NEW ZEALAND AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND TRADE

PROJECT REVIEW

PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY BUILDING PROJECT FOR ASEAN UNDER THE TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

REVIEW TEAM REPORT

AUGUST 2004

Prepared by Robert Sowman and Michael Watt

CONFIDENTIAL
Written for NZAID internal use only.

Annex to Phytosanitary Capacity Building Project Review Final Report

Administrative lessons learned during this review

1. Length of time allocated to projects

In this case, a year-to-year cycle of approval through the use of LOVs has operated since the project began. This reflects changes occurring within NZODA/NZAID and an evolving project rather than one designed, costed and approved for its full cycle of implementation over a number of years. To be fair to the MSC, the project has been operating on an implied implementation plan spanning a larger number of years but has never been able to secure commitment for more than one year at a time.

Lesson: Rather than extending the life of a project through a number of LOVs, ensure all projects are designed and costed from the outset for their full cycle of implementation.

2. Project preparation guide

This project has operated outside of any structured requirements and not followed an established pattern of project design – preparation and approval of a full proposal complete with outcomes, development and immediate objectives, activity/input/output schedules, workplan, logframe, risk assessment, monitoring and evaluation plan, exit strategy, reporting schedule and budget. This is seen as somewhat ironic, as a major output of the project has been a planning management tool that will facilitate the process of sound project formulation. Nevertheless, NZAID should consider the adoption of a set of general guidelines covering what is expected in project design, implementation and reporting. Particular programmes, such as VASS and ADAF provide valuable guidance to project managers. However, in this MSC and (presumably) others established under NZODA criteria, little guidance is given to desk and project managers.

Lesson: A set of general guidelines covering what is expected in project design, implementation monitoring and reporting should be adopted for NZAID programmes that are currently not providing this type of guidance to desk and project managers.

3. A structured approach to training

For projects where NZAID assists with trade-related capacity building, it needs to consider its expectations of what the training should involve. As part of a project preparation guide (as proposed above) or within the contractual agreement with the MSC, it should specify training requirements to be met by the project.

Lesson: Training provided through NZAID projects should be designed and reported around a training needs analysis, with an explanation of the training method, content, expected trainee competencies and mechanism for applying, evaluating and replicating the process in future training.

43143

4. Feedback on reports

All projects have milestone or reporting requirements. In most cases, reports provided to NZAID should satisfy process reporting requirements – what has been achieved against the objectives and project indicators, problems encountered, successes achieved, level of participation occurring, changes or variations in team personnel and work plan, budget issues and recommendations for NZAID consideration. Feedback should be provided to the project manager on these items and further clarification sought on points of concern. This feedback should be recorded on file. Projects often generate technical documents, training manuals and design guides. In some instances these are incorporated with process reporting. Ideally, they should remain separate, as they serve different audiences. If NZAID lacks specialised knowledge in the field being reported, it might seek outside peer review of these documents and share the findings with the project manager.

Lesson: Feedback should be provided to the project manager on process and technical reports with an indication that they are acceptable to NZAID. This feedback should be recorded on file. An independent peer review of technical reports should be sought for specialised subjects like phytosanitary systems.

5. Reliance on one particular provider and use of intellectual property in development projects

The Review Team recognises that GBS & Associates have spent a significant amount of time and funds developing the software involved in the NPD and the strategic plan builder, and the project has in no way covered these costs. Nevertheless, NZAID may be seen as endorsing the adoption of the software used in this project without fully understanding or verifying its technical suitability and effectiveness. NZAID (and possibly individual CMLV countries) are at risk of capture, locking themselves into one particular provider with continued reliance on GBS & Associates to enhance or modify the system if there are problems at some future date.

The field review identified some concern about the lack of formal legal agreements on copyright or usage between CMLV and GBS & Associates. Dr Vanhan, Chief of PPPIO in Cambodia, made the suggestion that it might be possible to negotiate some form of warranty agreement with GBS & Associates, under which GBS would maintain and repair the NPD (and the SPB) for a period of say five years. NZAID has indicated that it would be unlikely to provide support for such an arrangement, and the MSC rightly believes individual countries need to continue to maintain the programs and ensure their reliability by developing their own strong IT units. The MSC also maintains individual country issues can be raised directly with GBS & Associates and need not involve NZAID.

However, it highlights issues of intellectual property rights over reports, documents or materials prepared in the course of the project and the need for this material to remain with the host country or partners. Process reports should belong to NZAID. Where a project depends on the development and use of a product or process customised to the needs of a host country, that customised product or process should become the property of the country concerned. NZAID needs to be clear about what it is paying for and protect the interests of the intended beneficiaries. It must also safeguard the interests of the New Zealand agency who may have invested in the intellectual property of the process or product being utilised.

Lesson: NZAID needs to wary of capture when incorporating IT software development as part of project output. It also should ensure that all parties understand who owns the intellectual property and the rights to use, reproduce or adapt the process or product being developed.

6. Sharing of data

The use of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluating Questionnaire both initially and during the strategic planning process has resulted in the arguably unsatisfactory outcome of the MSC insisting that both the initial reports and the draft strategic plans be treated as confidential. He argues that information provided by CMLV authorities in the course of completing/updating the PCEQ reveals the extent of CLMV weaknesses in their plant protection systems, and that this information may be used against them by SPS services in countries with which CMLV countries are trading. The Review Team discussed this issue with senior NPPO officials in Cambodia, Viet Nam and Myanmar, who generally did not support the need for confidentiality – the consensus view was that the weaknesses of their phytosanitary services were already well known! This "need for confidentiality" has meant mission reports and other technical reporting have had limited circulation or peer review. The Review Team considers the reluctance to involve others based on this concern has worked against the project, limiting the understanding and awareness of it by others.

Lesson: There should be clear definitions about any confidentiality with partners, NZAID and the MSC, with encouragement to be as transparent as possible about the methodology and findings of a project. Elements of confidentiality should be separated out and dealt with and reported directly to the host partner and NZAID.

7. NZAID official representation

From a political and ceremonial point of view, participation at key milestone events by an Ambassador or similar NZ Embassy representative provides added visibility, heightened media awareness and overall status to the project while it was managed by NZODA. The third SOM had no representation and, as a result of the precedent already set for the earlier meetings, created some embarrassment for the MSC. The Review Team suggests that participation by NZAID management at such events would be important and productive, but recognises that such representation has to be weighed against cost and other priorities. This should not preclude ambassadorial or similar participation in future.

Lesson: NZAID should recognise the value added to a project by the presence of Embassy or NZAID officials at key milestone presentations for projects and seek to provide this support as part of its project planning.

8. Exit strategy

An exit strategy should be considered during the design stage, not at the end of a project. Part of the training and capacity building should be geared towards making this possible and a phase out programme should begin at least a year before the project's end date. A requirement for an exit strategy needs to be built into the terms of reference for future MSCs.

Lesson: Include the requirement for a preliminary transition or exit strategy at the feasibility and design stage of the project in all future MSCs.

9. Project reviews

The timing for reviews should ideally be spelt out in the original project design. Two types of reviews should probably be considered - a mid-term review, at least one year before the end of the project, which would review progress to date, suggest any changes that are needed, and make proposals for any follow up (second phase etc), and a terminal or post review, to be completed after all reports etc are completed, that evaluates the project and suggests any amendments to follow-up proposals. With this particular review the team was asked to combine both, and this has not worked effectively. Due to delays and failure of the MSC to deliver milestone documents on time, the Review Team has had the added complication of its workload sliding over into other commitments and taking longer than scheduled.

Lesson: Include the timing of a review in the original project design. Be clear as to whether it is a mid-term or post project review and do not attempt to combine them.

10. Involvement of the MSC

In most instances the MSC should participate in any review undertaken during the course of the project. It may not always be necessary for him/her to travel with the review team, although this also can help gain a greater appreciation of project complications and amendments to the workplan. He/she should be expected to work with the review team to a much greater extent than was possible in this review. The Review Team had the impression that the MSC for this project considered its presence as an unnecessary inconvenience and challenge to his credibility. He was not made aware of the team's findings until after the final report was delivered to NZAID.

Lesson: Include MSC in as many facets of the review as possible, keep the process transparent and avoid any surprises.

CONTENTS

		Page
Executive Summary		2
Recommendations		5
Abbreviations and Acronyms		6
Glossary		8
Acknowledgements		10
1.	Introduction	11
2.	Project description	13
2.1	Context	13
2.2	Problem and technical approach	15
2.3	Project design and work plan	17
2.4	Contracts, variations and budgets	18
2.5	Project management and reporting schedule	18
3	Results and impacts	20
3.1	Development of an integrated database system	21
3.2	Strategic planning process and plans	26
3.3	Awareness building for senior managers	28
3.4	Impacts on poverty and trade	30
4	Consistency with NZAID policy	34
5	Coordination with ASEAN and other donors	36
6	Future involvement of NZAID	39
6.1	Second-phase project	40
Appendices		43
I	SOM priorities for further action	43
II	Review Terms of Reference	47
III	NZAID CLMV Phytosanitary Capacity Development Project: Terms of Reference to cover period 1 October 2003 - 30 June 2004	53
IV	Review process and methodology	56
V	Itinerary for fieldwork	58
VI	Persons and organisations consulted	59
References consulted		62

Executive Summary

1. The Phytosanitary Capacity Building Project (PCBP) was commissioned by New Zealand Official Development Assistance (NZODA became NZAID on 1 July 2002) in February 2001. Its series of activities has occurred on a year-to-year Letter of Variation basis ever since. As a project it has achieved a great deal. Indeed it probably has achieved, or attempted to achieve, a great deal more than was envisaged when it began in 2001. The four CMLV countries are very appreciative of what has been achieved and the project has created considerable goodwill and raised awareness of the issues and responsibilities. Perhaps its greatest contribution has been making the four countries aware of sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) issues and their international trade agreement SPS obligations. There is general agreement that a good degree of communication and cooperation between the four countries has been fostered by the project. The gathering of senior officials at regular meetings (SOM) in particular has played an important role in establishing strong linkages between the four countries.

2. The detailed integrated National Phytosanitary Database system (NPD) was developed to provide an enabling tool for managers. It is a powerful IT tool with significant potential for phytosanitary service operators. Although it has become a highly sophisticated and impressive system, it has absorbed considerable time and effort that could have gone into improving other SPS areas. The review's field mission was able to witness the NPD being used, but only for a fraction of its functionality. For it to be truly effective, capabilities in areas such as pest diagnosis, surveillance and pest risk analysis first need to be significantly improved in the four CMLV countries.

3. An integrated component of the NPD, the strategic plans, became another significant task, taking the Management Services Consultant (MSC) much longer to complete than originally planned. It meant the plans were not ready for submission at the Vientiane SOM but key issues were at least addressed. With the advantage of hindsight, the Review Team believes that it would have been both advantageous and logical if the strategic planning process had been initiated at the beginning rather than in the last phase of the project. This would have provided an opportunity for the four CLMV countries to identify their own priorities. It would also have been possible to have completed the drafting, review and approval of the plans by the end of this project's contract date of 30 June 2004. The worth of these plans can only be judged on the outcome of the evaluations and consultations to be undertaken in each CMLV country. Until this occurs, there can be no real 'ownership' of the draft strategic plans that have been produced by the project team.

4. The project was established before NZAID adopted its central focus on poverty elimination and has not adjusted to meet this new direction. Even given its original objective of improving access to export markets, it is questionable whether the project has had any major impact on trade at this stage and it is unlikely it has had any effect on trade-related development. However, in the longer term, particularly once the plant risk analysis component of the NPD becomes functional and the issue of export

documentation becomes fully centralised, the project could facilitate the export of agricultural products from CMLV countries.

5. The most important objective of any national plant protection organisation must remain that of helping farmers prevent or reduce losses caused by pests and diseases in a cost-effective, sustainable, safe and environmentally acceptable manner. In developing countries such as CMLV, this need will continue to have a much greater direct impact on poverty. Hence the recommendation of the Review Team for the programme's original emphasis on trade facilitation to be balanced by support for key operational aspects of a quarantine service, including effective border protection that that would better address NZAID's focus on poverty alleviation through the development of sustainable livelihoods.

6. For the reasons given above, the PCBP should not continue to be supported by NZAID in its present form once completion of the required tasks under the current contract is achieved. The Review Team recommends a second phase project be established, building on the outputs of the original project and designed to support an effective plant quarantine programme in participating countries in coordination with the CMLV countries and other interested donors. This second phase should include holding a fourth SOM, logically in Cambodia, during the first half of 2005.

7. The Review Team supports installing, under the existing contract, the Strategic Plan Builder (SPB) software in each CMLV country and training of national plant protection organisation (NPPO) staff in its use.

8. Ongoing support of an effective plant quarantine programme in the four CMLV countries allows NZAID to continue to deliver results that will contribute to the NZ/ASEAN Dialogue relationship and support the AFTA-CER CEP framework and work programme. A programme of phytosanitary support in this sub-region also aligns with the general thrust of NZAID's recently drafted Asia Strategy.

9. The challenge is to find a way of using the positives from this project to design a new SPS programme with greater impact on poverty reduction. Any future involvement will need to be closely linked to the outcome of the SOM and strategic planning exercises. It should also involve the key donor agencies operating in these countries, notably FAO and AusAID. Both are implementing relevant programmes in the countries concerned, with AusAID's focus on a training programme for SPS staff. NZAID could look at establishing a joint fund with AusAid and FAO to address key phytosanitary issues for the CLMV.

10. The Review Team has identified potential components of a 2nd phase of assistance in the phytosanitary area. These reflect the agreed priorities of the recent SOM in Vientiane on key phytosanitary capacity development issues for the four countries. These agreed priorities provide the basis for initial planning of any second phase project.

11. Any 2nd phase NZAID assistance over a three - five year period should be:
    - based on the results of the strategic planning process and the differing stages of phytosanitary development in each country

- based on a participatory project design process including an NZAID discussion/design mission
- aligned to changing NZAID policy priorities
- aimed at training CMLV countries to a point where they can build their own reputable databases and use the NPD effectively
- designed to coordinate its activities with the AusAID Sanitary and Phytosanitary Capacity Building Program and with other donor support, and to provide for the formulation of a requests for funding under the GMS CBTA program or WTO/STDF to develop those areas of SPS activities not being supported by other donors.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Any future NZAID initiative should reflect a balanced approach to plant quarantine that recognises the need to prevent the spread of pests and diseases into CMLV countries, as well as facilitate their export trade. [section 2.1]

Recommendation 2: Delays in strategic plan preparation and their adoption need to be taken into account when making any recommendations for future NZAID assistance, with consideration given to ways of supporting the process of 'public consultation' and implementation. [section 3.2]

Recommendation 3: Any follow-up NZAID assistance in the phytosanitary area should include support for the funding of a SOM in Cambodia to complete the cycle of a SOM in each CMLV country, and encourage an ongoing role for the SOM. [section 3.3]

Recommendation 4: An important focus of any future NZAID support should be on developing quarantine awareness and highlighting its benefits for the community as a whole. [section 3.4]

Recommendation 5: Encouraging closer involvement of NZ MAF would lead to a more transparent approach to information sharing in future phases of an NZAID SPS project. [section 3.4]

Recommendation 6: Any future NZAID involvement should be designed in consultation, with the ASEAN Secretariat and its bodies associated with SPS. [section 5]

Recommendation 7: The involvement of the ADB through its Greater Mekong Sub-region Cross-Border Transport Agreement and/or other multilateral investment providers such as the WTO's STDF should be considered as mechanisms for achieving any downstream SPS-based projects and longer-term joint investment arrangements. [section 5]

Recommendation 8: NZAID support and funding in the phytosanitary area should not end at this point. That said, there are higher priorities for NZAID assistance than the further development of the NPD under the current project. NZAID should consider funding a 2nd phase SPS programme for CMLV countries to begin in 2005 for a 3-5 year period. This future project would be based on the key priorities identified at the SOM, particularly pest diagnosis, surveillance and pest risk analysis. To inform this process, it is recommended that NZAID commission a project design mission to CMLV countries, including consultation with AusAID, FAO, the ASEAN Secretariat and other relevant organisations. [section 6]

Recommendation 9: NZAID should use unspent PCBP funds from 2003/04 during the second half of 2004 to install the SPB software in each CMLV country, and to train NPPO staff in its use. [section 6]

Recommendation 10: The 2nd phase component should be extended from CMLV participation to include the Greater Mekong Sub-region with Thailand and Yunnan 'paying their own way' but sharing the knowledge and other cooperative benefits. [section 6.1]

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AADCP	ASEAN Australian Development Cooperation Program
ACIAR	Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research
ADAF	Asia Development Assistance Facility (NZ)
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AFTA-CER CEP	ASEAN Free Trade Area – Closer Economic Relations Closer Economic Partnership
AGPP	Plant Protection Service (FAO)
APHCN	ASEAN Plant Health Cooperation Network
APIP	Agricultural Productivity Improvement Project (Cambodia)
APPPC	Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (FAO)
ARDCP	Asia Regional Development Cooperation Program (Australia)
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
ASWGC	ASEAN Sectoral Working Group on Crops
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CABI	CAB International (formerly known as Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux)
CMLV	Cambodia, Myanmar, Lao PDR and Viet Nam
CPC	Crop Protection Compendium (CABI)
DAALI	Department of Agronomy and Agricultural Land Improvement (Cambodia)
DAFF	Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (Australia)
DPM	Development Programme Manager (NZAID)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FAOR	FAO Representative
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GBS & Associates	Private NZ IT development company headed by Dr G. Balasingam
GMS	Greater Mekong Sub-region
Ha	Hectare
HCMC	Ho Chi Minh City (Viet Nam)
Helvetas	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
IAI	Initiative for ASEAN Integration
ICPM	Interim Commission for Phytosanitary Measures
IDA	International Development Association
IPM	Integrated pest management
IPPC	International Plant Protection Commission
IRA	Import risk analysis
ISPM	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures
IT	Information technology
JICA	Japanese International Cooperation Agency
Lao PDR	Lao People's Democratic Republic
LOV	Letter of Variation
MAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (Lao PDR/NZ)
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (Cambodia)
MAI	Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Myanmar)
MARD	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (Viet Nam)
MFAT	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

MSC	Management Services Consultant
NARC	National Agriculture Research Centre, Lao
NPD	National phytosanitary database
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organisation
NZAID	New Zealand Agency for International Development
NZODA	New Zealand Official Development Assistance
OCPPO	Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer (within AFFA)
OIE	Office International des Epizooties
PC	Phytosanitary certificate
PCBP	NZAID's Phytosanitary Capacity Building Project
PCEQ	Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluating Questionnaire
PDD	Project design document
PEQ	Post-entry quarantine
PPD	Plant Protection Department (Viet Nam), Plant Protection Division (Myanmar)
PPPIO	Plant Protection and Phytosanitary Inspection Office (Cambodia)
PQ	Plant quarantine
PRA	Pest risk analysis
RAPA	Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (FAO)
SDTF	Standards and Trade Development Facility (WTO)
SOM	Senior Officers' Meeting
SPB	Strategic Plan Builder
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SPS	Sanitary and phytosanitary
SPS Agreement	Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures
SPSCBP	Sanitary and Phytosanitary Capacity Building Program (Australia)
SWOT	Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats
TA	Technical assistance
TCP	Technical Cooperation Programme (FAO)
TOR	Terms of Reference
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Glossary

AFTA-CER CEP: An agreement made in September 2002 for 'a closer economic partnership" between ASEAN countries and New Zealand/Australia

commodity: A type of plant, plant product, or other article being moved for trade or other purpose

EcoPort: An internet-based biodiversity information service (http://www.ecoport.org)

endemic (of pests or diseases): Occurrence limited to a particular country or region

epidemic: The occurrence of many cases of a pest or disease within an area

epidemiology: The study of the incidence, distribution and control of an epidemic pest or disease

exotic (of pests or diseases): Occurrence outside a particular country or region

monitoring: Passive collection and collation of data on a country's human, animal and plant health status

pest: Any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products

pest risk analysis: The process of evaluating biological or other scientific and economic evidence to determine whether a pest should be regulated and the strength of any phytosanitary measures to be taken against it

pest status (in an area): Officially determined presence or absence of a pest in an area, including where appropriate its distribution

PestNet: An email network in the Pacific and South East Asia providing advice and information on plant protection, including quarantine (http://www.pestnet.org/)

phytosanitary action: An official operation, such as inspection, testing, surveillance or treatment, undertaken to implement phytosanitary regulations or procedures

phytosanitary certification: Use of phytosanitary procedures leading to the issue of a Phytosanitary Certificate

phytosanitary measure: Any legislation, regulation or official procedure designed to prevent the introduction and/or spread of quarantine pests, or to limit the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests

phytosanitary procedure: Any officially prescribed method for implementing phytosanitary regulations including the performance of inspections, tests, surveillance or treatments in connection with regulated pests

phytosanitary regulation: Official rule to prevent the introduction and/or spread of quarantine pests, or to limit the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests, including establishment of procedures for phytosanitary certification

quarantine pest: A pest of potential economic importance to an area it endangers where it is not yet present or not widely distributed and officially controlled

surveillance: Active measures to detect new pest and disease incursions and changes in the distribution and prevalence of endemic pests and diseases

Acknowledgements

The Review Team is indebted to all those who assisted in the implementation of this review by providing information, facilities and hospitality.

Review Team:

Team leader and NZAID liaison:
Robert Sowman
17 Highbury Crescent
Wellington 6005
New Zealand
rjsowman@actrix.gen.nz

Plant protection specialist:
Michael Watt
51 Comber Street
Paddington, Sydney
NSW 2021, Australia
michaeljwatt@primus.com.au

1 Introduction

New Zealand Official Development Assistance (NZODA) commissioned a phytosanitary needs assessment in the four new ASEAN member countries of Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam (collectively referred to as CLMV) in February 2001. This assessment to identify the needs and gaps in SPS has been followed by a series of activities focused around the creation and installation of a National Phytosanitary Database (NPD) in each of the 4 CLMV countries, the formation and staging of three Senior Officials' Meetings (SOM) and the development of strategic plans for the strengthening of phytosanitary services. Dr Godwin Balasingam as the Management Services Consultant (MSC) for this project has been responsible for all stages of this work and his current Letter of Variation (LOV) to the original contract is valid until 30 June 2004.

This series of activities has occurred on a year-by-year funding basis during a time when NZODA was in a transition phase before becoming NZAID, and with uncertainty over future content and continuation of some of NZODA's Asia programmes. Following the creation of NZAID and the finalisation of its trade and development policy, the decision was taken to review the project, to determine its fit with NZAID's priorities and recommend future involvement of NZAID in the phytosanitary area.

A Request for Tender (the Terms of Reference [TOR] are attached as Appendix II) for this review resulted in the appointment of Michael Watt, a plant protection specialist and Robert Sowman as team leader and NZAID liaison. The review was carried out between February and April 2004 (the review process is described in Appendix IV) and included three weeks field work by Michael Watt (itinerary of field work is attached as Appendix V and people consulted are listed in Appendix VI). The Review Team submitted a draft report at the end of April 2004, and updated this as a final report in August 2004 to take account of new information submitted by the MSC (draft strategic plans of the four countries and a final project report) and to reflect comments from NZAID on the April draft report.

The structure of this report has been determined by the TOR for the review, with four objectives stated and a list of questions to be answered.

Objectives of the review

Objective one:	to assess the overall impact of this project including against its TOR
Objective two:	to assess the impact of the project from a poverty alleviation perspective through both direct and indirect mechanisms
Objective three:	to assess the on-going strategic fit of this project with (i) NZAID's Trade and Development Policy, (ii) NZAID's over arching policy framework, (iii) NZAID's proposed Asia strategy and (iv) ASEAN's strategic direction
Objective four:	to make recommendations on the future involvement of NZAID in this project (and/or off-shoots thereof).

The incremental design and management of the Phytosanitary Capacity Building Project (PCBP), discussed below in Section 2.2, has meant the development and immediate objectives of the project have not been clearly set out. For the purposes of this review the goal and objective as stated in the original TOR have been taken as the development objective, and the three main areas for short-term action identified during the first phase of project activities have been used as the project's immediate objectives:

Development Goal:

Improved access to export markets for fresh produce from a number of lesser-developed ASEAN countries

Development Objective:

Improved planning to develop capacity to meet the fresh produce phytosanitary requirements of trading partners for a number of lesser-developed ASEAN countries

Immediate Objectives:

Awareness-building programmes for senior managers in the SPS area
Assistance with the formulation of vision documents, strategic plans and action plans
Development of an integrated database system for information management

2 Project Description

2.1 Context

A set of rules that national governments agreed to follow to ensure trade is non-discriminatory, fair, predictable and transparent were first embodied in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations under the GATT that started in 1986 resulted in the establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in 1995.

Under the WTO, the primary agreement relating to quarantine rights and obligations is the *Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures* (the SPS Agreement). With this Agreement, the plant health status of Member countries has become an integral part of import risk analysis. The SPS Agreement removes the rights of countries to arbitrarily restrict access to domestic markets, and calls on Members to harmonise sanitary and phytosanitary measures on a global basis by adopting international standards, guidelines and recommendations.

The underlying objective of this agreement is to ensure that governments do not use food safety and quarantine requirements as unjustified trade barriers to protect their domestic agricultural industries from import competition. The SPS Agreement means governments have the right to impose sanitary and phytosanitary quarantine measures when these are considered necessary to protect human, animal and plant health. However, governments also have an obligation to scientifically demonstrate that the trade restriction is necessary to protect health.

In essence, the SPS Agreement requires prospective exporting countries (for example the 4 CMLV countries) and their target markets to provide scientific evidence to substantiate any claims regarding the presence or absence of pests. This information should include details about the geographical distribution of pests, their biology and taxonomic status and economic importance. It is not acceptable to indicate that a pest is "*not known to occur*"; rather evidence needs to be presented to support the assertion that the pest is "*known not to occur*". This means, diseased specimens and pest collections from properly conducted surveys are the only internationally recognised evidence of the existence (or absence) of a pest in a country.

The SPS Agreement identifies the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) as the international framework for phytosanitary standard setting and harmonisation of measures affecting trade. The IPPC has recognised that all importing and exporting countries need reliable information concerning their plant health status if they are to conduct risk analyses, establish and comply with phytosanitary regulations and maintain pest-free areas. Specific guidelines have been set out in IPPC's International Guidelines for Phytosanitary Measures, including ISPM No1: *Pest Risk Analysis for Quarantine Pests*, ISPM No.2: *Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis*, and ISPM No.8: *Determination of Pest Status in an Area.*

The implications of these agreements for trade and development in countries such as CMLV are considered in detail by Zarrilli and Musselli (2004). This report discusses the important concept of 'equivalence', under which Article 4 of the SPS Agreement encourages countries to give positive consideration to accepting as equivalent the SPS measures of other WTO members. This would apply even where these measures differ from those used by other countries, if the exporting country demonstrates that its measures achieve the importing member's appropriate level of sanitary and phytosanitary protection. For CMLV countries, which face difficulties in

trying to harmonize their standards with those of importing countries, the recognition of the equivalence of their SPS measures could represent a key instrument to enhance market access for their products.

Plant health status capacity underpins the capacity of a country to report on its plant health status and is an integral component of import risk analysis, which determines plant commodity access to overseas markets as well as their importation. Diagnostic capacity includes pest surveillance and monitoring capacity, as well as taxonomic capacity including diagnostic tests used and specimen storage facilities such as herbaria and collections. Pest surveillance and monitoring capacities are important because the SPS Agreement recognises areas within a country that may be free from a pest or disease of quarantine concern. Exporting countries claiming area freedoms must provide the necessary evidence regarding geographic distribution, epidemiology, eradication or control programs, inspection, sampling and testing methods to objectively demonstrate these claims to the importing country.

In parallel with these major developments in trade facilitation over the last decade has been an increasing value placed on 'clean' and 'green' as an international marketing tool, in part reflecting increased consumer concern about food safety. There have also been rapid increases in the volume of world trade and international passenger movements, placing heavy pressure on the ability of border controls to exclude exotic pests, diseases and weeds arriving in countries of destination.

An increasing emphasis on free trade and the need to comply with the SPS Agreement has become a priority for many countries wanting to join WTO and those wanting to export to WTO member countries. For example, many people attending the SOM in Vientiane now believe that the export aspects of trade are more important than border protection. This emphasis is also reflected in the initial Goal and Objective for the NZODA SPS project (see section 2.2). Some CMLV countries may indeed see effective border protection as simply too difficult, and feel that the limited level of resources available to the plant quarantine (PQ) service justifies emphasis on the export aspects of PQ.

Nevertheless the Review Team has concluded the primary goal of any national plant quarantine should remain the prevention of the establishment and spread of exotic pests, diseases and weeds deemed to potentially have a significant deleterious effect to plants, crops, humans, animals or the natural environment. The Team considers the current emphasis on trade facilitation, including the effective and transparent issue of phytosanitary certificates and other export documentation, will lessen over the next 5 - 10 years, once WTO membership and WTO Agreements have been secured, and will result in a more balanced approach to SPS.

Recommendation 1: Any future NZAID initiative should reflect a balanced approach to plant quarantine that recognises the need to prevent the spread of pests and diseases into CMLV countries, as well as facilitate their export trade.

Considering the lack of resources available to agricultural quarantine services, it could be argued that CMLV countries should ignore import quarantine/border protection between the four and

concentrate instead on the bio-geographic region defined by the outer boundaries of these countries or by recognising a more complete region such as the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS) – CMLV, plus Thailand and Yunnan province of China. This type of approach could mean focusing on border protection at international airports and seaports, and on major points of entry on land borders with countries outside this defined region. It would also mean that CMLV countries would require the capacity to manage pest problems once they arrive in a country, as well as accumulating sufficient information and expertise to convince potential export markets that they meet the necessary quarantine requirements.. Such an approach would only be feasible through the development of a pragmatic, effective regional approach to agricultural quarantine that ideally would operate under the auspices of an organisation such as ASEAN or ADB's GMS Cross-Border Transport Agreement

On balance, however, the Review Team believes most CMLV countries will, for the foreseeable future, wish to maintain border inspection posts at all major land border entry points, and that any future project support should be based on this position. This belief is based on existing national pride and the desire to employ people, making it difficult to abandon these posts.

The four CLMV countries are not at similar points in their development. Viet Nam is recognised as being a leader within CLMV in SPS and in some ways a driver of the NZAID initiative. Dr Paul Ferrar, formerly ACIAR Crop Sciences Research Program Coordinator and representing Australia's Griffith University as an observer at the Vientiane SOM, considers one of the factors in the success of the CLMV project may well have been the relatively high degree of development of quarantine and phytosanitary capacity in Viet Nam compared to the others. Myanmar suffers through its political isolation, limited resources and from little donor assistance. Both Cambodia and Lao PDR export less than the others. Lao PDR has the least developed SPS service of the group with staff resource problems, and many people having multiple tasks. As in Cambodia, some jobs are dependent on donor project support and present a challenging environment for technical assistance.

2.2 Problem and technical approach

This PCBP is recognised by NZAID as an NZ/ASEAN regional project set up under the NZ/ASEAN Dialogue relationship to support the AFTA/CER-CEP framework and work programmes. It was commissioned initially as a result of a range of activities aimed particularly at facilitating the Initiative for ASEAN Integration (IAI) and contributing to the bilateral country programmes and multilateral funding. The trade and facilitation initiatives resulting from these activities have included general trade policy training, customs and standards and conformance work.

Before the project commenced, NZODA was presented with general requests for technical assistance and training in SPS from ASEAN. In trying to identify how to provide exactly what assistance NZODA officials talked with John Hedley and Godwin Balasingam at New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (NZ MAF) about the ongoing needs assessment work they had been closely involved with under the auspices of the ICPM, NZ MAF and more recently through FAO funding.

The main 'tool' for phytosanitary needs assessment, a computer-based questionnaire, was completed with NZODA funding and tested in Viet Nam, Indonesia and Bangladesh during

2000. Hedley, Balasingam and others developed this tool and it has now been adopted by FAO and recognised internationally.

Dr Balasingam left NZ MAF after the completion of the needs assessment to become the NZODA MSC for the project in 2001. Further background and history of the PCBP is contained in the TOR for this review attached as Appendix II.

The problem as it was initially viewed is outlined in the original TOR (see box below) and, as indicated above, focuses on increasing market access for fresh produce exports from CLMV.

Needs Assessment in CMLV

Goal	Improved access to export markets for fresh produce from a number of lesser-developed ASEAN countries
Objective	Improved planning to develop capacity to meet the fresh produce phytosanitary requirements of trading partners for a number of lesser-developed ASEAN countries.

The approach adopted was to use the PCE Questionnaire as the basis for discussions and observations in the four countries, and from this a series of eight recommendations were made.

Recommendations from the Needs Assessment in CMLV

Recommendation 1:That the New Zealand Government, through the NZODA programme, provides further technical assistance to the governments of Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar and Viet Nam for phytosanitary capacity building and institutional development.
Recommendation 2: To be effective as a donor agency, MF AT adopts a longer-term perspective with the aid programme and makes a commitment for a minimum period of 5- years for addressing critical areas of Phytosanitary needs, especially in Laos, Cambodia and Myanmar.
Recommendation 3: NZODA programme supports the phytosanitary capacity building and institutional development programme for Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar and Viet Nam for a minimum period of five- years with a budget allocation of at least NZ $250,000.
Recommendation 4: As a matter of high priority, the NZODA programme initially targets its assistance towards the planning process for developing the institutional capacity of the National Plant Protection Organisation (NPPO) so that it has the capabilities and competencies to undertake core organisational functions and to respond to changes in the trade environment. This would involve awareness building programmes for senior managers, training and assisting senior managers to clarify their vision for the NPPO, review policies which are barriers to bring about the changes needed, prepare strategic plans for development and formulate project documents for donor agencies.
Recommendation 5: NZODA programme supports initiatives to facilitate cooperation and collaboration between the Phytosanitary Authorities in Myanmar, Laos, Cambodia and Viet Nam, the transfer of change management strategies adopted in Viet Nam to the other three countries and mechanisms which promote sustainable linkages being developed between these countries.
Recommendation 6: NZODA programme provides urgent assistance for developing/upgrading and automating information management systems which would contribute directly to the more effective use of scarce skilled manpower resources and increase transparency in the processes and procedures being used by the NPPO for certification and other phytosanitary activities like pest risk analysis and pest surveillance activities.
Recommendation 7: NZODA programme supports the proposed workplan for 2001-2002 with a budget allocation of about NZ $163, 000.
Recommendation 8: NZODA discuss the phytosanitary assistance workplan for the forthcoming year with senior officials of the Ministry of Agriculture from all four countries before the beginning of the financial year and set up a review mechanism to monitor progress.

From this list three main areas for urgent (short-term) action were identified:

- awareness-building programmes for senior managers in the SPS area
- assistance with the formulation of vision documents, strategic plans and action plans
- development of an integrated database system for information management.

The extent to which these recommendations and priorities were identified, understood or given equal weighting by all CLMV authorities is unclear. For example, the first three priorities identified in Cambodia following discussion of the results of the PCE Questionnaire are believed to have been development of staff capacity through short and long-term training, development of infrastructure for SPS services, and review of SPS legislation. Viet Nam, with its much more advanced development of PQ services, as well as greater importance of its agricultural exports, appears more aligned to these priorities.

A critical review of past plant quarantine technical assistance (TA) reports and an assessment of on-going TA projects in CLMV or other regions may have helped place these recommendations in the context of what has been attempted elsewhere. For example no reference is made to the Pest List Database developed and used by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) countries. This is based on a readily accessible software package, and would have the possible advantage of being simpler and easier to use than the integrated database system developed by the project. However, it is understood that the MSC has drawn on his experience with NZ MAF, as well as in India, Nepal, Bhutan and elsewhere, in his support for these priorities.

2.3 Project design and work plan

The absence of a full project design document, planning the life of the project over a number of years with outcomes, objectives and indicators, meant no clear reporting requirement was established , , which resulted in a reliance on year-to-year action plans and LOVs, with the apparent consent of NZODA. It is probably safe to assume this was also acceptable to CLMV authorities, in that their obligations and financial commitments under the project were not defined in any agreement. With the emergence of NZAID as a semi-autonomous agency and the development of new policy and operational strategies, closer consideration was given to the design and management of the project. This resulted in the production of a more structured LOV in April 2003 (Appendix III). In his final report (August 2004) the MSC, as well as commenting on problems associated with the year-to-year reliance on LOVs, quite properly mentioned the apparent lack of any formal arrangement (e.g. a signed project agreement) between NZAID and the CMLV countries.

The project is recorded as having three phases (see project background/history in the review's TOR, Appendix II): completion of the needs assessment, establishment of the SOM and NPD and building NPPOs' capabilities in strategic planning. The current MSC contract should result in the completion of these phases but, as discussed below, it is the Review Team's view that careful consideration will be needed to identify the most effective way to achieve self-reliance and a sustainable set of outputs.

2.4 Contracts, variations and budgets

The first contract for the phytosanitary needs assessment was signed in February 2001 with the current LOV for strategic plan development and other technical assistance signed in April 2003. Notes on file indicate a preference for regular LOV extensions may have been a reluctance to make a longer term commitment with NZODA in a transition phase before becoming NZAID and uncertainty over future content and continuation of some of NZODA's Asia programmes. The following table outlines when and for what these contracts were issued. However, these budgets do not appear to represent total draw down for this project. Total expenditure since its inception is recorded on file as being $1,008,000 (710K + 298K as of June 2004).

Date	Contract	Purpose	Budget
February 2001	1st contract	Needs assessment	$46,052
November 2001	LOV No.1	Workshops plus? (unable to cite LOV)	$40,000
March 2002	LOV No.2	Report writing, debriefing	$129,000
July 2002	LOV No.3	Extra days, purchase of equipment, training	$165,740
November 2002	LOV No.4	Extra days, costs of SOM	$71,169
April 203	LOV No.5	Field visits, workshops, technical assistance	$88,048

Even total expenditure of $1,008,000 is relatively small for a donor project spanning three years and four countries. If averaged out over this period it represents the modest sum of $84,000 a year for each country.

2.5 Project management and reporting schedule

The MSC and one other person make up the project team - the second person is a computer specialist responsible for developing the NPD. Other people have been engaged over short periods for specialist tasks. The MSC's private company, GBS & Associates, contributes to the project and has invested financially and intellectually in developing and refining the software used in the NPD.

A senior management group made up of two officials from each country has been established and has met at a SOM on three occasions, in Viet Nam, Myanmar and Lao PDR.

Apart from the needs assessment and the draft strategic plans, most of the reports prepared for this project have been generated after a trip or mission to CLMV by the MSC. These documents tend to contain key mission outcomes, recommendations and acknowledgements with a list of tasks, itinerary etc. attached as appendices.. Report milestones for this project to date include:

April-May 2001	Needs assessment in CLMV
November 2001	SOM & study tour in Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh City
April-May 2002	Procurement of server and client computers: customisation, installation of NPD and training in Lao PDR and Viet Nam
July-August 2002	Procurement of server and client computers: customisation, installation of NPD and training in Cambodia, Myanmar and Ho Chi Minh City
November 2002	SOM and study tour in Myanmar
March 2002	SOM and study tour in Lao PDR
May-June 2003	Review of progress in each of the CLMV countries

October 2003	Mission to Lao PDR, Cambodia and Viet Nam.
March 2004	SOM in Vientiane (submitted May 2004)
March-June 2004	Mission to Viet Nam and Myanmar (submitted August 2004)
August 2004	Draft Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategic Plans 2004 - 2009 for CMLV

Other technical documents such as user guides have been produced but are not listed in the above reports.

Submission of all reports scheduled for 2004 under LOV 5 (Appendix III) has been delayed. This in turn has meant the completion date of this review has had to be revised from mid–July to the end of August 2004.

3 Results and impacts

It must be stated at the outset that the project has clearly achieved a great deal – indeed it is probably fair to say that it has achieved, or attempted to achieve, a great deal more than was envisaged when the project began in 2001. This has led to NZAID being viewed by officials in CMLV as an effective provider of SPS development assistance. Paul Ferrar, reporting on his observations from the Vientiane SOM, found this remarkable "when one considers the level of development of phytosanitary capacity at the start of the project". Discussions during the course of this review with officials in CMLV have generally supported this view. The greatest immediately positive legacies of the project are the improved level of understanding of SPS issues, including what will need to be addressed longer term to ensure the sustainability of activities begun by the project, and the beneficial impact of cooperation and joint gatherings. These significant contributions to the general environment in which phytosanitary activities are carried out in CMLV countries have not directly assisted with plant quarantine operations *per se*. Apart from providing improved mechanisms for the issue of export documentation the project has not been able to provide equipment, training or expertise for inspection, treatment, pest surveillance or pest diagnosis.

It is thus difficult to measure the potential impacts on stakeholders, particularly farmers and agricultural organisations. Similarly it may be too soon to evaluate impacts on market/trade facilitation, although it is clear that the potential for positive impacts exists. Financial impact and cost effectiveness are particularly difficult to assess for a project that is still in progress. It may also be difficult to do this in the future, except in terms of the overall benefits to be gained from an effective agricultural quarantine service. Benefits gained will have to be assessed against obligations under WTO, IPPC etc. the perceived community benefits from agricultural quarantine, and the degree to which 'user-pays' arrangements are employed. In theory at least, countries can recover costs of quarantine services. However, they need to consider public benefits, the desirability of increased trade and other issues in deciding whether to recover all or some of the cost.

A more contained regional entity created by the inclusion of Thailand and Yunnan Province of China may allow for individual country savings, but may also impose shared costs for border controls around the edge of this region. There would probably be savings through sharing the lessons learned from CMLV with other regions such as the Pacific, where NZODA has in the past provided a number of countries with assistance in the development of agricultural quarantine, just as there may be lessons for CMLV to learn from Bhutan, where the same system has been introduced, but greater emphasis has been placed on the use of the pest status component. Future costs of training and maintaining or enhancing the system will need to be considered in the formulation of any follow-up to the current project.

The progress of the project can be charted through the mission reports by the MSC. These are generally well written, illustrated and easy to read, if perhaps sometimes lacking in critical analysis. One persistent criticism is that sources for data and other information quoted in these reports are frequently not given or acknowledged. The reports tend to have a combined function of process reporting and technical documentation. Without clear instructions on the reporting requirements, it is not surprising that their purpose and intended audience (other than NZODA/NZAID) is not always clear.

3.1 Development of an integrated database system

The National Phytosanitary Database (NPD), which, like the strategic planning software, has been developed by GBS & Associates as a copyrighted and customised server-based system, clearly represents a significant project output, and is a powerful IT tool with considerable potential for CMLV phytosanitary service operators. It is however obvious from the MSC's reports that its development and initial utilisation has dominated project activities and it is believed that this has played a major part in the project not achieving its TOR deadlines.

The May-June and August-September 2002 mission reports provide information on the NPD. The field review was able to witness the NPD being used to issue phytosanitary export certificates and to a limited extent, import permits, and also to enter pest status records. However, the review is unable to comment effectively on the capability of other components of the database. As outlined in the concept diagram below, these were not operational, were being used to a very limited extent only, or contained little or no data in any of the countries visited. For example, the effectiveness of the potentially very important risk analysis component will depend on one hand on the capability and robustness of the software, and on the other on the accuracy and completeness of the data in the NPD pest status component. As indicated below, very little if any meaningful data had been entered into the pest status component at the time of the review's visit to CMLV, but even if such data was in place, the pest risk analysis (PRA) component software is still under development by GBS and Associates and its use could not be demonstrated to the review team.

Clearly the main use of the NPD so far has been as a means of replacing paper based systems for the issue of phytosanitary certificates. However, not all certificates are issued this way. In all CMLV countries, certificates continue to be issued from locations not connected to the central server, and some operated by provincial administrations are not even under the control of the NPPO. The project has addressed this by providing stand-alone copies of the database to locations not currently linked to the server.

However, it is clear if the NPD is to work to its full potential, it must be an integrated national system that can operate from a central point where export/import conditions are set, modified and controlled, with an effective query system operating from all ports of entry. The importance of this is illustrated in Myanmar where it was stated that importing countries have already questioned the issue of two types of certificates, some using the NPD and some using the older paper-based system. The full utilisation of the NPD will therefore require a wide area network (WAN) that covers all locations where export and import documentation are to be issued, based on telephone, satellite or microwave links. Currently there is a lack of a reliable and comprehensive telecommunication infrastructure in CMLV, with Viet Nam being the possible exception. The problem begins with the very basics, such as reliable electricity supply and telephone line penetration and goes on to include basic internet access. For example, Myanmar has been unable to download NPD patches because its internet system is not stable enough. The MSC is confident, perhaps optimistically, that within two years most CMLV countries will have enhanced network capability. leapfrogging current telecommunication technology, with broadband access, fibre optic cables, etc installed in all the countries.

Commercial providers could possibly provide in-country services including local area networks (LAN), WAN, computer and network maintenance and phone systems. Out-sourcing of this kind

is still uncommon in CMLV but could be considered, particularly as it should be possible to recover additional costs through charging for services provided. It is recognised, however, that charges tend to be returned to the Treasury rather than used to recover costs of service providers. In Viet Nam it seems that the Plant Protection Department (PPD) is in the process of developing a WAN covering the whole country and, if this is so, its use for linking the NPD to all PQ stations (national and provincial) must be a high priority.

The MSC clearly sees the NPD to be a work in progress, requiring a further two years to complete - all the components on the right hand side of the diagram reproduced on the following page are 'under development' by GBS and Associates. This is reinforced by the MSC's recommendations in his final report, and reflects the review team's concern about the absence of a clearly defined project design document at the start of the project to show what areas of information the "integrated database system" should manage, in what order and over what timeframe.

In the longer term there could, for example, be a need to link import phytosanitary management systems to electronic customs' import and export clearance systems that are increasingly being adopted by many countries, and to link border and post-border PQ actions (inspection, destruction, disinfestation, PEQ, incursion management etc) to import certification, in the same way that inspection activities are now linked to phytosanitary certification. It is believed that the NPD has the capacity to incorporate such developments.

Assessments of the use of the NPD were made in all CMLV countries but, with the SOM staged in Vientiane, the evaluation of the NPD in Lao PDR was more limited in the time available. In Lao PDR, less than 10 phytosanitary certificates are currently being issued per month, from three entry points, using stand-alone copies of the database. Office facilities are minimal, and there is no connectivity to the central server in Vientiane. Some attempt has been made to use the pest status component, but there must be considerable doubt about the ability of NPPO staff to undertake this work effectively. In Cambodia, as in Lao PDR, the database is not yet being used extensively. One reason may be the very cramped facilities available to the Plant Protection and Phytosanitary Inspection Office (PPPIO) in Phnom Penh and it is noted from the country report presented at the Vientiane SOM that World Bank assistance is currently being used to significantly upgrade these facilities. Currently about 25 - 30 phytosanitary certificates plus fewer than five import permits are being issued per month, and some 75 pest surveillance records have been entered into the database. In Cambodia and Lao PDR the NPD is not configured to be bilingual (as it is in Viet Nam) for the issuing of export certificates. The effectiveness of even the export certification process in Cambodia, particularly in respect of inspection and treatment, is considered problematic. In 2001 all phytosanitary staff were withdrawn from international exit/entry points, and since then phytosanitary work has been undertaken by the PPPIO in Phnom Penh only. It is, however, understood that SPS activities at entry/exit points may be resumed in the near future.

There is currently no connectivity between the PPPIO in Phnom Penh, where the server is located, and where work on issuing phytosanitary certificates and import permits is undertaken, and the Plant Diagnostic Laboratory, one hundred metres away, where initial work on the pest status component of the NPD is being undertaken using a stand-alone version on the database. One probable result of this is that no pest status records have been uploaded to the server as yet.

The October 2003 mission report discusses the computerisation of historical pest status records, but despite the obvious importance of this activity, very limited work of this type has in fact occurred in CMLV. Again the field review raised questions over whether staff involved with this work indeed have the necessary skills to carry this out, and information provided by the MSC that similar work with a FAO project in Bhutan required the use of expert consultants would appear to reinforce these concerns. Linking existing data from other sources, such as EcoPort and CABI's Crop Protection Compendium (CPC), could provide a reasonably reliable and comprehensive foundation of historical data for new surveillance records. Monitoring and surveillance[1] for pests and diseases is clearly a key element of post-border quarantine activities and is closely related to the utilisation of the NPD for such work as PRA.

Discussion with NPPO staff involved with the pest status component of the Cambodian NPD, as well as in Myanmar, indicated that further refinement of some entry details might be possible and this information has been passed on to the MSC. These details include the need to be able to:

- relate a specific pest record in the pest status component of the NPD with a specific voucher specimen in an identified biological collection, as detailed in ISPM 8
- capture the local name(s) of a pest recorded in the NPD, if needed in the local language and font – this, together with the inclusion of images of the pest and the damage it causes would seem to be particularly important if farmers, extension workers and other non-specialists are to be involved in pest surveillance and monitoring.

Limited assessments of the use of the NPD were made in Ha Noi on 17 March, 19 March in Ho Chi Minh City (HCMC) and in Yangon on 22 March. The number of phytosanitary certificates being issued at these places is much greater than in Lao PDR or Cambodia. In Ha Noi about 150 export certificates were issued per month and up to 200 per day in HCMC. Use of the NPD for pest status records however has been more limited than in Cambodia, although there is certainly more skilled staff in Viet Nam who should be able to undertake this work. Again, stand-alone versions of the pest status component have apparently been given to relevant institutions in Viet Nam, although the extent to which any of these institutions have made use of them is unreported.

In Yangon about 100 phytosanitary certificates are being issued per day using the Myanmar NPD, plus 3-4 import certificates per month. The system appears to be working well on a day-to-day basis, although some problems with the reporting and printing functions were mentioned, and these have been conveyed to the MSC However, the procedure being used in Myanmar is hardly a time saver. It involves the preparation of a draft certificate by hand using the old form for manual certificate issue, with approval of this draft required from a senior officer and then the electronic issue of the PC by a keyboard operator.

The inspection procedures associated with the issue of PCs in Myanmar are also questionable. Except for exports to Korea and Japan, samples for inspection are brought to the plant quarantine office by the exporters or by private companies who have undertaken fumigation treatments themselves. This inspection is done apparently without any checking of the sampling or fumigation processes. This does not reflect a lack of understanding of what should be done, but

[1] phytosanitary monitoring in this context, refers to the passive collection and collation of data on a country's plant health status. and surveillance is used to detect new pest and disease incursion as well as changes in the prevalence of endemic pests and diseases.

simply a lack of resources, and is an example of the need to strengthen the overall phytosanitary component of the import/export process, not only the process of certificate issue. As in the other countries, progress with the use of the pest status component has been limited in Myanmar. The staff involved have reported considerable difficulty in using the software, mainly associated with the retrieval of data once it has been entered.

In summary, it appears that the export certification component of the NPD appears to be sufficiently robust and user-friendly to justify its use as the basis for countrywide systems in each country. The limited use of other components, including import certification and pest status, has meant this review has not been able to assess their worth, although the potential value of these components is clear. In the case of the pest status component, its limited use points to possible problems with its operation and design. A number of other key components, including pest surveillance and PRA, remain undeveloped or uninstalled, and their use could not be properly demonstrated to the review team. Quarantine operations *per se*, can proceed without the availability of an integrated information management system such as the NPD aims to provide. Even when used, its value will depend on the validity of the data with which it is populated, and the reliability of inspection and treatment processes that support the issue of certificates. To the Review Team, this emphasises the necessity of developing the operational aspects of the quarantine process, as well as the planning, coordination and information management components.

The NPD, like the strategic planning software discussed below, is server based and was not available for specialist evaluation from an IT viewpoint. The MSC was opposed to providing access to either database or to any 'stand-alone' versions of the export certification and pest status components of the NPD. While he was happy to demonstrate those components of the NPD that are currently operational, he maintained that if the review wanted to evaluate the NPD in any more detail it would need to look at a country-customised version with the permission of that country. The need for any such evaluation was indeed questioned by the MSC, who considers that its operation in Bhutan and Nepal, as well as its use in CMLV, is proof that it works.

Considerable emphasis has been placed on workshops and 'hands-on' training programs on NPD use during this implementation phase of the PCBP – the MSC's final report states that 'more than ... 20 workshops have been held ... with approximately 200 NPPO staff involved'. In general this training appears to have been adequate, although only about half of the people trained in the use of the NPD are believed to be now working with the database – with the other people apparently being dropped because of unsatisfactory language or computing skills. No attempt appears to have been made to assess prior skill levels apart from the need for basic understanding in English and computer use, relevant gender issues for participants, or likely constraints to undertaking the training. There is also no evidence of any assessment of competencies gained by those participating in the workshops or hands-on exercises. From general observation, operational staff are clearly able to issue export certificates and generally appear good at doing so. Other usage of the database remains limited and the effectiveness of the training in these areas has been difficult to evaluate, and refresher courses may be needed once the demand for this grows. Detailed user guides for each component of the NPD have been provided to all trainees. They are in English and appear to assume a significant level of computer and language skills; this emphasises the importance of careful selection and training of people involved with the use of the NPD.

In Cambodia for example, there appears to be considerable variation in the ability of the people trained under the project to use the database, particularly between those people trained in the issue of certificates and permits and those using the pest status component of the database - this almost certainly is related to their English language and perhaps their computer skills. Also in Lao PDR it was clear that inadequate English language skills limited the effective use of the database. However, there was general agreement that the training, technical manuals and functionality of the NPD were satisfactory.

Training provided was limited to workshops of a few days in each of the NPPOs. In Cambodia for example, it was carried out with 15 - 23 people in a very cramped office, with not everyone having access to a computer screen. Ideally, training may have been better carried out in a proper computer training facility (with each student's computer linked to a master server), over a longer time frame to compensate for those participants with limited language and computer skills, and using specifically developed computer-based training modules as well as user guides. It is, however, recognised that training organised in this way would have required significantly increased expenditure, and in Cambodia, Myanmar and Viet Nam, the message was that the best people trained by the project would be able to train additional staff in NPD use. This will become essential as more entry points are brought into the networks in each country, and the availability of computer-based training modules covering key components of the NPD would be particularly valuable to assist with this. A further impression from the field review was that the people in Myanmar appear to have absorbed more through this exercise - possibly due to their better English language levels.

The field review found that technical support offered by the Project Team and GBS & Associates for the installation and operation of the NPD was timely, effective and appreciated. However, sustainability of the NPD in CMLV remains a key factor. The need to provide wider technical support on operational quarantine issues outside those addressed by the NPD is also critical, and the Review Team would suggest that this type of support could in the future be provided through links with NZ MAF.

3.2 Strategic planning process and plans

The Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Questionnaire (PCEQ), which was used in all four countries at the initial stages of the project, has been updated and used as a key tool for the strategic planning process. There seems to be broad agreement that the use of the PCEQ was a helpful exercise in allowing NPPOs and those responsible for planning and policy development, to understand priorities for SPS development in a WTO environment. There is even the suggestion that the questionnaire may have encouraged CMLV countries to look at the issue of legislation.

The TOR for the PCBP during the period 1 October 2003 to 30 June 2004 (Appendix II) focus almost entirely on the development of strategic plans for each of the CMLV countries. In particular they sought to have a standardised strategic planning process in place and to use the senior officials meeting scheduled for Vientiane in late February 2004 to address the issues surrounding the "development of collaborative mechanisms for designing/developing regional projects in the future". At the Vientiane SOM the components and use of the template of the Strategic Plan Builder or SPB, (designed by GBS and Associates and referred to by the MSC as the Strategic Planning Tool) were discussed in detail, and the format agreed to by senior CLMV officials. However, the actual plans themselves were not ready to be presented at this meeting.

Using updated information from the PCEQ, supplemented by additional data from each country, the MSC completed draft five-year strategic plans for the four countries by August 2004. According to the MSC this process involved significant amounts of training on the strategic planning process in each country but is 'no more than an awareness building exercise exposing senior and middle (level) managers to ... a complex (strategic planning) process which requires an understanding of the conceptual framework as well as competencies in a range of methodologies'. Despite the involvement of NPPO staff in the strategic planning process, the draft plans have essentially been prepared by the MSC and not, as anticipated in the TOR, in partnership with the countries themselves. The risk in preparing the plans this way, is that it has been undertaken in a passive participatory manner that could undermine any sense of ownership of the plans by CMLV authorities.

Nevertheless, except in Viet Nam, there seemed to be little or no concern about the process, and in Myanmar at least, the impression was given that it might be the only way in which strategic plans get developed and ultimately approved. There was agreement at SOM that it would take at least 6 months for a public consultation period and approval of the plans at 'a senior level'. The idea that consultation could be achieved through a broad-based national workshop was generally well received in Cambodia, Viet Nam and Myanmar. Representatives of three of the four countries at the SOM felt that this plan would also have to be approved at ministerial level.

Recommendation 2: Delays in strategic plan preparation and their adoption need to be taken into account when making any recommendations for future NZAID assistance, with consideration given to ways of supporting the process of 'public consultation' and implementation.

With the advantage of hindsight, the Review Team believes that it would have been both advantageous and logical if the strategic planning process had been initiated at the beginning rather than in the last phase of the project. As with the development of the NPD, the amount of work required to create and test the strategic planning tool was significantly underestimated and took much longer than planned. Perhaps if the strategic planning process had begun early in the life of the project, it would have been possible to have completed the drafting, review and approval of the four plans by 30 June 2004. Nevertheless by taking the planning process to its present stage, the Review Team considers the MSC has largely met the relevant TOR in LOV 5, with the important caveats that:

- the draft plans have essentially been prepared by the MSC, albeit with significant inputs from CMLV, rather than by the countries themselves
- the Strategic Plan Builder (SPB) software has not been installed in the NPD in each country, nor has training been provided in the use of the software.

The Review Team has seen a PowerPoint slide demonstration of the template and plan builder. These are impressive pieces of software and it is obvious from the meticulous attention to detail that they have taken hundreds of hours to create and fine tune. The resulting plans are also detailed and sophisticated documents that clearly provide very useful analysis of capacity constraints in each country, and by this means identify areas for donor assistance. They will require careful analysis by CMLV authorities and other stakeholders. In this respect the Review Team wonders if the planning process may have benefited from a simpler, less prescriptive, approach. Nevertheless the worth of these plans should be judged on the outcome of the evaluations and consultations to be undertaken in each CMLV country.

Because of the request from NZAID to treat the draft plans as confidential documents, the Review Team is reluctant to comment in detail on them, and believes each country should review the plans without detailed comment from outside sources. However, in the hope that it may assist with such reviews, the Review Team would offer the following general comments on the plans, based on an analysis of the draft plan it has seen for Cambodia. The Review Team suggests that as a generalisation, any strategic plan for an agricultural quarantine service should attempt to address the following issues in a way that is consistent with national goals and priorities, as well as realistic in terms of resource availability. It should:

- provide a **vision** for quarantine that defines the scope of activities required and the principles that are needed to achieve the quarantine goal
- stress the need for **community awareness and consultation**
- outline the preferred **organisation** of the quarantine service
- address requirements for effective **pre-border quarantine,** including international and regional obligations, trade-related activities and risk analysis
- address requirements for effective **border quarantine,** essentially those activities that relate to agricultural materials passing through national borders
- address requirements for effective **post-border quarantine,** including monitoring and surveillance, post-entry quarantine, and preparedness and response to pest incursions
- address **legislative and funding** requirements.

During the review of its strategic plan, each CMLV country may wish to consider if the draft meets the above criteria, and:

- satisfactorily addresses all the issues referred to above, including the need for mission and vision statements that adequately reflect national goals and priorities for each country's NPPO and its agricultural quarantine services, the need to develop community awareness of the importance and value of agricultural quarantine, post-entry quarantine services and the ability to respond to pest incursions, as well as provide a reasonable balance between the development of trade related and other aspects of phytosanitary services
- should include at least an outline of the preferred organisation of agricultural quarantine services, rather than only provide for a review of organisational structure
- places too much emphasis on the development of phytosanitary services to prescribed international standards, as distinct from those capable of being addressed by the expertise available and needed by stakeholders, particularly farmers, in each country.
- relies too heavily, and perhaps unrealistically, on the availability of foreign expertise to assist with the development of phytosanitary services in a situation where neither local expertise nor the amount of money needed to secure them is not available
- provides some estimate of likely requirements for capital and recurrent expenditures, including financing through overseas grant and investment funding

At the end of the process, each CMLV country should have a widely accepted and realistic strategic plan for the medium-term development of their agricultural quarantine services. It would also be hoped that CMLV officials would have a better understanding of the planning processes involved. It may well be that one the most useful outputs of this planning process will be increased capacity of CMLV authorities to prepare and present well designed and formulated project proposals to international donors. The main value of the strategic plans themselves may well be as documents used in discussions with potential donors.

A suitable approval process for the strategic plans would involve:

i circulation of a translated version of the draft plans to relevant government and semi-government agencies, universities, Chambers of Commerce, environmental organisations, producer and export groups and other interested bodies
ii preparation of a revised version based on written submissions
iii national workshops in each country during the first quarter of 2005 aimed at obtaining broad consensus on the plans
iv the workshop recommending the appropriate level of approval required
v obtaining approval
vi adoption of the strategic plans

3.3 Awareness building for senior managers

Senior managers of the phytosanitary services in CMLV have clearly benefited from project activities, as have the staff of NPPOs in each country involved in the management and day to day operation of plant quarantine services, and there appears to be a genuine appreciation of the immediate benefits that the project has provided for the management and operation of PQ services in NPPOs. Alongside this is a good understanding of the problems associated with

ensuring the sustainability of activities begun by the project and of key phytosanitary capacity development issues that will need to be addressed in the longer term.

There is also general agreement that a good degree of communication and cooperation between the four countries has been fostered by the project. The SOM in particular has played an important role in establishing strong linkages between senior officials. Mr. Dam Quoc Tru, the Deputy Director General PPD in Viet Nam considers that as a result "we now know each other personally and in most cases are in regular contact with each other".

Wider coordination and collaboration will be necessary at all levels for CMLV to develop effective agricultural (plant and animal) quarantine services. At a country level it will be necessary to effectively link all stakeholders: government, the service and agricultural sectors, donors and the general public. This will only be achieved if there is a realisation that agricultural quarantine is a shared responsibility for the benefit of everybody. Many government and non-government agencies are stakeholders in agricultural quarantine – this includes branches of government responsible for animal health, forestry, fisheries, public health, customs and the environment, as well as organisations representing producers and exporters of agricultural products. It is important that this level of coordination and collaboration is addressed in the strategic plans being prepared for each country. It is interesting to note that Myanmar, prompted by the requirements of WTO membership and with the added impetus provided by the PCEQ exercise, has already formed a National SPS Technical Committee within the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MAI).

Donor collaboration will also be an important factor at a national and regional level. It is evident from the MSC reports that considerable attempts have been made to develop this over the past three years, in part through donor participation at SOM meetings, and this is for example reflected in the MSC's March 2004 report on the Vientiane SOM. In each country there is a formal system for donor coordination, usually led by UN agencies. This includes donor coordination of the agricultural sector with FAO acting as the lead agency. It is therefore important that FAO Representatives in each country are kept fully up to date on activities of all donors in the SPS area and are encouraged to seek involvement from other potential donors.

Coordination at the regional level will also be essential, particularly as all four CMLV countries have common land borders – the level of quarantine inspection that is justified at these borders was discussed at the SOM meeting and needs further careful consideration.

The PCBP, through its focus on working with key officials in each NPPO and bringing these officials together at SOMs, has played a valuable role in beginning the process of coordination between the four countries. It is noted that both Thailand and China (Yunnan) were invited to the Vientiane SOM, and although China did not attend, it reflects a realisation that CMLV plus Thailand and the Yunnan Province of China represent a defined bio-geographic area.

In the longer term, the role and capacity of ASEAN's Sectoral Working Group on Crops, and FAO's Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Committee will need careful consideration in any CMLV regional coordination effort. There appears to be a considerable degree of scepticism in CMLV about the role that these bodies could usefully play, with a broadly held feeling that the SOM group could possibly offer a more permanent coordination role, both in terms of

coordination between the four countries, and in the important area of regional donor coordination.

Recommendation 3: Any follow-up NZAID assistance in the phytosanitary area should include support for the funding of a SOM in Cambodia to complete the cycle of a SOM in each CMLV country, and encourage an ongoing role for the SOM.

3.4 Impact on poverty and trade

In a conventional sense poverty remains a problem in ASEAN countries, although significant gains have been made in the last decade – for example in 2001 the World Bank reported that about 35% of people in Laos and Cambodia were still living on less than US$ 1 per day. Past efforts to alleviate poverty have usually focused on strengthening national economies, and it has been assumed that this will have a trickle-down effect on the poor. More recently there has been greater emphasis on such measures as promoting market opportunities for poor rural producers, and increasing the returns on their assets. There is no doubt that improving the health of plant (and animal) industries in CMLV through better SPS measures and systems can:

- enhance prospects for national, regional and international trade leading to higher national incomes, and indirectly contribute to poverty reduction
- in some regions provide direct benefits to poor farmers and rural communities by giving them direct access to improved markets
- increase the productivity of crops and in particular reduce the occurrence of major pest and disease outbreaks that result in devastating crop losses, and hence contribute directly to poverty alleviation.

The SOM in Vientiane highlighted the current emphasis on trade-related plant quarantine issues, and this is reinforced by the MSC. For example, traditionally monitoring and surveillance activities have primarily provided information to help farmers protect their crops from the ravages of pests. diseases and weeds This emphasis on trade-related issues has led to the suggestion by the MSC at the Vientiane SOM that these activities should be more about facilitating trade, by providing information that would help CMLV fulfil the phytosanitary requirements of trading partners and thus assist farmers by providing export market access.

Nevertheless the Review Team maintains that the most important objective of any NPPO must be to help farmers prevent or reduce losses caused by pests, diseases and weeds in a cost-effective, sustainable, safe and environmentally acceptable manner, that the development of effective border protection can contribute significantly to this by preventing the introduction and spread of major crop pests and diseases, and that, in developing countries such as CMLV, this need will continue to have a much greater direct impact on poverty than increasing exports.. Examples of this were discussed at the Vientiane SOM, including the problems posed by the introduction of the coconut leaf hispid (*Brontispa longissima)* a more detailed account of this problem is outlined in the box below.

The threat of *Brontispa* – an example of the need for effective border protection

The coconut leaf beetle, *Brontispa. longissima,* (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) is native to Indonesia and PNG, and had been reported in other locations in the Asia-Pacific region. It is believed that this pest was introduced into southern Viet Nam a few years ago in shipments of ornamental palms. The PPD in Viet Nam estimated in 2001 that the infestation of *Brontispa* had affected approximately one million coconut palms over 150,000 ha in all 21 southern provinces in Viet Nam. The beetle advanced rapidly into central Viet Nam and by August 2002 was found in more than 30 provinces, where it infested an estimated 6 million coconut palms over a much larger area. The pest has since spread to the northern region of the country, and it is now estimated that over 10 million palms have been affected. The larvae and adults of the beetle feed on the young, unopened leaves of the coconut palm, and serious defoliation may occur when the attack is severe. If this is sustained over a prolonged period, young palms in particular may be killed, and in Viet Nam severe losses have been reported.

Initially in Viet Nam, control with pesticides was attempted on a large scale. This was costly – an estimated US$0.33 per palm in Ben Tre province – and relatively ineffective because the pests are protected from contact with pesticides by the unopened leaves.

Since this report from Viet Nam, *Brontispa* has been reported in Hainan province in PR China, and at the SOM Cambodia reported that the pest was found in late 2001 attacking coconut palms in provinces bordering Viet Nam, where it is estimated that 60-80% of palms are infected.

These incursions of *Brontispa* have demonstrated the ease with which serious pests can be introduced from outside the CMLV region, and, once established, spread rapidly without regard to land borders. They emphasise the continuing importance of developing rational and cooperative border protection policies, alongside the development of PS initiatives that serve to facilitate trade. The Viet Nam delegation at the SOM concluded that 'we should seek to strengthen our resolve in increasing our cooperative efforts to reduce the risk of future pest incursions that will affect each of our countries. The interest from our partner countries in development to help us improve the efficiency of our quarantine services is therefore very much'. appreciated.'

While the absence of pests such as the coconut leaf beetle may be important in gaining export access, the introduction of many of them could mean that production, and ultimately export, of some crops may be very difficult indeed, and this emphasises the need for a balanced approach to any future NZAID support in the phytosanitary area.

The impact on exporters has been difficult to assess. In Viet Nam it was suggested that some exporters might be less than happy with the introduction of a transparent PC issuing process. The development of such a process must, however, be seen as inevitable, and an important part of the developing phytosanitary services in CMLV will be raising awareness of the benefits of effective agricultural quarantine for the whole community, including exporters.

Recommendation 4: An important focus of any future NZAID support should be on developing quarantine awareness and highlighting its benefits for the community as a whole.

It is therefore doubtful the project has had any significant impact on trade at this stage, and it is unlikely that it has had any effect on trade-related development. Lao PDR and Cambodia export

very limited quantities of plant products, and although Viet Nam and Myanmar export more, the range of products exported in any quantity is also limited. In light of this, the Review Team would suggest that in most instances it should for the foreseeable future be possible for CMLV countries to meet the SPS requirements of importing countries on a case-by-case basis. This is what is currently being attempted; in the export of mangoes and dragon-fruit from Viet Nam to New Zealand. Interestingly this has been the only example that the Review Team has been able to identify in which the export of agricultural products from any CMLV country has been prevented because of an inability to comply with phytosanitary requirements, and is a good example of the application of the concept of 'equivalence' discussed in Section 2.1.

In the longer term, particularly as the range and volume of exports from CLMV countries increase and the issue of export documentation becomes fully centralised and supported by acceptable inspection and treatment services, the project will undoubtedly be able to facilitate export activities. Nevertheless, the Review Team is doubtful whether a project of this nature without a more balanced approach towards preventing losses from pests and diseases and trade facilitation can, except in an indirect way, address the needs of subsistence farmers or alleviate extreme poverty. Clearly it will provide greater benefits to more advanced farmers capable of growing surplus commodities for national markets or for export and to businesses contracting producers to supply produce for export, and/or dealing with foreign markets. The Review Team would argue that improving capabilities in pest diagnosis, surveillance and PRA can achieve both – preventing losses and facilitate trade and in turn alleviate poverty.

One trade-related benefit of the project that is already being felt is the understanding in all four countries that use of the NPD in particular should lead to much greater transparency, particularly in areas such as certificate issue – in Myanmar for example it has already been possible to confirm the use of forged PCs through use of the NPD.

Many countries operate phytosanitary information systems and databases, including both NZ and Australia. The possibility of allowing access for countries such as CLMV to NZ or Australia's databases and information systems might be explored, at least for example, through NZ MAF making its global pest lists available to CMLV authorities. There appears to be a general reluctance on the part of NPPOs in developed countries to share data with others who have few resources, such as CMLV, despite the WTO requirement to make information on technical decisions available under the principle of transparency (ISPM No.1 and IPPC Art. 2(b)). An exception to this is the information on CABI's CPC, which has become an almost essential resource for anyone undertaking PRAs. Indeed, NPPOs could use the PRA module in the Compendium. The CPC module is designed to generate pest lists and to provide assistance with other parts of the PRA process.

This need to share data is supported by a recent response to a query posted on the internet site *PestNet*. Robert Ikin, a recognised Australian authority on biosecurity, acknowledged that NPPOs compile many datasheets when undertaking their own PRAs, but there seems to be considerable reluctance to make this basic information available to others who have fewer resources. To illustrate this point he referred to an Australian import risk analysis (IRA) for apples that assessed over 440 individual pests and an IRA of grain identifying over 500.

Ikin writes on *PestNet*, "It would seem obvious to me that NPPOs should maintain a list of datasheets they have compiled so that others can access it on request. At present anyone who

needs to compile a datasheet, after searching the resources has to start from scratch. Surely this is very inefficient, (even for developed countries), when it is possible that someone has already compiled much of the information for their own IRA needs."

Although not in the TOR of this review, it is evident that other plant protection agencies in developed countries are not rushing to share data on agricultural quarantine. It would be hoped through any future New Zealand involvement that NZ MAF might consider setting a good example by developing a more transparent approach to information sharing. The development of a standard Pest List Database tool for use by member countries of the Secretariat of the South Pacific (http://www.spc.int/pps/pacific%5Fpestlists%5Fdatabase.htm) is an interesting attempt to encourage such an approach, and also provides an example of the type of computer-based training modules that could be developed for use with the NPD.

Recommendation 5: Encouraging closer involvement of NZ MAF would lead to a more transparent approach to information sharing in future phases of an NZAID SPS project.

4 Consistency with NZAID policy

Information on file indicates that this project is recognised by NZAID as an NZ/ASEAN regional project under the NZ/ASEAN Dialogue relationship and one in support of the AFTA/CER-CEP framework and work programme. New Zealand is one of ten ASEAN dialogue partners and its relationship with ASEAN countries dates back to the 1940s. The NZ/ASEAN programme is only one of the broader political and trade relationships that were the catalyst for continuing an aid presence in this region.

The ASEAN Free Trade Area – Closer Economic Relations Closer Economic Partnership (AFTA/CER-CEP) and ASEAN's Initiative for ASEAN Integration (IAI) work plans represent the main priorities for NZAID to consider funding projects. Although not specifically mentioned, ongoing phytosanitary or agricultural quarantine activity can be aligned with the IAI work plans. These plans focus on the priority areas of infrastructure development, human resource development, information and communication technology and promoting regional economic integration in the CMLV countries.

Other NZAID projects operating within the ASEAN countries include ELTO (English Language Training for Officials), Legal Metrology (weights and measures), customs (MCV WTO valuation agreement), a collaborative project with Singapore involving workshops on WTO, plus other non-trade and development related projects including a natural gas project and several Asia Development Assistance Facility (ADAF) assignments. An added value for NZAID of the PCBP, or a possible extension, in this region is that it represents an agricultural initiative, and an area where NZ has particular expertise.

NZAID's draft Asia Strategy released for public consultation in July 2004 recognises New Zealand's limited development resources in Asia and argues these should be offered to core-bilateral partner countries including CMLV countries, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Viet Nam. It also believes NZAID should support human resource development, particularly in the Greater Mekong Sub-region. It mentions reviewing NZAID's assistance to China and developing an entry strategy for Myanmar. In selecting its core focus on sustainable rural livelihoods complemented by other sectoral and thematic programmes, the Asia Strategy sets an ideal framework for continuing an SPS programme in the Mekong Sub-region.

The greatest danger in supporting regional programmes or projects is the possible capture by one country, the diffusion of impact resulting from harmonisation and the difficulty of aligning political boundaries with sectoral or bio-geographic regions. It has already been noted that within the PCBP, Viet Nam is certainly a major driver of initiatives. The possible addition of Thailand to the group would need to be managed carefully for possible capture reasons. Regional projects still need to provide for an individual country focus or recognition of differences and allow for attention to different priorities while advancing a common goal.

Any project approved for funding by NZAID is required to contribute to the alleviation of poverty and the achievement of the strategic outcomes detailed in its overarching policy statement "Towards a Safe and Just World Free of Poverty". These outcomes are: fulfilment of basic needs, sustainable livelihoods, sustainable and equitable development and safe, just and inclusive societies.

NZAID's Trade and Development policy "Harnessing International Trade for Development" reiterates the aims and objectives of its policy statement. It also outlines NZAID's operating principles for trade and development assistance which have been adapted from the principles in the policy statement. Section 3 of the trade and development policy provides an overview of the trade-related programming areas in which NZAID considers it can add value. The most relevant one for the PCBP is under trade-related institutional and human resource capacity building, "b) implementing international trade obligations and standards".

The PCBP was evaluated on the extent to which it has delivered outputs consistent with the six key NZAID operating principles for trade and development assistance. The Review Team also assessed the extent to which the project's downstream activity (after NZAID funding ends) will be able to deliver outputs consistent with NZAID operating principles. The chart below lists the NZAID operating principles in the left-hand column. The next three columns assess the capacity for downstream delivery of outputs consistent with NZAID operating principles. The final column assesses the extent to which the project itself has delivered outputs to date.

NZAID Operating Principles for Trade and Development Assistance	Likelihood of **downstream developmental outcomes** consistent with NZAID			Evidence the Project has
Projects are supposed to:	Clearly will	Potentially will	Probably will not	delivered outputs to date
protect and promote human rights			X	**nil**
offer a strategic approach to poverty elimination		X		**limited**
enhance sustainability of development benefits		X		**limited**
achieve equitable benefits		X		**limited**
offer effective partnerships	X			**clear**
empower vulnerable members of society through participation			X	**nil**
enhance coordination and policy coherence	X			**clear**
support access and accountability		X		**limited**

The potential is there. but it is unlikely the project will deliver on a number of the above criteria in the short to medium term and certainly not without further support.

One further policy issue raised during this review is an outcome of the separation of NZAID as a semi-autonomous body from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. This involves shared roles and responsibilities between the two agencies and is most likely still evolving. From a political and ceremonial point of view, the participation at key milestone events of an Ambassador or similar Embassy representative provides added visibility, heightened media awareness and overall status to a New Zealand-funded project. In a situation where host countries involve their Ministers and heads of departments at opening ceremonies or meetings of senior officials, it may not always seem very courteous if that seniority is not matched by New Zealand, or indeed the donor agency is represented by a non-governmental project manager.

5 Coordination with ASEAN and other donors

The ASEAN bodies involved in SPS issues include the ASEAN Secretariat, ASWGC, the Expert Group on the Harmonisation of Phytosanitary Measures, and ASEANET (the Southeast Asia loop of BioNET International, which aims to build regional alliance in taxonomy and bio-systematics). Regardless of this involvement, there appears to have been little effective project engagement with ASEAN so far, even through ASEAN Secretariat representation at any of the SOM meetings. Nevertheless recent correspondence suggests that the older members of ASEAN (ASEAN-6) are expressing some interested in incorporating the CMLV system and establishing common standards.

It is noted that while the project design document for the AusAID SPS Capacity Building Project stipulates close informal liaison with the above bodies and proposes that an annual summary and project work plan will be presented to the ASWGC, the ASEAN bodies will not be required to sign off on Annual Plans or other documents. The Review Team would like to see greater efforts made to encourage effective coordination of activities and exchange of information at this level if NZAID-funded SPS activities are to continue in this region.

Other donors and organisations involved with SPS activities in CMLV include:

Recommendation 6: Any future NZAID involvement should be designed in consultation, with the ASEAN Secretariat and its bodies associated with SPS.

AusAID and other Australian agencies

Australia's main interest is currently through the upcoming Sanitary and Phytosanitary Capacity Development Building Program (SPSCDP), which it is believed will become operational in mid-2004 (ARDCP 2003). The question of collaboration with this project has been considered by the MSC. He has concluded that while some of the activities may be complementary, there are significant differences in concept, design and in-country inputs. The AusAID project focuses on training, and little overlap with the PCBP seems likely. On a practical level, however, the Review Team believe it desirable if the function of the relevant components of the NPD and strategic planning process could be dealt with in the AusAID program's training activities. Close coordination of any future NZAID assistance with this project and other Australian initiatives is clearly desirable, and a mechanism for achieving this needs to be established.

Other official Australian assistance (past, ongoing and proposed) in SPS involving CMLV countries includes:

- OCPPO workshops on pest diagnostics and needs assessment/assistance with pest collections
- ACIAR publications on pest surveillance and on arthropod and plant pathogen collection
- ACIAR projects on fruit fly quarantine and phosphine fumigation in Viet Nam

- the AADCP plant health project. This is part of a project that has the overall title of "Enhancing ASEAN Competitiveness", and four sub-components:
  a) Quality assurance systems
  b) Quality assurance and safety of fish products
  c) Strengthening ASEAN plant health capacity
  d) Strengthening ASEAN animal health and quarantine

JICA: JICA are interested in SPS issues in the region, attended the Vientiane SOM, and as reported in the October 2003 mission report were willing to fund observers from Thailand and China at the SOM. However, their presentation at the SOM was largely non-committal although subsequent contacts with the MSC have indicated that JICA funding for training CML officials in Viet Nam may be possible through its 'Third Country Programme'.

FAO: APPPC, with its headquarters in Bangkok, is one of the regional plant protection organisations established under the FAO/IPPC framework. CMLV countries are members, and as such, APPPC can play a valuable role in coordinating SPS activities in the four countries. At a country level, FAO can also play a coordination role through FAORs who usually chair donor coordination working groups for the rural sector. In this capacity, the FAOR Lao PDR co-chaired the SOM in Vientiane. It should be noted that, except through its TCP programme, FAO is not a funding agency.

WTO/STDF: At the Doha WTO Ministerial meeting held in Qatar in November 2001, the heads of WTO, FAO, WHO, OIE and the World Bank committed their organisations to work together to strengthen the capacity of developing countries in meeting SPS standards. The establishment of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) in September 2002 resulted from this joint commitment. The purpose of the STDF, which is managed by the WTO, is to facilitate the collaboration between the partner organisations in enhancing the capacity of developing countries. This is to be achieved through cooperation between the relevant institutions in SPS-related activities, including the development of joint institutional projects, and provision of STDF-funded projects in developing countries. The STDF will support information exchange, development of databases, tool kits and learning materials on trade-related SPS issues to better coordinate capacity building projects. Furthermore, the STDF will provide funding for pilot projects in capacity building in individual countries or through regional initiatives in direct support of the Doha declaration. The STDF is now operational, and the STDF Working Group met in May 2003 to discuss initial project preparation proposals and projects. At this meeting, agreement was reached to provide a maximum of US$37,000 for the preparation of one project proposal and US$10,000 for each of three additional proposals. The objectives of the fund and these proposed projects would seem to be very much oriented towards the type of information management and planning activities undertaken by the PCBP. Therefore, it may represent a future funding avenue for completing some of this work. The size of the grants for projects proposed to date and the fact that total funding for the first three years will apparently not exceed US$1,000,000. This suggests that the STDF is unlikely to immediately be a major source of future funding for SPS activities in CMLV countries. Further information, including details of the criteria for grants, is at http://www.standardsfacility.org/index.htm

World Bank/IDA: The IDA Agricultural Productivity Improvement Project (APIP) in Cambodia is currently contributing to the development of SPS activities through its plant protection sub-component, specifically by support through 2005 for the development of

laboratory and office facilities and for activities including pest diagnosis, pest surveillance, development of pest lists and improvement of the legal basis for PQ in Cambodia. It is anticipated that a second phase of APIP will begin after 2005, and it will be essential that any SPS activities in this area are carefully coordinated with any future NZAID assistance. In the medium term, the possibility of obtaining investment funding through WB/IDA, ADB etc for SPS activities in individual countries or in the region should be kept in mind - especially as agricultural quarantine offers good possibilities of adequate returns on investment through a combination of reducing costs associated with pest and disease outbreaks, the development of trade, and the potential of at least partial cost-recovery.

ADB: The ADB would appear to have potential as a donor in the area of SPS, in particular through its Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS) program. (For ADB purposes, GMS comprises Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Thailand, Viet Nam and Yunnan Province in the People's Republic of China). In 1992, with the assistance of ADB, the six countries entered into a programme of sub-regional economic cooperation, designed to enhance economic relations among the countries. Although none of the current projects deal directly with SPS issues, the programme is designed to develop infrastructure to enable development and sharing of the resource base, and promote the freer flow of goods and people in the sub-region. It has also led to international recognition of the sub-region as a growth area, and to the GMS Cross-Border Transport Agreement 1999 (GMS CBTA), a multilateral instrument for the facilitation of cross-border transport of goods and people. Formulated under the auspices of an ADB technical assistance, the GMS CBTA aims to provide a practical approach, in the short to medium term, to streamlining regulations and reducing non-physical barriers in the GMS. It incorporates the principles of bilateral or multilateral action, and flexibility in recognition of the differences in each of the GMS countries. The Agreement appears to be a compact and comprehensive multilateral instrument. which covers in one document all the relevant aspects of cross-border transport facilitation. including in principle phytosanitary and veterinary inspection. However its practical involvement in SPS, beyond cross-border transport facilitation, at this stage appears limited. Further information can be found at http://www.adb.org/GMS/agreement.asp

Recommendation 7: The involvement of the ADB through its Greater Mekong Sub-region Cross-Border Transport Agreement and/or other multilateral investment providers such as the WTO's STDF should be considered as mechanisms for achieving any downstream SPS-based projects and longer-term joint investment arrangements.

6 Future involvement of NZAID

MSC Recommendations

The MSC has indicated in discussions with the Review Team that he sees both the NPD and the strategic planning process as activities requiring at least two years further involvement of NZAID to bring them to a satisfactory exit point. This view is confirmed in his final report, where he recommends that at least for the next two years, the NZAID programme should remain focused on delivering outputs in the strategic directions set at the beginning of the project. This includes:

- extending the use of the information management system or NPD to all major entry/exit points and regional offices by providing hardware and technical assistance
- enabling information exchange between the NPPO and other non-NPPO agencies such as research institutes, agricultural universities and provincial departments of agriculture
- customisation and installation of other major components of the NPD system - especially laboratory operations, pest risk analysis and training for users.
- providing technical advice and guidance to senior managers on strategic development issues such as project formulation, needs assessment at various levels, especially on human resource development
- further strengthening the linkages between the CLMV countries through senior officials meetings and other forums and assisting in the formulation of concept or background papers for CLMV sub-regional projects for submission to other donor agencies e.g. JICA, UNDP, FAO, ADB, World Bank, USAID, AusAID, CIDA, DFID etc.
- providing technical advice and guidance for developing appropriate curricula for training programmes in pest diagnosis at the Hanoi Agricultural University
- providing a relatively small amount of funds (e.g. NZ $25,000 per year) to support trainees from Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar to attend courses in phytosanitary disciplines in Viet Nam.

Additionally the MSC makes three recommendations that refer specifically to the NPD, the strategic planning process and the further development of collaboration on SPS issues:

1. That NZAID provide phased technical assistance over the next two years to the CLMV countries to extend the NPD network and customise and install other components of strategic value. Assistance for procurement of client PCs (ten for each country over the next two years) and accessories to extend the NPD network should also be provided. This would include development of information exchange systems between the NPPO and relevant non-NPPO agencies. The estimated budget for computer hardware is about NZ$50,000 per year for two years.
2. That NZAID continues to provide technical assistance in the 2004-2005 financial year for further training in the strategic planning process, the use of the Strategic Plan Builder, and to assist the CMLV countries to institutionalise the strategic planning process and develop consultation mechanisms with stakeholders
3. That NZAID continues to provide technical assistance to strengthen the linkages between the CMLV countries through supporting another senior officials meeting around February or March 2005 to discuss progress on the finalisation or implementation of their respective strategic plans, explore opportunities for formulating regional projects for

capacity development, especially in such areas as pest surveillance systems, pest diagnosis and review of legislation.

Review Team's Recommendations

Although there is a general appreciation of the positive benefits of the PCBP, and despite the MSC's recommendations, the Review Team believes that a change of approach is required for NZAID. The preceding sections of this Review reveal that the current project has had a limited effect on poverty reduction and trade facilitation - important findings for NZAID. For the four countries, the current priorities are in improving the operational capabilities that underpin a credible plant protection/phytosanitary organisation. This means improving capabilities in areas such as pest diagnosis, pest surveillance and pest risk analysis, all areas identified by CLMV officials as priorities at the Vientiane SOM.

For these reasons, the Review Team recommends:

1. A continuation of NZAID's assistance to CLMV in the phytosanitary area, but through a new project to be designed in the coming months.

2. NZAID use unspent funds from 2003/04 for the current project to finalise the installation of the strategic planning software and training in its use in each CMLV country.

Recommendation 8: NZAID support and funding in the phytosanitary area should not end at this point. That said, there are higher priorities for NZAID assistance than the further development of the NPD under the current project. NZAID should consider funding a 2nd phase SPS programme for CMLV countries to begin in 2005 for a 3-5 year period. This future project would be based on the key priorities identified at the SOM, particularly pest diagnosis, surveillance and pest risk analysis. To inform this process, it is recommended that NZAID commission a project design mission to CMLV countries, including consultation with AusAID, FAO, the ASEAN Secretariat and other relevant organisations.

Recommendation 9: NZAID should use unspent PCBP funds from 2003/04 during the second half of 2004 to install the SPB software in each country, and to train NPPO staff in its use.

6.1 Second-phase project

Establishment of a 2nd phase would essentially be seen as building on the outputs of the original project and designed to implement an effective operational plant quarantine programme in participating countries in coordination with other donors. To maintain the momentum and interest in SPS developed through the PCBP, any second-phase project should begin as soon as possible. A suitable project design process could be achieved by an NZAID-funded mission to Thailand and each CMLV country for discussions with senior CMLV officials and FAO/RAPA.

This could be extended to discussions with ASEAN and ADB, and then to Australia for discussions with AusAID, DAFF,AQIS and ACIAR during the third quarter of 2004.

As outlined above this could be accompanied by a study tour of senior CMLV PQ managers to New Zealand and perhaps Australia with the purpose of establishing links with agricultural quarantine services to be further developed during the second-phase project. Such a gathering would also prove useful for discussing the draft design of a second phase project prior to sign-off during the IV SOM meeting in Cambodia in the first quarter of 2005.

Commencement of a 2nd phase project is envisaged in 2005. The selection of 2nd phase components would be based on the list of SOM priorities outlined below and determined in part by likely funds available through NZAID for this activity. These priorities represent what is clearly a perceived desire of CMLV officials to strengthen the operational aspects of their phytosanitary services, and would build on the planning, information management and coordination components that have been supported during the PCBP. These SOM priorities are detailed, with comments by the Review Team, as Appendix I.

The Review Team would rank the SOM priorities in the following order, with the first four considered most deserving of NZAID support during a 2nd phase:

1. review organisational structure
2. review legislation
3. improve pest surveillance systems
4. improve pest diagnostic capabilities
5. improve inspection systems at main entry/exit points (including border exchange)
6. improve pest risk analysis capabilities.

Two additional matters, discussed briefly at the SOM, but not included as priority areas, deserve particular consideration in terms of any future NZAID assistance:

7. the need for increased attention to developing community awareness of the importance of PQ activities at all levels, so that the whole community understands PQ is a shared responsibility that benefits everybody
8. in order to maximise the effectiveness of limited available resources, the importance, referred to frequently elsewhere in many contexts of coordination, both between CMLV countries, between donors and with other plant protection activities in CMLV countries.

A third area not discussed would be:

9. an overall need for training in areas not supported by other donors and in particular the AusAIDs SPSCDP project. This might involve in-country training including computer-based training using the NPD and advance level training (post graduate) at international institutions e.g. Massey University and Griffith University, Brisbane, or possibly, as suggested by the MSC in his final report, Hanoi Agricultural University.

In addition to the above components, any 2nd phase project could *inter alia* consider:

- extending the CMLV membership to include all Greater Mekong Sub-region members
- abandoning the need to control internal borders between participating countries
- combining plant quarantine with animal quarantine in each country, making it a full agricultural quarantine system

- aligning the 2nd phase with downstream investment by, for example, the GMS CBTA

Recommendation 10: The 2nd phase component should be extended from CMLV participation to include the Greater Mekong Sub-region with Thailand and Yunnan 'paying their own way' but sharing the knowledge and other cooperative benefits.

In summary any 2nd phase NZAID assistance over a 3 - 5 year period should be:

- based on the priorities described above, reflecting the results of the strategic planning process undertaken in each country and the differing stages of SPS development in each country
- based on a participatory project design process, using the strategic planning tool, and benefiting from a formulation/design mission fielded as part of the extension or transition phase
- aligned to changing NZAID policy priorities, particularly those outlined in the recently published Public Consultation Document on NZAID's draft Asia Strategy
- aimed at training CMLV countries in pest diagnosis, risk analysis and surveillance and in inspecting and treating plant imports and exports to a point where they can build their own reputable databases and use the NPD effectively
- designed to coordinate its activities with the AusAID SPSCBP and with other donor support, and to provide for the formulation of a requests for funding under the GMS CBTA program or WTO/STDF to develop those areas of SPS activities not being supported by other donors.

Appendices

I SOM priorities for further action (agreed at Vientiane SOM, March 2004)

1 Review of Organisational Structure

- Lao PDR, Cambodia and Myanmar
- Assess feasibility for integration of Animal and Plant Quarantine operations
- Strengthen linkages with customs and other border agencies
- Assess options for cost recovery of NPPO activities (e.g. export certification)
- Develop management and leadership skills

Comment: At the SOM two aspects of organisational structure and administration were discussed in some detail. The first was the question of the integration of plant and animal health inspection and quarantine, and perhaps also customs, human health checks, border drug checks, etc. The second was the degree of cost recovery that should be introduced for quarantine services, phytosanitary certification, etc. The Review Team considers these matters and indeed the overall organisational structures are of great importance, providing, with good legislation, the basis for effective phytosanitary services, and it is hoped that the strategic planning process will provide the basis for a systematic organisational review in each country.

2 Review of Legislation

Undertake a comprehensive review of national plant protection and other relevant legislations to check for compliance with the SPS Agreement, IPPC and international standards for phytosanitary measures.

Comment: The harmonisation of phytosanitary measures is a primary object of the SPS agreement and IPPC, and the need to bring current legislation into line with this requirement clearly has prompted CLMV authorities to give priority to a review of legislation in each country. At the SOM meeting it was suggested that the Legal Office of FAO would be a suitable and competent body to undertake such a review, and during the field visit this was discussed with the FAO Representative in Myanmar. He suggested that the use of FAO's Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP), in the form of a regional TCP project covering the four countries, would be a possible means of undertaking this. The drafting of a suitable project would not be difficult – a framework was provided by the Lao PDR FAOR at the SOM meeting – and it may be worthwhile recommending that NZ put forward such a proposal to FAO through the APPPC, with the possibility of funding being provided as part of any second-phase project. Any such proposal would probably have to be in two stages – firstly a desk review of current legislation, followed by field visits in order to assess the ability and willingness of each country to undertake necessary revisions – this would include recommendations of any additional assistance that would be needed in a second stage of the project.

3 Improve Pest Surveillance Systems

- Undertake a comprehensive review of Pest Status Records
- Determine 10 high priority crops and production sites in each country

- Offer technical assistance for survey methodology
- Provide training and equipment (including transportation)
- Develop 'National Standards'
- Extend surveillance network to every level possible - Research Institute, University, extension workers, farmers etc.
- Develop mechanisms for sharing of pest status information between CLMV
- Determine high priority pest list for CLMV

Comment: There was broad agreement at the SOM and during country visits that support for monitoring and surveillance programs should receive high priority in any TA programs. It is perhaps worth restating what an effective monitoring and surveillance programme should achieve:

- Provide knowledge of a country's current plant health status
- Provide information on plant pests and diseases that occur in other countries, and could threaten primary industries, natural environment and human health
- Provide early detection of incursions of exotic pests and diseases, whether due to illicit or natural entry or through not being intercepted at the border, which will greatly improve the chance of successful control or eradication
- Represent an important element of meeting a country's international obligations
- Provide basic input to the risk analysis process and thus facilitate trade
- Add to the knowledge of a country's flora and fauna

The current project hopefully has provided a means of managing the data generated from monitoring and surveillance programmes in CMLV, and what would appear to be need now is assistance to the four countries with the knowledge and means to undertake this work. Deciding how this might best be done – this work is relatively costly - would seem to be a major challenge for the formulators of any second phase NZAID project in determining how this could be achieved in a coordinated and cost-effective manner. The cost of surveillance was recognised by the SOM, and it was agreed that each country would nominate a maximum of ten priority crops for surveillance, and specific high-risk regions should also be identified. The meeting also welcomed the information that ACIAR is about to support writing and publication of a "Toolbox" Manual on how to conduct national pest, disease and weed surveys for phytosanitary purposes.

4 Improve Pest Diagnostic Capabilities

- Reference Laboratory (at least one in each CLMV country)
  - Building
  - Equipment
  - Reference Collection
  - Tools for Identification
- Human Resources
  - Training in-country and overseas
  - Basic level training
  - Advanced level training
  - Develop linkages with staff from other advanced laboratories
  - Develop project documents which should include govt. staffing obligations

- Management training for laboratory managers
- Technical assistance for non-routine pest diagnosis from advanced laboratories
- Use of pest diagnostic training facilities within CLMV
- Training at International Fruit Fly Centre (Brisbane and Kuala Lumpur)

Comment: Again the current project provides the means to manage data from pest diagnosis, and again the future challenge is to enable the CMLV countries to undertake this work. It is noted that AusAID's SPSCBP places considerable effort on human resource development in this area, but the need remains to provide reference laboratories, with collections, in each country and to support their collaborative utilisation, as well as to provide for non-routine pest diagnosis from advanced laboratories. The sharing of resources between CMLV countries would clearly be very important, and at the SOM it was suggested that a CLMV Training Centre for pest diagnosis might be established in Viet Nam. Overseas training, including post-graduate training, will be essential, particularly in specialised areas such as fruit fly identification, and in this regard the resources available through Massey University and Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia, were noted by the meeting.

5 **Improve Inspection Systems at main entry/exit points (includes border exchange etc.)**

- Establish main quarantine check points
- Strengthen inspection systems at main check points incl. international airports, sea ports and post office
- Develop a regional standard for quarantine operations (Viet Nam to send standard)
- Equipment
- Training (Training modules from Prof. Norton)
- Border Exchange
- Develop criteria for border exchange commodities and MOU between CLMV

Comment: What to do about border inspections and controls will be a politically, operationally and financially difficult problem for CLMV, particularly in respect of internal land borders – as suggested above, it may be logical to do away with all SPS border controls at land crossings within CMLV and concentrate on international airports and seaports and on major points of entry on land borders with countries outside CMLV. This would serve to resolve the question of what was called at the SOM "border exchange". This refers to the casual movement of produce between communities close to and on either side of the border, which has been traditional for years. It is believed that 50-60% of all cross-border movement of quarantinable commodities falls into this category, and at present is not subject to any phytosanitary measures. CMLV authorities are clearly unwilling to impose any measures or restrictions on this "border exchange". This of course is only the movement that occurs at official border crossings– there is an unknown additional amount of movement through other crossing points, and all this only goes to demonstrate the 'porous' nature of these borders. Related to this are the efforts of ADB to facilitate the movement of goods and people through its GMS program described above, and this will become more critical with construction of the ASEAN highway. This will hugely increase traffic across borders in the region, and there will be quarantine, and many other, implications for all CMLV countries. In respect of training, the SOM noted that Dr Geoff Norton of the University of Queensland has, through an ACIAR project with China, developed a series of

Quarantine Training and Information modules, and it was suggested that funding could be sought to have versions prepared for CMLV in their own language and customised for their own pests and quarantine needs. Additionally Viet Nam offered to assist by supplying its national standards for border inspection as a possible basis for the development of regional standards, and any future NZAID assistance might consider supporting the customisation and incorporation of these materials into the NPD. In light of all this the Review Team suggests priority be given to helping CMLV countries develop a coherent and common policy on border controls, and seek ADB funding for the implementation of a comprehensive project that would provide for the implementation of this policy, as well as assisting with other aspects of SPS development that require significant capital inputs. Such a project should be attractive to the Bank, not only as part of it GMS programme, but also for its cost repayment potential through a combination of increased trade and complete or partial cost recovery of quarantine operations.

6 Improve Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) Capabilities

- Form a multi-disciplinary PRA team (minimum of 4-5 people)
- Develop national standard for PRA
- Training
    - Workshops – in-country and/or overseas (e.g. AusAID SPS Capacity Development Project)
- Tools and Equipment
    - Textbooks
    - CD-ROMs etc.
- Develop a workplan for the PRA team
- Request a global pest list and examples of PRA from developed countries (e.g. Australia, NZ, USA etc.)

Comment: PRA, as normally considered, is used in relation to imports, and thus may not have as high a priority in some countries as it probably deserves – Myanmar for example indicated that it would have a relatively low priority. A detailed review of quarantine risk analysis in Australia is given by Nairn *et al* (1996). A tool for undertaking PRA, potentially an important part of the NPD, is still under development and its finalisation and use could form part of any future assistance in this area. The usefulness of this PRA component will rely on the database containing comprehensive pest status records for key crops, and would be greatly assisted by exporting countries being able and willing to supply corresponding data on pests in those countries. The apparent unwillingness of developed countries to share PRA and other SPS data and the possibility of NZ showing increased willingness to share this data, have been referred to above. Again the AusAID SPS project will provide assistance with HRD in this area, and a number of countries have reported that short term training in PRA has at times been available from other donors.

II Review Terms of Reference

NZAID: Review Of The Phytosanitary Capacity Building Project For ASEAN Under The Trade And Development Programme

Terms Of Reference (January 2004)

The purpose of this review is to assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the Phytosanitary Capacity Building Project and recommend the scope of any future NZAID assistance under this project.

Project Background/History

Over the past few years, NZAID (previously NZODA) has undertaken a range of activities under ASEAN's economic recovery sectoral heading of the "Hanoi Plan of Action". These activities have been aimed at facilitating the integration of ASEAN's newer members under the AFTA/CER-CEP framework. They have included general trade policy training as well as work with customs, standards, conformance, and sanitary and phytosanitary systems (SPS).

In April-May 2001, NZODA commissioned Dr Godwin Balasingam to assist the Governments of Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam (CLMV) to undertake a needs assessment in the SPS area. The needs assessment examined the capabilities and identified the gaps that needed to be addressed, so that the newer ASEAN members would not (i) be disadvantaged in trying to gain market access for their agricultural products in the global marketplace or (ii) face increased risks from exotic pest introductions associated with imported agricultural commodities.

During the initial phase or **Phase I** of the NZODA Phytosanitary Capacity Development Project, Dr Balasingam undertook the needs assessment by using a number of tools/methods including:

- the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) Questionnaire developed by a team of New Zealand consultants (now adopted as an international ICPM standard by FAO) with funding from the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- discussion through focus group meetings and person-to-person interactions with staff from all levels in the respective National Plant Protection Organisations (NPPO) undertaking phytosanitary activities, and, with technical staff from Agricultural Universities and Research Organisations.
- discussion with senior managers (Director General or Secretary of State, Deputy Director General, General Managers and Managers) in the various Ministries of Agriculture.
- observations of activities and resources at plant protection and/or quarantine laboratories, selected entry/exit points for trans-boundary movement of plants and plant products including land border posts, airports and seaports.

By using a multi-level needs assessment process, the consultant assisted the Government officials in each of the four countries to systematically, objectively and realistically identify needs (or gaps in the capabilities) for the NPPOs to carry out phytosanitary activities in accordance with the specifications and/or guidelines stipulated in the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs).

The scope and nature of the gaps identified were extensive and included the lack of essential tangible assets such as skilled human resources; lack of physical infrastructure (e.g. buildings at entry/exit points); pest inspection and diagnostic equipment; information management systems and documentation systems.

The findings identified areas of critical need and provided evidence to support a strong case for technical and financial assistance from donor agencies. However, the magnitude and scope of the capacity building and institutional development programmes required were such that long-term assistance from multiple donors would be needed. Dr Balasingam recommended that urgent assistance be provided under the NZODA-ASEAN capacity building programme by providing targeted assistance to the various governments to systematically bring about the transformational changes required to their respective NPPOs to carry out core organisational functions.

The main areas identified for most urgent action (short-term) included:

- development of an integrated national phytosanitary database system for information management.
- assistance for the formulation of vision documents, strategic plans and action plans for phytosanitary capacity development and the formulation of project proposals in an integrated manner so that multiple donor agencies could be involved in the development programme(s).

It was also recommended that the NZODA programme support initiatives to strengthen linkages and promote cooperation and collaboration between phytosanitary officials in CLMV; between industry and regulatory officials in each country; and, between the NPPOs and other related organisations (e.g. research institutes and universities) in each country.

NZODA approved these recommendations and supported the initiative. **Phase II** of the programme involved a senior officers meeting and study tour in Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh City in November 2001. At this meeting, attended by senior officers (Director General or Deputy Director General and the Head of the Phytosanitary Service) from the four countries, the proposed NZODA workplan for the 2001-2002 financial year was discussed and approved. The participants also proposed that, with the approval of the Government of Myanmar, the next senior officials meeting be held in Myanmar in November 2002.

The next stage of the programme involved the procurement of computing equipment (including servers and client PCs); installation of software and the national phytosanitary database to computerise and automate the phytosanitary and permit certification systems, pest surveillance data collection systems and other activities of the phytosanitary service; and training of staff. This phase commenced in Viet Nam in May 2002 and was concluded in Myanmar in September 2002.

With the approval of the Government of the Union of Myanmar, a Senior Officers Meeting and Study Tour, was held in Myanmar from 25 – 30 November 2002. The objectives of the meeting were to (i) ensure commitment of senior officials to the project, (ii) facilitate cooperation and collaboration between phytosanitary authorities in the four countries, (iii) increase awareness among senior managers of international requirements in the phytosanitary field and (iv) show officials local facilities and systems in Myanmar.

[Reports on all of these activities are held with the NZAID Programme Manager.]

Phase III began in May 2003, shifting the focus of the project to the second main priority identified in the original needs assessment – that of building NPPOs' capabilities in strategic planning for phytosanitary capacity development. By the end of this phase, in June 2004, each of the four countries should have produced a draft five year strategic plan to address SPS issues. In addition, Dr. Balasingam and his colleague have been providing on-going technical support for the database, as well as providing training on other modules/functionality of the database such as the pest status/surveillance component.

Dr. Balasingam's first visit for phase III was to Lao PDR in May-June 2003. During the visit, a standardised methodology and template for preparing strategic plans was developed, which could then be

applied by Lao PDR and the other three countries. Workshops were held for NPPO staff on the process of strategic planning. A computer-based strategic planning tool was developed to help progress the strategic plans, and relevant data was collected to inform the planning process.

Cambodia was visited in October 2003, where the strategic planning methodology, template and tools developed during the May visit were applied. Workshops were held for middle and senior level management at the NPPO to improve their understanding of and capabilities in strategic planning. Senior management discussed the vision and mission of the NPPO; identified development objectives; and reviewed the organisational structure of their organisation. Training was also provided on data entry for the pest status/surveillance component.

There was a further visit to Lao in order to gather further information such as current activities at regional/provincial offices: status of buildings (e.g. labs) and equipment; communication systems; and human resources. The results of the original needs assessment conducted in April 2001 were also updated so that they could be incorporated into Lao's strategic plan.

In late early March 2004, a senior officials meeting will be held in Vientiane in Lao. Staff from the NPPOs of the four countries will meet to discuss:- the progress of the project to date; linkages between their respective organisations; and progress on the strategic planning processes being followed by Lao and Cambodia. Drafts of strategic plans from these two countries will be presented. Other donors such as JICA and FAO should also be present at the meeting.

Following this meeting, Dr Balasingam is due to visit Myanmar and Viet Nam to assist their strategic planning processes. By the end of June 2004, each of the four countries should have produced a "government-approved draft strategic plan for public consultation".

Purpose of the review

To assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the Phytosanitary Capacity Building Project and recommend the scope of any future NZAID assistance under this project.

Objectives of the review

Objective one: **To assess the overall impact of this project including against its TOR**

It is expected that Tasks required to achieve this objective will include:

Within New Zealand:

- reviewing the project file and reports for relevant information
- reviewing the original TOR and objectives of the project
- consulting Dr Balasingam, Mary Oliver (the former ASEAN Development Programme Manager/DPM – depending on availability) and Guy Redding (the present DPM) to gauge their views on the performance and impact of the project.
- consulting a number of experts in the SPS field, specifically New Zealand's Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Hort Research, the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM), Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission, as well as the relevant experts at AusAID, JICA and FAO. Such consultation to be through meetings (NZ-based) or by telephone or email (overseas-based). The consultant will be expected to develop an appropriate consultation methodology, which avoids subjective opinions and enables an objective assessment of the project, and the degree to which it (i) improves market access for CLMV and (ii) moves CLMV towards best practice in SPS systems and strategic planning

Field Visits:

- consulting a sample of staff at NPPOs in CLMV to obtain their views on the effectiveness of the project, and to make an assessment of their understanding and use of the database system
- consulting senior officials in the NPPOs and Ministries of Agriculture to obtain their views on the project, and to make a general assessment of their understanding of international phytosanitary requirements..

Objective Two: **To assess the impact of the project from a poverty alleviation perspective (through both direct and indirect mechanisms)**

Tasks undertaken to meet Objective One will also help in meeting this objective. In addition, there will be a need to:

- review NZAID's overarching policy statement and its Trade and Development Policy
- assess the project impact (as per objective one) against these two policies

Objective Three: **To assess the on-going strategic fit of this project with (i) NZAID's Trade and Development Policy, (ii) NZAID's over-arching policy framework, (iii) NZAID's proposed Asia strategy and (iv) ASEAN's strategic direction**

It is expected that Tasks required to achieve this objective will include:

- reviewing NZAID's Trade and Development Policy and overarching policy
- reviewing various strategic documents from ASEAN such as the AFTA-CER and Initiative for ASEAN Integration (IAI) work-plans
- consulting with the ASEAN Secretariat. Such consultation to be by email and/or telephone.
- consulting with the leader of the Strategy Development Team for NZAID's Asia Strategy
- comparing the strategic direction of these policies against the findings from objectives one and two

Objective Four: **To make recommendations on the future involvement of NZAID in this project (and/or off-shoots thereof).**

These recommendations to be based on:

- findings from the above-mentioned objectives/tasks including the results of consultations with NZAID staff, Dr Balasingam, the ASEAN Secretariat, project beneficiaries and other experts
- assessment of the training and strategic plan workshops delivered through in-country visits
- review of the draft strategic plans for Lao PDR and Cambodia, and the process for producing those plans
- an assessment of the extent to which resources will be available from other donors (particularly AusAID, JICA and FAO), bearing in mind the need for donor co-ordination. This will be determined through telephone/email discussions with the relevant counterparts in other donors.

Questions to be answered

Through pursuing the above-mentioned objectives and tasks, this review should answer the following questions:

- To what extent has this project fulfilled its TOR?

- What has been the impact of this project, in terms of:
    - poverty reduction
    - increased efficiency
    - facilitating increased trade (including intra-ASEAN)
    - improved transparency and governance
- To what extent does the phytosanitary database/software enable the NPPOs to fulfil their day-to-day functions, and thereby expedite imports and exports?
- To what extent does this project contribute to the international acceptability of agricultural exports from these four countries?
- To what extent is the functionality of the database/system being exploited at present? What further potential is there?
- What is the level of understanding of the database/system among NPPO staff? How effective has the database/software training been? Has a cadre of staff in each of the four countries been sufficiently trained to ensure on-going use of the database/system?
- Is the database operational on a day-to-day basis or are there any technical issues (e.g. connectivity, servers) preventing its regular use?
- How successful has the strategic planning process been? Do staff have a good understanding of the process? Do they have ownership of the draft strategic plans produced?
- To what extent do the draft strategic plans produced provide the basis for the NPPOs to improve their phytosanitary capabilities towards international best practice?
- How significant are the links/impacts of this project to/on:
    - Farmer and producer group activity?
    - Exporter activity?
    - Activities of other agricultural organisations, particularly those responsible for agricultural extension/training, and pest monitoring/surveillance, field trials and testing?
- If not significant, how could these links/impact be improved?
- What is the strategic fit between this project and the strategies/policies of NZAID and ASEAN?
- Should NZAID continue to provide funding for this project, and, if so, in which areas?
- Alternatively, should NZAID provide assistance in the area of phytosanitary capacity building but through alternative projects?
- To what extent are other donors involved in phytosanitary capacity building in CLMV, and is there any overlap with this project?

Outputs

The reviewing consultant will provide both a draft and then a final report, which:

- meets objectives one to four above
- answers the questions above
- includes an executive summary of the main findings of the review and recommendations for future NZAID involvement
- outlines the methodology used and the counterparts consulted
- includes brief reports of any meetings and/or summary of views (if by telephone or email)
- includes an itinerary/schedule of activities (with dates)

Methodology

The consultant(s) should propose a methodology for the review, but it is expected that the methodology will include most or all of the following:

- (prior to departure) studying existing documentation on the project; familiarisation with key issues concerning SPS; consultation with NZ-based counterparts including NZAID staff
- attendance at the Vientiane senior officials meeting from March 7th-10th
- field-work in each of CLMV (3 days in each) consulting with project beneficiaries following Vientiane meeting i.e. during March
- briefing NZAID on findings of the review and recommendations for future NZAID involvement

Reporting

Draft report 16th April
Final report 30th June

The consultant(s) will be expected to submit a draft report to NZAID for comment by 16th April. Further work will be required in June to analyse (i) the updated draft strategic plans of the four countries and (ii) other information on project progress since March. The review report will need to be updated to take account of this new information, and to reflect any comments from NZAID on the draft. A final report will be required by the end of June.

III NZAID CLMV Phytosanitary Capacity Development Project: Terms of Reference to cover period 1 October 2003 - 30 June 2004

Main Objectives of the CLMV Programme

The following objectives apply to each of the four countries:

1. Develop senior management and staff capabilities on the strategic planning process, including SWOT and GAP analysis.
2. Encourage staff (various levels) participation in the strategic planning process, including through the formation of a strategic planning team.
3. Develop an integrated framework for the strategic planning process, which is practical and can be readily used by CLMV management staff
4. Encourage participation of stakeholders, such as research institutions and major industry groups, in the strategic planning process
5. Develop and enhance capabilities to gather relevant and accurate information using the National Phytosanitary Database System for the strategic planning process
6. Assist senior managers/strategic planners to develop a comprehensive and integrated strategic plan for phytosanitary capacity development, including the identification of major capacity/capability constraints and priority needs.
7. Assist senior managers/strategic planners to involve other donors in the strategic planning process
8 Develop more transparent systems for decision making in the planning process.

Key Activities / Outputs

1. Provide training to senior managers/strategic planners within the national plant protection organisation (NPPO) on the strategic planning process. This shall include a series of training sessions on such aspects as:
   - *The conceptual model of the strategic planning process*
   - An understanding of the characteristics of the strategic plan including clarifying the vision and mission of the NPPO, formulating appropriate objectives, identification of key issues, undertaking situation analysis (SWOT etc), stakeholder participation, information requirements (including use of database(s) for collection of data, analysis of data (including trend analysis), generating alternative courses of action and prioritising needs.
   - Development of tactical plans (or action plans) from the strategic plans.
2. Assist the respective NPPO's to form a strategic planning team, which can in the future amend or enhance the country's strategic plan as new issues emerge or internal or external changes take place
3. Provide training in the use of the GBS Strategic Plan Builder, a computer-assisted strategic planning tool.
4. Assist the CLMV countries to standardise the strategic planning process and develop collaborative mechanisms for designing/developing regional projects in the future. In particular, the senior officials meeting to be held in Vientiane in late February 04 will address these issues.
5. To gather or collect all relevant data/information from each CLMV country for analysis and use in the strategic plan. This would include relevant government policy documents.

6. Review and up-date the results of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation/needs assessment undertaken by each country in April 2001. Such needs assessment should provide an accurate picture of the major capacity/capability constraints currently facing the country in the SPS domain, and identify priority needs for development/improvement.
7. Provide training to staff on the pest surveillance component of the National Phytosanitary Database in order to enter historical data to inform the strategic planning process.
8. Assist each country to develop a "government-approved draft strategic plan for public consultation". Such plan should be approved at senior level -Head of the NPPO and above. It should address all of the issues outlined in the GBS Strategic Plan Builder, and incorporate the results of the updated needs assessment (see 7 above).
9. Assist officials of the Government of Lao PDR to prepare an appropriate programme for the senior officials meeting, donor agency meeting and study tour and to serve as a facilitator at all formal sessions of the meeting.
10. Purchase at least 6 personal computers and associated equipment for extension of the National Phytosanitary Database into other key entry/exit points in the four countries on obtaining NZAID's approval as to the proposed location of each computer.

Main Objectives of the Senior Officials Meeting

1. To review the strategic planning methodology, the strategic planning tools being used and the draft strategic plans prepared for Cambodia and Laos PDR to ensure it meets each country's needs.
2. To discuss recent developments in each country on phytosanitary capacity development programmes and emerging issues.
3. To further strengthen the role of the NZAID CLMV management team and discuss technical cooperation initiatives among the countries.
4. To discuss strategic phytosanitary capacity development issues with representatives of donor agencies located in Lao PDR.
5. To study relevant aspects of the plant protection and research organisations, production systems, inspection and certification systems at entry/exit points with the view of harmonising procedures and standards, where possible.

Reporting Requirements

Payments from NZAID to the consultant will be staged according to implementation of the contract. Payment of fees and costs (less any advances) for a particular trip will be made against the delivery of progress reports. The deadlines for these reports will be as follows:

1. Cambodia and Lao trip report -30 November 2003
2. Report on SOM Vientiane -30 March 2004
3. Viet Nam trip report -30 April 2004
4. Final report for this contract

The reports for (1) and (3) above should be in the same format and level of detail as the report provided for the Lao trip in May/June The SOM report should cover the contents of the discussions at Vientiane and should also attach drafts of the Cambodian and Lao strategic plans ,

The final report should include the trip report for Myanmar (subject to the force majeure clause) in the same format and detail as (1) and (2) above. In addition, the final report should:

- Attach *"government approved draft strategic plans for public consultation"* for each of the four countries conforming to the format of the strategic plan builder including the results of the updated needs assessment.
- Include lessons learned from the phytosanitary project since its initial inception
- Make an assessment of the project's impact
- Conclude with recommendations for future donor assistance.

IV Review process and methodology

Key features of the process included:

Review Team pre-departure sessions. The team met for the first time on 23 February 2004 at NZAID in Wellington. The team consisted of Michael Watt, agricultural specialist, and Robert Sowman as team leader and NZAID liaison.

Review of project documentation. The reports and correspondence associated with the project were made available to the review team. Further assessment of these documents continued once the team returned to Wellington to draft the review report.

Pre-departure interview with MSC. The Review Team met for half a day with Dr Balasingam on Thursday 26 February at NZAID in Wellington.

Interviews with key stakeholders. The Team also met in Wellington with John Egan and Mary Oliver from NZAID and Richard Ivess from NZ MAF. E-mail contact was established with Barbara Waddell of HortResearch, John Hedley of NZ MAF (seconded to FAO) and Yongfan Piao of FAO/RAPA. A draft list of key stakeholders for Michael Watt to meet in the four countries was made in New Zealand and refined during the Senior Officials Meeting (SOM) in Vientiane. A full list of those met is attached in Appendix VI.

Meetings in ASEAN. Michael Watt started in Vientiane attending the Senior Officials Meeting. He also held private meetings with government officials and donor agencies. Interviews were later held in each of the four countries with staff of NPPOs and other key stakeholders. A list of those interviewed is set out in Appendix VI.

Final debriefing session. At the end of the ASEAN field visit Michael Watt came to Wellington to debrief Robert Sowman at NZAID. This process provided an opportunity to clarify issues and facts about the project. The debriefing also facilitated an objective reflection on events and findings, and allowed for a further brief meeting with the MSC.

Report writing. A draft of the final report was provided to the NZAID Desk Manager before Dr. Balasingam completed his report on the Vientiane SOM, Viet Nam trip, draft Strategic Plans for the four countries and Final Project Report. The final draft project review report was produced, taking into account comments provided by NZAID and content of Dr. Balasingam's remaining reports. This final review report was made available to NZAID.

For fieldwork the following questions were used in addition to those detailed in the TOR (see Appendix V:

1 Concerning the PCEQ

- Was the PCEQ a useful tool for demonstrating deficiencies in SPS activities to a) NPPOs and b) others e.g. Ministries of Agriculture etc?
- Did the priorities selected for NZAID assistance (information management, strategic planning) reflect your priorities?
- If not, what would have been your priorities?

- Do you consider the information provided for the PCEQ should be restricted in distribution to SPS authorities in other countries?
- Has the PCEQ been updated since 2001?

2 **Concerning the NPD**

- Is the NPD a useful and sustainable tool for the management of SPS data? Why?
- Is the export/import documentation, or the pest status/surveillance component the most useful?
- How many export/import certificates have been issued using the database?
- Are certificates currently issued by not using the database?
- How many pest surveillance records have been entered?
- Has any historical pest status data been entered? If so from what source?
- What is the status on connectivity of the database?
- Is outsourcing the connectivity and maintenance of the system possible?
- Have there been any problems with the software? If yes, how have these been resolved?
- Do you foresee any problems concerning ownership/copyright of the software? If yes, how could these be resolved?
- Was the training and manuals for NPD use OK. If not, how could improvements be made?
- How many trained people now use of the NPD on a day-to-day basis? Gender?

3 **Concerning the strategic planning process**

- What is the current status of the SP process in your country?
- What is your understanding of the future development of the process?
- Do you feel 'ownership' of the process?

4 **General**

- Do you feel that border protection or improved export access is more important in SPS terms?
- Are you satisfied with the way the project was formulated and implemented? If no, what improvements would you like to have seen?
- Were the consultants and reports OK? If no, what were the deficiencies?
- Do you feel 'ownership' of the project? If not, why not?
- What have been the most useful outputs of the project?
- What would happen to these, if the project stopped at 30 June 2004?
- What have been the impacts of the project on stakeholders (NPPOs, exporters etc)?
- Are you in agreement with the priorities for medium term assistance established at the SOM? If not what are your country's priorities.
- How can coordination between CMLV countries and between donors best be achieved?

V Itinerary for fieldwork by Michael Watt

March 2004

Saturday 6	Travel Sydney-Bangkok
Sunday 7	Travel Bangkok- Vientiane
Monday 8 -Wednesday 10	SOM meeting Vientiane
Thursday 11	AM travel Vientiane-Phnom Penh. PM discussions PPPIO
Friday 12	AM discussions on NPD PPPIO; PM visit to Pesticide laboratory and IPM project
Saturday 13 - Sunday 14	Field trip to Siem Reap Province with PPPIO staff
Monday 15	Discussions with Director PPPIO
Tuesday 16	AM meeting with Director DAALI and FAO Representative; PM travel Phnom Penh-Ha Noi
Wednesday 17	AM discussions PPD; PM discussions on NPD, PPD and visit to PEQ station Ha Noi
Thursday 18	Field visit to border inspection stations at Tanthanh and Huunghi, and to PQ Sub-Department No. 7
Friday 19	Travel Ha Noi-HCMC; discussions PPD HCMC
Saturday 20	Travel HCMC-Yangon
Sunday 21	AM meeting with Khin Mar Oo, Plant Quarantine Officer; PM report preparation
Monday 22	AM meeting, Plant Protection Division MAI. PM inspect facilities and laboratories at Plant Protection Division MAI
Tuesday 23	AM discussions PPD, MAI. PM meetings at MAI
Wednesday 24	AM meeting with AusAID Program Manager and Head PPI. PM meeting with FAO Representative and Program Officer
Thursday 25	Travel Yangon-Bangkok
Friday 26	Travel Bangkok-Sydney

VI Persons and organisations consulted

Wellington

G. Redding	Development Programme Manager	NZAID
J. Egan	Leader of NZAID Strategic Development Team	NZAID
M. Oliver	Ex DPM	NZAID
G. Balasingam	MSC	GBS & Associates
R. Ivess	Director Plants Biosecurity	NZ MAF

Cambodia, DAALI, MAFF

P. Vuth	Director	
H. Vanhan	Chief	PPPIO
B. Simona	Vice-Chief	PPPIO
H. Chhunhy	Field Experimentation Officer	PPPIO
S. Thavrith	Insect Identification Officer	PPPIO
A. Phirum	Plant Disease Identification Officer	PPPIO
T. Pisethchcat	Pesticide Information Officer	PPPIO
O. Sophen	Field Demonstration and Extension Officer	PPPIO
M. Cheta	Pest Surveillance and Forecasting Officer	PPPIO
N. Chhay	Deputy Director, National IPM Programme	

Lao PDR, MoA

H.E. Sitaheng Rasphone	Vice Minister	
V. Phannourath	Director General	DOA
P. Phiaxaysarakham	Director, Agricultural Regulation Division	DOA
I. Akkharath.	DD. Division of International Cooperation and Development	
S. Kethongsa.	Researcher. Agriculture Regulation Division	DOA

Myanmar, MAI

U Tun Than	Managing Director, Myanmar Agriculture Service
U Than Htay	Managing Director, Myanmar Cotton and Sericulture Enterprise
U Myo Nyunt	General Manager of Administration, Myanmar Agriculture Service
U Tin Maung Shwe	Deputy General Manager, Dept. of Agric. Planning
U Toe Aung	Deputy Director-General, Dept. of Agric. Planning
U Kyi Win	Deputy Director, Dept. of Agric. Planning
U Maung Maung Yi	Deputy GM, Planning Division, Myanmar Agriculture Service
U Than Aye	Head, PPD, Myanmar Agriculture Service
U Hlaing Min	Manager, PPD, Myanmar Agriculture Service
U Myo Nyunt	PQ Officer, PPD, Myanmar Agriculture Service
Daw Khin Mar Oo	PQ Officer. PPD, Myanmar Agriculture Service

Viet Nam, PPD, MARD

Nguyen Quang Minh	Director General	Hanoi
Dam Quoac Tru	Deputy Director General	Hanoi
Luong Thi Hai	Head, PQ Division	Hanoi
Hoang Trung	Deputy Head, PQ Division	Hanoi
Dang Viet Yen	PQ Division	Hanoi
Huynh Tan Dat	PQ Division	Hanoi
Le Duc Dong	Director, Post-Entry PQ	Hanoi
Quach Viet Do	Director, Regional PQ Sub-department No. 5.	Hanoi
Nguyen Van Hoc	Head, Tanthanh PQ Station, Regional PQ Sub-department No. 7	
Vu Hai Son	Head, Huunghi PQ Station, Regional PQ Sub-department No. 7	
Vu Dung	Technical Officer, Regional PQ Sub-department No. 7	
Nguyen The Phu	Vice Director-General	HCMC
Nguyen Van Nga	Director Plant Quarantine	HCMC
Nguyen Huu Dat	Deputy Director Plant Quarantine	HCMC
Nguyen Bach Tuyet	General Director, International Inspection – Fumigation JS Co	HCMC

AFFA

I. Naumann	Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer	

Griffith University

P. Ferrar	Consultant	

AusAID

Jane Davies	Program Officer	Vientiane
Raine Dixon	Second Secretary Australian Embassy	Phnom Penh
Ene-Mai Oks	Program Officer	Yangon

FAO

N. van der Graaff	Chief, Plant Protection Service	FAO, Rome
J. E. Jones	Plant Quarantine Officer	FAO/AGPP, Rome
J. Hedley	Acting Coordinator, IPPC Secretariat	FAO/AGPP, Rome
Piao Yongfan	Regional Plant Protection Officer	FAO/RAPA, Bangkok
L. M. Kirjavainen	FAO Representative	Vientiane
R. Arnst	FAO Vegetable IPM Development Officer	Vientiane
J.C. Levasseur	FAO Representative	Phnom Penh
Tang Zhenping	FAO Representative	Yangon
U Saw Lai War	Programme Officer	Yangon

Helvetas

K. Gerner	CTA Laos Extension for Agriculture Project Vientiane	

JICA

T. Takashima	Agricultural Policy Expert	Vientiane

Thailand, Department of Agriculture

Surapol Yinasawapun	Senior Agricultural Scientist, Plant Quarantine Research Group, Plant Protection Research and Development Office	

NZAID project team at Vientiane SOM

G. Balasingam	MSC	GBS & Associates
V. R. Ramanathan	Computer Consultant	GBS & Associates

References consulted

Anon. (2004) Background Documents. Senior Officials Meeting on Phytosanitary Capacity Development in CLMV, Vientiane, 8-15 March 2004.

AusAID ARDCP (2003) Sanitary and Phytosanitary Capacity Building Program. Draft Program Design Document. August 2003.

Balasingam, G. (2001-4) Phytosanitary needs assessment for Myanmar, Laos, Cambodia and Viet Nam. August 2001

Phytosanitary needs assessment review meeting for Cambodia, Laos. Myanmar and Viet Nam held in Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh City. Viet Nam 27 – 29 November 2001

Virtual tour of National Phytosanitary Database (NPD). 2002

National phytosanitary database installation in Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Viet Nam. May – June 2002, August – September 2002.

Senior Officials Meeting. NZAID project on phytosanitary capacity development in Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Viet Nam. Yangon Myanmar, November 2002

NZAID project on phytosanitary capacity development in Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Viet Nam. May – June 2003

Mission to Lao PDR, Cambodia and Viet Nam. October 2003.

Senior Officials Meeting Vientiane March 2004. Mission report Mission to Viet Nam and Myanmar March-June 2004. Mission report, strategic planning workshops & information management systems development. 30 July 2004

Kingdom of Cambodia, Ministry of Forestry and Fisheries, Department of Agronomy and Agriculture Land Improvement, Plant Protection & Phytosanitary Inspection Office, Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategic Plan 2004-2009. Draft Version August 2004

FAO (2003) Report of the Twenty-Third Session of the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission, 4 - 8 August 2003, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) Tool. Secretariat of the IPPC. CD-ROM.

FAO, OIE, World Bank, WHO and WTO joint initiative (2004) Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) Draft Final Business Plan Version 8 June 2004

Ferrar, Paul (2004) Trip Report – Laos, Malaysia – 6-14 March 2004

Nairn, M.E. *et al* (1996) Australian Quarantine; a shared responsibility. Canberra, DPIE. 284 pp.

NZAID (2003-04) Harnessing International Trade For Development. Wellington

Policy Statement Towards A Safe And Just World Free Of Poverty. Wellington

Draft Asia Strategy. Public Consultation Document.1 July 2004

Zarrilli, S. and Musselli, I. (2004) The Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement; Food Safety Policies and Product Attributes. In M.D. Ingco and J.D. Nish (eds.) (2004). Agriculture and the WTO. Creating a Trading System for Development. Washington. World Bank. Pp. 215-234