

**Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures**

**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON GOOD PRACTICE IN SPS-RELATED  
TECHNICAL COOPERATION**

Note by the Secretariat<sup>1</sup>

1. The WTO and OECD are collaborating closely in the monitoring of Aid for Trade. The initial results of this collaboration were presented during the First Global Review of Aid for Trade on 20-21 November 2007. As part of this on-going monitoring function, specific thematic research is being undertaken on particular issues identified during the 2007 review. In particular, research is being commissioned in the area of food safety, animal and plant health measures, collectively known as sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures.
2. The research on SPS measures is being conducted within the framework of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF). This work builds on initial surveys of SPS needs and the provision of assistance in three pilot regions: Central America, East Africa and the Greater Mekong Delta Sub-region. The initial findings were presented during the three regional reviews of Aid for Trade held in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The pilot countries in each region are as follows:
  - Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama;
  - Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda; and
  - Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Vietnam.
3. This work has a twofold objective:
  - To strengthen the link between "supply" and "demand" of SPS-related assistance by identifying gaps in the provision of assistance and catalyzing the further provision of assistance as necessary; and
  - To identify "good practice" in the delivery and receipt of SPS-related technical cooperation which may be replicated in future assistance activities. It is being done in collaboration with the OECD.
4. The aim of this document is to seek the assistance of WTO Members in the achievement of the second of these objectives: research on good practice. Further details on the first of these objectives will follow in a separate communication to the SPS Committee from the Secretariat.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

5. More specifically, we request that Members identify one or more SPS-related technical assistance projects in each of the aforementioned regions which could be considered to be "good practice". The projects chosen may have had SPS-assistance as a secondary part of a larger programme of assistance (e.g. on agricultural development, WTO accession, environmental protection or human health), or as its primary focus.

6. For each project identified, Members are kindly requested to complete the attached questionnaire and provide copies of final project documents and evaluations. On the basis of responses provided, field research will be conducted in each of the three regions to examine beneficiary analysis of the projects. A separate questionnaire will thus be circulated to beneficiaries in due course. The responses of donors and beneficiaries will then be compiled and general elements of good practice identified.

7. Results of this research will be presented at a joint STDF-OECD workshop on good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation. This workshop is tentatively scheduled to be held back-to-back with the SPS Committee meeting in October 2008

8. Members are requested to return the completed project questionnaires and related documentation to Mr Michael Roberts at the WTO Secretariat (e-mail: [michael.roberts@wto.org](mailto:michael.roberts@wto.org); fax: +41 22 739 5760) by **Friday, 29 February 2008**.

9. Please note that this same request is being circulated to OECD Development Assistance Committee contact points.

## QUESTIONNAIRE ON GOOD PRACTICE

A separate questionnaire should be completed for each project identified as good practice. The aim of the questionnaire is to examine elements of good practice at two levels:

- Project cycle: From project design to ex-post evaluation; and
- Assessment of outcomes or impacts on beneficiary's objectives: i.e. impact on market access, impact on the domestic burden of food-borne illness, impact on the pest or disease prevalence, impact on institutional capabilities, impact on beneficiary's capacity to implement the SPS Agreement, etc.

### General Project Information:

**Please provide the following general information on the project.**

Title :

Dates: beginning and end of the project

Funding: US \$ or other currency,  
(including information on 'in kind' services and/or equipment.)

Beneficiary: Specify the primary and secondary beneficiaries

Project type: Follow-up project ☐ Pilot project ☐ Stand alone new project ☐

## Project Cycle - Questions

### Design

#### (1) What issue(s) did the project seek to address?

Please check all relevant boxes.

Animal health? ☐ Food safety ? ☐ Plant health? ☐ General SPS capacity ? ☐

*If others, please specify:*

#### (2) Who initiated the project request?

Donor identified need? ☐ Request from beneficiary? ☐

#### (3) Who designed the project?

Donor? ☐ Donor and beneficiary in collaboration? ☐ Beneficiary ? ☐

*If other, please specify:*

#### (4) Was the project based on a needs assessment?

Yes ☐ No ☐

#### (5) Was the needs assessment specific to the problem being addressed (e.g. a specific capacity evaluation of animal health capabilities?)

Yes ☐ No ☐

or was it part a broader assessment of needs?

Yes ☐ No ☐

**(6) In the design of the project, was account taken of other relevant on-going or completed projects?**

No information available ☐ No relevant projects ☐ Project designed as a follow-on activity to previous assistance by donor ☐ Project designed as a follow-on activity to previous assistance by other donors ☐ Pilot project ☐

*Please specify:*

**(7) Please indicate to what extent you felt the preparation time and information gathering phase for the project was sufficient?**

☐ 0-20% ☐ 20-40% ☐ 40-60% ☐ 60-80% ☐ 80-100%

**(8) Please specify which beneficiaries or stakeholders, if any, were consulted during the project design phase.**

## Implementation

**(9) Who implemented the project?**

Donor ☐ Independent contractor ☐ Beneficiary ☐ International organization ☐

*If other, please specify*

**(10) To what extent did the beneficiary participate in implementation of the project?**

☐ 0-20%      ☐ 20-40%      ☐ 40-60%      ☐ 60-80%      ☐ 80-100%

**(11) In what way did the beneficiary contribute to the project implementation (for example through an in-kind contribution, joint implementation of activities etc.)?**

*Please specify*

**(12) Did difficulties arise with the beneficiary during implementation of the project?**

Yes ☐ No ☐

*If so, please specify the nature of the problem and how it was resolved.*

**(13) Who was responsible for monitoring the project?**

Donor ☐ Independent contractor ☐ Beneficiary ☐ International organization ☐

**(14) To what extent were the activities and outputs delivered according to the project cycle plan (e.g. on time and within the budget)?**

☐ 0-20%      ☐ 20-40%      ☐ 40-60%      ☐ 60-80%      ☐ 80-100%

**(15) What changes, if any, changes made during project implementation?**

Reallocation of ☐ Time extension to allow ☐ Supplement to original ☐  
budget items completion of activities project budget

*If others, please specify:*

**(16) If changes were made, at whose request were the changes made?**

Donor ☐ Contractor ☐ Beneficiary ☐

**Evaluation**

**(17) Was an evaluation of the project undertaken?**

Yes ☐ No ☐

*If so, please attach a copy of the evaluation to this questionnaire*

**(18) To what extent have the benefits of the project continued after funding has ceased?**

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐  
0-20% 20-40% 40-60% 60-80% 80-100%

**(19) To what extent did the beneficiaries have the necessary capacity to sustain benefits of the project?**

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐  
0-20% 20-40% 40-60% 60-80% 80-100%

**(20) Was the capacity to sustain outcomes assessed during the project design phase?**

Yes ☐ No ☐

## Outputs

(21) To what extent were the project objectives/outputs achieved?

☐ 0-20%      ☐ 20-40%      ☐ 40-60%      ☐ 60-80%      ☐ 80-100%

(22) What were the main factors determining the achievement of the objectives?

Please list :

## Achievement of higher order objectives

(23) Has any evaluation been made of the project's impacts on higher order objectives, such as institutional capacity, poverty alleviation, market access, burden of pest or disease, burden of food borne illness, etc...?

Yes ☐      No ☐      Don't Know ☐

*If not submitted under question (8), please attach a copy of the evaluation.*

*Please specify the projects alignment with the national social or economic development objectives.*



## Good practice

**(24) In what respect(s), can the project be described as an example of good practice?**

Project cycle ☐ Achievement of higher order objectives ☐

*Please explain:*

**(25) What aspect(s) of good practice from this project could be repeated e.g. in future projects in this issue, in future projects for this beneficiary and by the broader donor community?**

*Please explain:*

**(26) Please indicate to what extent was the project a cost-effective contribution to addressing the designated objectives?**

☐ 0-20%      ☐ 20-40%      ☐ 40-60%      ☐ 60-80%      ☐ 80-100%

---