Update on the Operation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility	6 February 2007
G/SPS/GEN/774 Update on the Operation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility	8 May 2007
WT/AFT/W/26. WTO Work Programme on Aid-For -Trade	29 May 2007
G/SPS/GEN/812 Background Document from the Standards and Trade Development Facility for the Global Review of Aid for Trade	22 November 2007
G/SPS/GEN/816 Request for Information on Good Practice in SPS-Related Technical Cooperation	18 January 2008
G/SPS/GEN/821 Overview of SPS Capacity Evaluation Tools	15 February 2008
G/SPS/GEN/829 Update on the Operation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility	25 March 2008
G/SPS/R/48 Report of the STDF Workshop on SPS-Related Capacity Evaluation Tools, 31 March 2008	6 May 2008
G/SPS/GEN/847 Update on the Operation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility	17 June 2008
WT/COMTD/AFT/W/7, G/SPS/GEN/864 Mobilising Aid for Trade for SPS-Related Technical Cooperation – Conclusions from Pilot Activities of the Standards and Trade Development Facility	10/14 July 2008
WT/COMT/AFT/W/8 WTO Work Programme on Aid for Trade. Symposium on Monitoring and Evaluation Identifying Indicators for Monitoring Aid for Trade	2 September 2008
G/SPS/GEN/871 SPS/STDF/OECD Workshop on good practices in SPS-related technical cooperation. Good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation. East Africa Region Report	10 September 2008
G/SPS/GEN/872 SPS/STDF/OECD Workshop on good practices in SPS-related technical cooperation. Good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation. Greater Mekong Sub-region: Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam	10 September 2008

WTO Documents	Date
G/SPS/GEN/874 SPS/STDF/OECD Workshop on good practices in SPS-related technical cooperation. Good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation. Central America Sub-region: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama	26 September 2008
G/SPS/GEN/875 Good practice in SPS-related technical assistance. An overview and synthesis of the findings of STDF/OECD research	24 September 2008
G/SPS/GEN/877 Update on the Operation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility	26 September 2008
Framework agreement on the STDF between the WTO and FAO	
Interagency letter of agreement between the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the International Trade Centre (ITC)	
Framework agreement for oversight services in support of the STDF. (Agreement with International Bank for Reconstruction (IBRD) and the International Development Association (IDA), collectively referred to as the Bank.)	
Other documents	
Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness	
Aid for Trade at a Glance. 1 st Global review	

Table 1: Responses from 19 developing countries to the questionnaire on the performance of the STDF secretariat

	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very poor
Overall performance of the STDF Secretariat	7	6			
Coordination					
Contacts with broader cooperation programmes, in particular the Enhanced Integrated Framework and Aid for Trade Initiatives	5	6	1		
Contacts with the STDF partners, observers, donor members and beneficiary representatives	3	8	3		
Reporting on technical cooperation activities of bilateral and multilateral donors and developing countries	4	7	3		
Dissemination of information on the STDF and STDF projects via the SPS Committee	9	6			
Dissemination of information on the STDF and STDF projects via the STDF website and newsletter	9	6	3		
Identification and dissemination of good practices in the request, provision and receipt of SPS-related technical cooperation	3	10			
Organization of regional workshops and consultations aimed at improving coordination between STDF stakeholders	6	7	3	2	1
Project development and implementation					
Identification of possible projects in the area of food safety, animal and plant health for funding	4	5	6		
Assistance to LDCs and others in preparing applications for Project Preparation Grants (PPGs) and project funding	6	5	2	1	
Review of applications for STDF funding	6	4	2		
Project administration and follow-up	4	2	2	1	
Contacts with agencies implementing and/or overseeing the implementation of STDF-funded projects	4	4	3	1	
Funding of the STDF					
Contacts with current donors to the STDF Fund	4	6	2		
Identification of other potential donors to the STDF Fund	3	3	4		
Facility operation					
Documentation for the Working Group and Policy Committee meetings	6	7	1		
Preparation for and servicing of Working Group and Policy Committee meetings	5	6	1		
Financial administration	5	3	1		
Financial reporting	4	5	1		

Table 2: Seven donors' responses to the questionnaire on the performance of the STDF secretariat

	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very poor
Overall performance of the STDF Secretariat	4	2			
Coordination					
Contacts with broader cooperation programmes, in particular the Enhanced Integrated Framework and Aid for Trade Initiatives	2	5			
Contacts with the STDF partners, observers, donor members and beneficiary representatives	4	2	1		
Reporting on technical cooperation activities of bilateral and multilateral donors and developing countries	1	2	2	1	
Dissemination of information on the STDF and STDF projects via the SPS Committee	3	2	1		
Dissemination of information on the STDF and STDF projects via the STDF website and newsletter	2	3	1	1	
Identification and dissemination of good practices in the request, provision and receipt of SPS-related technical cooperation	1	4	1		
Organization of regional workshops and consultations aimed at improving coordination between STDF stakeholders	1	5			
Project development and implementation					
Identification of possible projects in the area of food safety, animal and plant health for funding	1	2	3		
Assistance to LDCs and others in preparing applications for Project Preparation Grants (PPGs) and project funding	2	2	1		
Review of applications for STDF funding	4	3			
Project administration and follow-up	2	4	1		
Contacts with agencies implementing and/or overseeing the implementation of STDF-funded projects	2	2	2		
Funding of the STDF					
Contacts with current donors to the STDF Fund	4	3			
Identification of other potential donors to the STDF Fund	2	3	2		
Facility operation					
Documentation for the Working Group and Policy Committee meetings	4	2	1		
Preparation for and servicing of Working Group and Policy Committee meetings	3	1	3		
Financial administration	4	1	1		
Financial reporting	4		2		

Table 3: Responses of FAO, OIE, WB, WHO, ITC & UNCTAD to the questionnaire on the performance of the STDF secretariat

	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very poor
Overall performance of the STDF Secretariat	2	1	1		
Coordination					
Contacts with broader cooperation programmes, in particular the Enhanced Integrated Framework and Aid for Trade Initiatives		3			
Contacts with the STDF partners, observers, donor members and beneficiary representatives	3	1	1	1	
Reporting on technical cooperation activities of bilateral and multilateral donors and developing countries	1	3	1	1	
Dissemination of information on the STDF and STDF projects via the SPS Committee		5			
Dissemination of information on the STDF and STDF projects via the STDF website and newsletter	2	4			
Identification and dissemination of good practices in the request, provision and receipt of SPS-related technical cooperation		2	2	1	
Organization of regional workshops and consultations aimed at improving coordination between STDF stakeholders	1	2	3		
Project development and implementation					
Identification of possible projects in the area of food safety, animal and plant health for funding	1	2		2	1
Assistance to LDCs and others in preparing applications for Project Preparation Grants (PPGs) and project funding	1	1	1	1	
Review of applications for STDF funding	2	1		2	1
Project administration and follow-up	1	2	1		
Contacts with agencies implementing and/or overseeing the implementation of STDF-funded projects	1	1	2		
Funding of the STDF					
Contacts with current donors to the STDF Fund	3		1		
Identification of other potential donors to the STDF Fund	2				
Facility operation					
Documentation for the Working Group and Policy Committee meetings	2	4			
Preparation for and servicing of Working Group and Policy Committee meetings	1	5			
Financial administration	2	1	1		
Financial reporting	2	2	1		

Table 4 : STDF-funded Project Preparation Grants (PPGs) and projects by area

Area	PPG nos.	Total PPGs	Project nos.	Total Projects	Total Projects and PPGs
SPS in general	61,65,(68),88, 127,191,234, 242	7(8)	5,10,19,20,56,65, 79,108,120,127, 170,238,246	13	20(21)
Plant health	66,102,103,126, 155,165,171, 221,232,268	10	37,89,126,133, 145,146,155,171, 230,255	10	20
Animal health	64,105,116, 265	4	13,14,15,(64),116	4(5)	8(9)
Food safety	38,46,52,62,63, 69,100,101, 113,172,223	11	9,48,62,69, 114,134,(172),173, 238	8(9)	19(20)
Total		32(33)		35(37)	67(70)

Please note:

1. Projects/PPGs which have been approved by the STDF Working Group but not yet contracted are included in the table.
2. In some cases the Projects/PPGs cover more than one area and only the main area is shown in the table.
3. Many PPGs have resulted in applications for projects that have been funded by the STDF (the STDF-number of the project is often, but not always, the same as the project number). Some projects developed from PPGs have been funded outside the STDF are not included in the above list of projects(e.g. STDF 66, 100 and 113).Some completed PPGs have resulted in applications for projects which have not been approved or funded by the STDF (PPGs 38, 46, 61, 100, 101 and 265).
4. Project 64 was approved by the Working Group in September 2005 but approval was withdrawn in March 2007 and the applicant was invited to resubmit the project for funding. A final decision on whether or not to approve project STDF 172 is pending. Due to a delay of over two years in implementation, the Working Group withdrew approval for PPG 68 in 2007.

Table 5. Contributions received by the STDF by September 2008 (CHF)

STDF - Contributions Received (CHF)							
Donors	Years						Total
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
Australia			192,380				192,380
Canada			392,464		415,000		807,464
Denmark			1,066,285	743,050	758,026		2,567,361
Germany				238,500	247,350		485,850
European Commission						342,550	342,550
Finland						163,300	163,300
France		234,246					234,246
Ireland					334,200		334,200
Italy			312,000		328,700		640,700
Netherlands		459,900	468,000	466,500			1,394,400
Norway					205,910		205,910
Sweden			656,840	660,400	1,399,220		2,716,460
Switzerland						200,000	200,000
United Kingdom			1,903,065	225,400	1,187,500	485,925	3,801,890
United States				129,038	302,000		431,038
World Bank	417,000	720,000					1,137,000
WTO	100,000	100,000	150,000	225,000			575,000
Total	517,000	1,514,146	5,141,034	2,687,888	5,177,906	1,191,775	16,229,749