

**Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures**

**OVERVIEW OF SPS CAPACITY EVALUATION TOOLS**

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

1. On 31 March 2008, the STDF will organize the first in a series of thematic workshops. The topic for this workshop is how to evaluate SPS needs. A variety of SPS capacity evaluation tools have been developed. These can be split into three broad categories: (i) specific tools (e.g. looking exclusively at a particular thematic area, for example plant health), (ii) generic tools (which look at the SPS system as a whole) and (iii) related tools which treat one aspect of the SPS area in a more general setting (e.g. the interface between food safety, health and trade). The tools discussed are those which have been developed by international organizations.<sup>2</sup> The workshop will also provide an opportunity to learn about other approaches and evaluation tools which may exist. A draft agenda for the workshop is provided in the Attachment of this document.

**SPECIFIC TOOLS**

**Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Tool**

2. One of the first SPS evaluation tools developed, the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE), originated from a pilot project conducted by New Zealand in 1999. The project developed a questionnaire for the assessment of phytosanitary capabilities, to identify needs and priorities. The original questionnaire was piloted in six countries (Cook Islands, Fiji, Solomon Islands, Indonesia, Bangladesh and Viet Nam). By the time of the last meeting of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) in April 2007, the PCE had been applied in more than 60 countries world-wide.

---

<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.

<sup>2</sup> This document uses hyperlinks to facilitate electronic access to background documents and websites. These linkages can only be accessed from an electronic copy of the document from a computer with a reliable internet connection. The documents can also be consulted through contacting the respective organizations.

### Countries where the PCE has been applied (November 2006)

Antigua and Barbuda	Estonia	Mexico	St. Vincent and the Grenadines
Bahrain	Gabon	Myanmar	Sudan
Barbados	Grenada	Nepal	Suriname
Belize	Guatemala	Nicaragua	Swaziland
Benin	Guinea Bissau	Niger	Tanzania
Bhutan	Guyana	Nigeria	Bahamas
Bolivia	Haiti	Oman	The Gambia
Burkina Faso	Honduras	Panama	Togo
Cambodia	India	Peru	Trinidad and Tobago
Colombia	Iran	Qatar	Uganda
Costa Rica	Jamaica	Saint Lucia	United Arab Emirates
Cote d'Ivoire	Kenya	Saudi Arabia	Venezuela
Dominica	Kuwait	Senegal	Viet Nam
Dominican Republic	Lao People's Democratic Rep.	St Lucia	Zambia
Ecuador	Mali	St. Kitts and Nevis	
El Salvador			

3. The PCE comprises 614 questions in 11 modules, and empty matrices for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis. This facilitates the prioritizing of actions and the construction of a logical framework. The primary focus is to examine the capacity of the National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) in relation to implementation of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) and the rights and responsibilities described in the International Plant Protection Convention. It has been agreed that PCE results should be kept confidential, unless a country wishes to use or present their PCE results externally.

4. At the CPM in 2007, [a review of the PCE was presented by CABI Africa](#). The report noted the positive impacts of the PCE with respect to its intended use, in particular on national strategic planning, justification for budgetary allocation, legal frameworks, training and awareness raising. Recommendations made by CABI will be discussed at the forthcoming [CPM on 7–11 April 2008](#). For the forthcoming discussion on the PCE at the CPM meeting, see document CPM 2008/4 at the IPPC website: <https://www.ippc.int/IPP>.

#### **Evaluation of Performance of Veterinary Services**

5. In 2003, the OIE began collaboration with the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) on capacity evaluation tools. The OIE, with funding from the STDF and the World Bank, developed the [OIE Tool for the Evaluation of Performance of Veterinary Services \(OIE PVS Tool\)](#). Standards of performance for national veterinary services have been in the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code (the Code) for more than ten years, based on the recognition by members that OIE standards are important to support the capability of national veterinary services.

6. The OIE PVS Tool is designed to help veterinary services establish their level of performance relative to the quality standards in the Code; to identify gaps and weaknesses; and to establish priorities for strategic initiatives to improve performance in key areas of veterinary services' activities. In the follow-up to a PVS Evaluation, the OIE works with members to develop proposals for investment by national and international donors to support projects to strengthen veterinary services.

7. The OIE-PVS Tool contains four fundamental components:
- (a) human, physical and financial resources, including the capacity to attract resources and retain professionals with appropriate technical and leadership skills;
  - (b) technical authority and capability to address current and new issues, including prevention and control of biological disasters based on scientific principles;
  - (c) sustained interaction with stakeholders, to stay on course and carry out relevant joint programmes and services; and
  - (d) ability to access markets through compliance with existing standards and the implementation of new disciplines, such as the harmonization of standards, equivalence, zoning and compartmentalization.

8. For each critical competency, qualitative levels of advancement are described. The criteria for advancement are based on critical competencies set out in the Code [Chapter 1.3.3](#), on the Evaluation of Veterinary Services and [Chapter 1.3.4](#), on the Guidelines for the Evaluation of Veterinary Services. OIE is also examining extending the PVS Tool to provide a similar framework for evaluating aquatic animal health services.

9. OIE PVS Evaluations are conducted at the request of an OIE member and performed by OIE-trained and certified experts, using the Manual for PVS Assessors to guide each step in the PVS review. The OIE does not publish or distribute the report without formal authorization from the member. To date, nine OIE members have given their agreement to a conditional release of PVS reports. The OIE is also producing guidelines for members requesting or considering a PVS Evaluation. The OIE aims to evaluate 105 OIE members within three years, using resources in the OIE Animal Health and Welfare Fund. Some 46 evaluations are currently on-going or completed.

### **Guidelines to assess capacity-building needs for national food control systems**

10. FAO's Guidelines assist countries to identify their capacity-building needs in the core components of a national food control system. The Guidelines focus on government agencies and food control authorities responsible for food safety and quality. They are based on a methodology for self-assessment of capacity-building needs and internationally accepted benchmarks and principles for each of the core components of a national food control system. The five modules of the Guidelines cover needs assessment in: (i) food control management; (ii) food legislation; (iii) food inspection; (iv) official food control laboratories; and (v) food safety and quality information, education and communication. Two guidelines have been published: strengthening national food control systems: Guidelines to assess capacity-building needs (2006) and Strengthening national food control systems: A quick guide to assess capacity-building needs (2007).

11. For more information, consult FAO webpage: [http://www.fao.org/ag/agn/agns/capacity\\_en.asp](http://www.fao.org/ag/agn/agns/capacity_en.asp).

### **GENERIC APPROACHES**

#### **FAO Biosecurity Toolkit**

12. Biosecurity is a strategic and integrated approach to analyzing and managing relevant risks to human, animal and plant life and health and associated risks to the environment. It is built on a recognition of the critical linkages between sectors and the potential for hazards to move across sectors, potentially with far-reaching cross-sectoral consequences. As such, biosecurity is thus central to the need to comply with the SPS Agreement.

13. [FAO's Biosecurity Toolkit](#) has been developed to support countries in developing and implementing national biosecurity frameworks in accordance with their international obligations and particular needs. It presents the benefits of a harmonized and integrated approach to Biosecurity, and illustrates the experiences of countries that have recently adopted such an approach.

14. The toolkit was published in 2007 and comprises three separate but related parts. The first part, Biosecurity principles and components, is an introductory text providing a contemporary context for the development and implementation of a harmonized and integrated biosecurity approach across all sectors. The second part is a guide to assess biosecurity capacity, which offers a process for assessing dimensions of biosecurity capacity across all sectors and sector organizations. The third part, an overview and framework manual for biosecurity risk analysis, presents a generic framework to structure and guide the application of risk analysis principles in biosecurity.

15. Three regional workshops (in Asia, South America and Africa) and an international training of trainers' course based on this Toolkit were held by FAO in 2007 and early 2008.

### **Food safety and agricultural health action plans**

16. In 2005, the World Bank published a report on "[Food Safety and Agricultural Health Standards, Challenges and Opportunities for Developing Country Exports](#)". This study noted that the capacity to comply with SPS requirements is a component of the overall competitiveness in agricultural trade. In line with this conclusion, the World Bank has increasingly integrated SPS issues into its operational work. Studies on agricultural competitiveness for Bangladesh, India and Pakistan looked at SPS issues affecting horticulture, fish, meat and livestock products. This trend was likewise reflected in recent Diagnostic Trade Integration Studies conducted as part of the Integrated Framework process (Lao P.D.R., Niger, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia) – with the inclusion of SPS capacity among the factors affecting a country's performance in agricultural trade.

17. Another World Bank activity has been the preparation of national strategies to build SPS capacity. Such stand-alone SPS action plans have been developed for Armenia, Lao P.D.R., Moldova, Viet Nam and Zambia. The five action plans deal with the cross-cutting nature and the different institutions involved in managing SPS risks. They aim to provide a comprehensive approach that looks at SPS capacity in both the public and private sectors for food safety, animal and plant health. The assessments identify gaps and weaknesses and discusses them in the light of estimated investment costs, existing and emerging hazards, domestic issues and trade performance. The country-based reports and action plans are available from the [World Bank SPS work](#) website.

### **Performance, Vision, Strategy - IICA**

18. IICA developed the Performance, Vision, Strategy (PVS) approach in collaboration with OIE, but has extended it beyond just the animal health area. Four different versions of the PVS have been developed to evaluate:

- (a) [national veterinary services](#) (in a strategic partnership with the OIE);
- (b) [national food safety services](#) (in partnership with the World Health Organization) and its Regional Office for the Americas (PAHO/WHO);
- (c) internationalization of government services (with support from the STDF); and,
- (d) [national plant health protection organizations](#) (applied in several countries).

19. More than a diagnostic tool, the PVS is meant to be a process geared to the future that can be used in a passive or active mode, depending on the level of interest and commitment of the users and the official services to improve national services over time. In the passive mode, the PVS instrument raises awareness, improves understanding, and teaches the different participating sectors the basic components and critical competencies needed for national food safety services to function adequately. In this mode, the instrument can also be used to develop a shared vision, foster dialogue, and adopt a common language for discussion.

20. In the active mode, performance is assessed, differences are explored, and priorities are established. Leadership from the public sector is critical to success. It is in the active mode that actions happen, investments are made, and commitments are fulfilled. Continuity of the PVS process is assured when a true partnership exists between the official and the private sectors. For more information, see the [IICA agricultural health homepage](#).

### **Cost-benefit analysis and SPS-related investment: STDF project**

21. An early project approved for STDF funding examined the use of cost-benefit analysis to decide between different priorities for investments in SPS capacity building. The project was piloted in two Members, Peru and Uganda. It involved the development of a generic cost-benefit analysis methodology and in-depth survey of the public and private sectors in both Members to examine SPS constraints. From this survey, a limited group of products and markets were chosen for further in-depth analysis and application of the cost-benefit analysis. SPS requirements for these products and markets were examined and a cost-benefit ratio for compliance was calculated. Within the generic cost-benefit analysis, consideration was given to direct benefits (e.g. increased export revenue) and to indirect benefits (e.g. increased employment, poverty alleviation, improved consumer health, etc.) – although the latter proved difficult to quantify.

22. Conservative scenarios were used for export market growth. The first scenario used was one of zero growth from 2005 export market revenues - reflecting the continuing SPS investment needed to maintain current market access. A second scenario of five per cent growth per annum on top of 2005 export market revenues was used. In Uganda, two products were selected for the cost-benefit analysis: fish and honey. For honey, the cost-benefit analysis showed rates of return in export revenue of between US\$60 per US\$1 invested (using the no-growth scenario) and US\$89 for US\$1 invested in SPS infrastructure (using the five per cent growth scenario). Returns on investment in fisheries were lower, at between US\$4 and US\$5 per US\$1 invested, although the export revenues generated were four times larger in absolute terms.

23. One objective of the project had been to use the cost-benefit analysis to assist policy makers in determining where the highest rates of return on SPS investment could be achieved and to direct resources accordingly. However, during the analysis it became clear that methodological problems made recommending specific investments difficult. Investments in particular elements of the national SPS infrastructure can benefit multiple export products. For example, a laboratory properly equipped for residue monitoring could provide tests results for both fish and honey exporters. The approach used focused on specific products rather than specific investments, and so made tracing the impact of specific investment decisions impossible.

24. The outcome of the analysis has been to generate useful "headline" numbers with which to examine the case for more public and private investment in SPS infrastructure. PROMPERU, the Peru Export and Tourism Promotion Board, is currently working on updating the cost-benefit analysis undertaken with a view to presenting the results to the national authorities and donors.

## **RELATED TOOLS**

### **Conformity assurance infrastructure - UNIDO**

25. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) uses a multifaceted approach to make SPS compliance measures effective in developing countries. This involves support for enterprises in the agro-industrial sector, assistance to governments and trade associations, as well as the development of the conformity assurance infrastructure. With respect to the conformity assurance infrastructure, UNIDO has strategic partnerships with international standards measurement and accreditation bodies, including the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC), International Accreditation Forum (IAF), International Bureau of Weights and Measures (BIPM) and the International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML).

26. UNIDO's approach starts from what it considers the necessary conformity assurance infrastructure including:

- (a) A National Standards Institute to formulate, harmonize and disseminate standards, including international ISO/IEC standards and for market surveillance for consumer protection;
- (b) National microbiology and chemical testing laboratories providing credible testing services;
- (c) A National Metrology Institute to establish measurement units and provide measurement traceability and testing for enterprises to assure precision manufacture and quality;
- (d) National Certification capacity to certify enterprises for ISO 9001, ISO 14001 and ISO 22000, train internal auditors to carry out the audits and ensure international acceptance of its certification; and
- (e) A National Accreditation Board to accredit testing laboratories using ISO 17025, accredit certification bodies and inspection bodies and to have its own accreditation capabilities accepted internationally.

For more details, see [UNIDO's Trade Capacity-Building Programme: SPS Compliance](#).

### **Diagnostic tool for analysis and assessment of trade and health**

27. WHO is working to develop a new trade and health diagnostic tool. This project stems from a resolution adopted at the [59th WHO Health Assembly](#) resolution to assist WHO members to understand the implications of international trade agreements for health. The tool aims to help health and trade ministries more systematically assess trade and health issues, to empower health ministries to give better advice to their trade counterparts and to enhance health policy input into the trade community, particularly in such areas as the Integrated Framework, trade policy reviews and aid initiatives to bolster trade capacities in developing countries.

28. The tool is based on five components which highlight the relationship between trade and health: (i) the impact of trade policies and trade liberalization on health; (ii) trade in health-related products, including medicines and related intellectual property related issues; (iii) trade in products hazardous to health; (iv) trade in health services (e-commerce, health tourism, foreign direct investment in health, cross border movement of health professionals); and (v) trade in foodstuffs. Pilot studies have been undertaken in China, Costa Rica, Brazil, India, Malaysia, Thailand, South Africa and Viet Nam to help develop a set of questions that could be used as a tool to identify

capacity constraints, as well as a "how to" handbook on addressing these problems. Preliminary results of these studies were discussed at meetings in New Delhi and Ottawa in March and October 2007. For more information, see the [WHO Globalization, Trade and Health](#) webpage.

### **National capacity self assessment - Convention on Biodiversity**

29. In compliance with Article 6 of the Convention on Biodiversity, signatories should prepare and implement National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). To assist parties in this undertaking, a [Biodiversity Planning Support Programme](#) (BPSP) was established by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) in 1999, with financial support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF). A [Guide to Developing a Biodiversity Strategy from a Sustainable Development Perspective](#) was published in 2000.

30. Another CBD technical cooperation programme is the [Capacity Development Initiative](#) (CDI). The CDI is a strategic partnership between the UNDP and the GEF Secretariat. Through this initiative, a national capacity self assessment (NCSA) has been developed to provide countries with the opportunity to identify priority capacity needs in order to effectively address cross-cutting global environmental issues. Countries are encouraged to develop a plan of action to achieve global environmental management objectives in the context of the three Conventions relevant for NCSAs: the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. The NCSA Operational Guidelines ([English](#), [Spanish](#), [French](#)), a [national capacity self assessment resource kit](#) and other background information can be found at the CBD website: <http://www.cbd.int>.

31. The CBD has organized coordination meetings for government agencies, relevant organizations and donors involved in implementing and/or funding biosafety capacity-building activities to, *inter alia*: (i) share information and experiences; (ii) identify key biosafety capacity-building issues, priority needs and gaps and discuss ways to address them; (iii) identify overlaps and potential opportunities for collaboration between existing activities; and (iv) facilitate exchange of views in order to improve the planning and delivery of capacity-building activities. A fourth such meeting will be held in [New Delhi on 11-13 February 2008](#). The New Delhi meeting will consider measures for enhancing capacity building and guidance to facilitate consideration of socio-economic in decision-making regarding living modified organisms (LMOs) and LMO identification and documentation requirements.



## ATTACHMENT

### STDF Workshop on SPS Capacity Evaluation Tools - 31 March 2008

#### Draft Agenda

- 10.00      *Opening remarks*
- 10.10      *Session 1: Specific capacity evaluation tools*
- **Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation**, Mr Jeffrey Jones, Technical Assistance Officer, International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat
  - **Tool for the Evaluation of Performance of Veterinary Services (OIE-PVS)**, Ms Sarah Kahn, Chef de Service, International Trade Department, World Organization for Animal Health
  - **Strengthening National Food Control Systems : Guidelines to Assess Capacity-Building Needs**, Ms Masami T. Takeuchi, Associate Professional Officer, Food Quality and Standards Service, Food and Agriculture Organization
  - Discussion
- 11.30      *Session 2: General SPS capacity evaluation tools*
- **Food Safety and Agricultural Health Action Plans**, Mr John Lamb, Senior Agribusiness Specialist, Agriculture and Rural Development Department, World Bank
  - **Biosecurity Capacity Evaluation**, Mr Sithar Dorjee, Bhutan Agriculture and Food Regulatory Authority
  - **Performance Vision Strategy**, Mr Ricardo Molins, Director, Agricultural Health and Food Safety, Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
  - **Cost-benefit analysis and SPS planning**, Mr Michael Roberts, Secretary , STDF
  - Discussion
- 13.00      *Lunch*
- 15.00      *Session 3: Related approaches and tools of interest*
- **Trade and Health Evaluation**, Ms Corinna Hawkes, Research Fellow, Food Consumption and Nutrition Division, International Food Policy Research Institute
  - **Evaluation of Standards Metrology and Quality Infrastructure**, Ms Muge Dolun, Associate Industrial Development Officer, United Nation Industrial Development Organization



- **Biosafety Capacity Evaluation**, Mr Erie Tamala, Programme Officer, Convention on Biodiversity
- Discussion

16.30

**Session 4: Which tool for what purpose?**

Open discussion of issues arising, in particular:

- Merits of specific vs generic tools;
- Role of beneficiary in choice of tool, application and end use, in particular public dissemination of results vs. internal confidential usage;
- How to prioritize needs ? How to turn evaluations into action – either through domestic resources or external assistance?
- Scope for collaboration and cooperation between organizations in development and use of tools as well as sharing of results.

17.45

**Closing remarks**

---