



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Twenty-Third Regular Meeting
23 - 24 July 2003

IICA/CE/Doc.427 (03)
Original: English
23-24 July 2003

WORKING PLAN

IN RESPONSE TO THE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF

IICA'S AGRICULTURAL HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY PROGRAM

San Jose, Costa Rica

Summary

The external assessment of IICA's agricultural health and food safety (AHFS) program, pursuant to Executive Committee Resolution 367, provides useful feedback for IICA as it structures its portfolio of AHFS activities and improves its collaboration with Member States. This document represents IICA's response to recommendations made in the external assessment and by the Special Advisory Commission on Management Issues (SACMI), and is structured as follows:

- Introduction: IICA's perspective on the importance of AHFS in the Americas.
- Mission and strategy of IICA's AHFS program: Minor modifications are made to the mission and strategic lines of action, taking into account the recommendations of the external assessment.
- The role of the countries in supporting IICA's AHFS program: Three actions are needed by the countries to strengthen the AHFS program.
- The role of IICA in improving the AHFS program: Six specific actions are adopted, taking into account the recommendations of the external assessment and of the SACMI meeting.
- Attachment A: Six proposed and prioritized core activities for the AHFS program are presented for consideration by the Member States.
- Attachment B: Four proposed and prioritized limited-timeframe activities *for all countries* are presented for consideration by the Member States.
- Attachment C: Limited-timeframe activities *for selected countries*, funded with external resources, or undertaken if additional resources are provided by countries benefiting from such activities, are described.

The importance of strengthening the AHFS program becomes even more evident when we consider that in the Americas: US\$125 billion in agricultural exports and US\$85 billion in imports are facilitated by either AHFS regulations, standards, norms or actions; there are 120 million visitors to the Americas each year; the second largest export market for Latin America is the trade among Latin American countries; and there are almost 50,000 kilometers of shared land borders between countries in the Americas, which do not prevent the spread of diseases and pests.

Background

As indicated in the external assessment, in the past decade the global environment surrounding AHFS has changed dramatically for countries, in large part due to the adoption and implementation of the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Prior to this, traditional national AHFS programs began at the countries' borders and focused inward. Their overall mission was to protect domestic agriculture, and resources were channeled to control disease and pest agents that could adversely affect primary production. The credibility of AHFS programs for the private sector and other countries was built upon the effectiveness of domestic programs, ongoing inspection and surveillance, and emergency responses to unexpected incursions. Inspection systems, ports of entry and surveillance were established to prevent the introduction and spread of unwanted diseases or pests. Eradication programs were geared toward specific agents such as hog cholera, avian influenza, or citrus canker. Initiatives were labor intensive, requiring skilled technical

expertise in disciplines such as veterinary medicine and plant pathology. The disease or pest profile was generally well understood, but required large financial outlays, often over a number of years. Across the hemisphere, most of the traditional programs have only been slightly successful. In today's global environment, to meet their obligations and exercise their rights at the international level, countries must assume additional responsibilities and structure their national services to have a global focus, from their countries' borders outward.

To restructure national AHFS services based on these new realities requires greater cooperation between the public and private sectors and more strategic coordination with international and hemispheric organizations such as IICA. Historically, the few loans provided to countries for AHFS have focused almost exclusively on technical capacity, with little emphasis on strengthening regulatory mechanisms and institutional sustainability. Today, much higher priority must be given in the hemisphere to actively participating in international standard-setting organizations such as the World Animal Health Organization (OIE), the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), and the Codex Alimentarius. Member States must also use IICA's AHFS program more strategically and not as a substitute to cover the growing gap between increasing global demands and underinvestment in national services.

While the external assessment provides more precision on how IICA can be more effective, it also assumes that Member States are willing to invest time and resources in their own national services, as well as in IICA's AHFS program. It is worth noting that few countries have a long-term national agenda for their AHFS services that transcends changes in governments and calls for private-sector participation. Technical assistance and training must often be repeated due to a lack of supporting infrastructure. For IICA activities to be more effective and strategic, in keeping with the strategic lines of action set out in its Medium Term Plan, the countries must be more actively involved in enhancing their own national services; supporting the AHFS program in executing specific, agreed to activities; and avoiding placing additional demands on IICA without providing the corresponding resources and realigning their priorities.

Mission and strategy of IICA's AHFS program

Based on the external assessment, the AHFS mission statement has been modified to read: *“Assist Member States to strengthen their animal and plant health and food safety services, including their capacity to help develop and comply with international rules and standards, in order to compete successfully in national and international markets and contribute to safeguarding consumer health.”*

The mission statement requires that IICA place emphasis on the infrastructure requirements of national services, especially as pertains to countries developing and complying with international standards and rules.

The four strategic lines of action are reworded slightly to better reflect the mission statement and provide greater precision:

1. Support national AHFS services' efforts to develop regulatory mechanisms, science-based technical capacity and sustainable institutional infrastructures.

2. Work with Member States to apply the provisions of the WTO Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement, as well as the decisions taken in the international reference organizations: OIE, IPPC and Codex Alimentarius.
3. Support Member States' efforts to develop standards and regulations, leadership capacity and technical competence in food safety, and to work across the agri-food chain.
4. Assist countries with early recognition of emerging issues that offer potential AHFS threats or opportunities or that put animal, plant and human health at risk.

Each of the strategic lines of action assumes that corresponding activities are being undertaken at the national level. For example, if countries do not invest time and resources in the WTO or the three related standard-setting organizations, actions by IICA become ineffective and have little sustainability. The strength of the strategic lines of actions are in their interrelatedness. For example, many emerging issues (4) require technical actions and leadership across the entire agri-food chain (3) and are often addressed in international fora (2), but require countries to participate, base their actions on science and make an investment in their national services (1) to have a sustainable infrastructure.

For most countries, this mode of operation is substantially different from a decade ago and from how many of their national services still operate. The essence of sound strategic planning is to define what will and what will not be done; otherwise, there is no precision and prioritization as to what activities will and will not be carried out. The AHFS program requires specific and well-defined activities that directly support the mission and four strategic lines of action, taking into account those proposed in the external assessment and the resources available. Examples of agricultural health and food safety activities that would not directly relate to the strategies outlined include integrated pest management, campaigns to eradicate traditional diseases and pests, construction of surveillance posts, seminars on residual analyses, etc. While it can be argued that these topics can relate to agricultural health or food safety, they are not directly linked to one or more of the strategic lines of action. With limited resources, it is increasingly important that AHFS activities reinforce the interrelated strategic lines of action.

The role of the countries in supporting IICA's AHFS program

The need for countries to enhance their national services in order to address current realities continues to grow, as does IICA's need to be more specific in selecting activities that reinforce the four strategic lines of action. In most countries, awareness is still lagging as to the importance of AHFS and the need for an integrated approach in upgrading national services. With regard to the first strategic line of action, an IICA study looked at the overall capability of national services, divided into three components: regulatory mechanisms, technical capacity and institutional sustainability. For the 31 developing countries analyzed, and taking into account the measurement criteria used, the overall level of development was 40%.

As concerns the second strategic line of action, IICA member countries account for only 22% of total WTO membership, yet within the SPS committee, roughly 65-70% of the trade issues are

either brought forward or verbally supported by countries of the Americas (within the committee one or more countries state their specific interest in or concern regarding the issue under discussion).

Regarding the third strategic line of action, an IICA analysis of food safety showed that only two or three countries in the Americas had food safety policies and practices both for exports and for domestic consumption; 17 countries had policies and practices for exports only; and 14 countries had nothing at all.

For the fourth strategic line of action, recent events only reinforce the importance of being proactive: the proposed product-tracing requirements in Europe; the southern migration of the West Nile virus in Latin America; and the first domestic case of mad cow disease in the Americas. It is worth noting that from 1968 to 1998, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) invested around 3% of its overall portfolio in agricultural health, with the vast majority of capital being earmarked for the building of new laboratories and quarantine posts or one-time purchases of equipment.

Since 1995, countries have asked IICA to maintain the basic infrastructure of its Offices, even add new Offices, while holding nominal resources constant. Resources have had to be diverted to cover rising operating expenses, inflation and salaries. Clearly, a substantial investment is required to maintain the hemispheric infrastructure that countries have asked for. Within the last five years, at the request of the countries, the AHFS program has taken on additional responsibilities in the areas of food safety (line 3), emerging issues (line 4), the SPS agreement and the related reference organizations (line 2), and formation of the information web site, Agro-Salud. The level of financial resources has not kept pace with this growing demand either in real or nominal terms, and even greater precision is required now for future activities.

As proposed in the external assessment, strengthening the AHFS program requires that countries be more specific as to the activities and expectations of the AHFS program, based on the amount of resources budgeted for each activity. In addition, countries need to:

- Be aware of the comparative strengths of the AHFS program, providing resources or insisting with other countries or agencies that the AHFS program assume a lead role where it has a clear advantage. For example, IICA's efforts in the WTO/SPS Committee started with countries recognizing the role IICA could play and working toward that end. There are, however, many examples of where the AHFS program could have played an important role in assisting countries, but could not do so because it lacked their active support.
- Ensure that each activity is adequately funded and use the AHFS program strategically, in line with the activities agreed to and not as a substitute for underinvestment in national services. Understand the comparative strengths of other organizations and avoid the duplication of activities.
- Be consistent and provide continuity for moving the agreed to activities forward. Many of the activities suggested in the external assessment require an ongoing and continuous effort of coordination with other parties in order to fully realize the intended benefits. With

limited resources and time, the cumulative effect of individual requests for services not agreed to drastically impedes the possibility of maintaining timelines, moving forward on planned activities and meeting expectations.

The role of IICA in improving the AHFS program

The following operating guidelines have been adopted in response to the SACMI recommendation to consolidate and streamline the recommendations contained in the external assessment:

- The activities of the AHFS program (see Attachments A, B and C) are classified into three categories: *i) core program activities*, which have quota resources funding approved for each activity; *ii) limited-timeframe activities for all countries*, which operate independently of core funding and staffing and are implemented only if additional or external resources, beyond core funding, are provided; *iii) Limited-timeframe activities for selected countries*, which operate independently of core funding and staffing and are implemented only if external resources or other resources are provided by those countries.
- *Core program activities* consist of a limited, well-defined set of activities. Attachment A contains a description of six prioritized activities, including budget and staffing requirements. Implementation of each activity will be based on Board approval of the activity and the corresponding budget.
- *Core program activities* are ongoing from year to year, but are always subject to review by the countries as to whether they should continue. The budget is specific for each activity, and authority is delegated to those responsible for implementing and carrying it out. Decisions regarding staffing and location are included in the authority and responsibility delegated for carrying out the activity. Additional core activities that have not been previously approved are undertaken only if additional resources are provided and priorities and expectations are readjusted.
- Funding and staffing for *limited-timeframe activities for all countries* are covered by resources provided by all the countries or by external resources. Attachment B contains a description of four prioritized activities, including budget and staffing requirements. Staffing requirements are specific to each activity and implementation follows the guidelines outlined in the above point. Additional activities can be undertaken if additional resources are provided and priorities and expectations are readjusted.
- Funding and staffing for *limited-timeframe activities for selected countries* are covered by non-quota funds, external resources, or funds provided or secured by the beneficiary countries. Attachment C contains a description of proposed activities or activities already being implemented with external funding. No budget and staffing information is provided. Staffing and location for limited-timeframe activities are specific to the given activity. For activities that benefit *specific countries*, it is assumed that staffing will be in a central location in which the activity is to be carried out. Additional activities can be undertaken if additional resources are provided to cover the activity and staffing requirements.

Attachment A: Core AHFS program activities for all countries

Taking into account the external assessment, core program activities are listed below in prioritized order. The actual set of activities implemented will be based on the activities and budgets approved by the Member States.

1. Activity: Help countries assess and then measure advancements in the performance and quality of their national AHFS services

Type of activity and timeframe: Core program activity, ongoing

Strategic line of action: Primarily 1 but also 2 and 3 and to a lesser extent 4

Explanation: Most national AHFS services are inadequately structured and supported to meet today's realities. Traditional assistance has focused on certain aspects of technical capacity, has not followed an integrated approach, and has not involved the private sector. An approach that takes into account the rights and obligations stemming from the SPS agreement can increase articulation across sectors and provide a map for prioritizing efforts and channeling resources. The OIE has expressed strong interest in working collaboratively with IICA in this area.

Expected outcome: i) greater articulation at the country level between the different public sectors and between the public and private sectors; ii) prioritization of areas of greatest need on which to focus resources and efforts; iii) a common approach in the Americas for gauging advancements and on the basis of which regional results can be used to identify highest priorities and to work with other organizations and financial institutions; and iv) a standardized approach that countries can use in seeking loans from financial institutions.

Operating expenses: US\$76,000 (US\$3,000 for 17 countries per year plus US\$25,000 to work collaboratively with the OIE).

Staffing requirements: 1.0-IPP, 1.0-LPP, 0.5-GSP

Estimated total cost: US\$240,000

2. Activity: Develop management, leadership and communication capacity in food safety and across the agri-food chain

Type of activity and timeframe: Core program activity, ongoing

Strategic line of action: Primarily 3 but also 2 and 1

Explanation: Traditional assistance assumes that technical training is the greatest need for advancing national AHFS services. However, based on the country consultations, two critical needs identified by the countries are: i) to improve the level of communication and understanding between technical professionals and decision makers vis-à-vis national program requirements, and ii) to improve management skills for leading technical initiatives. This becomes even more important when we consider that issues such as food safety and the SPS agreement require leadership across the entire agri-food chain. This activity works with individuals leading these initiatives and combines technical training in areas such as risk analysis with management and leadership training for conducting initiatives in their countries.

As part of the process, participants will implement specific activities in which they will apply the capabilities acquired through the technical and leadership training. This initiative requires close collaboration with selected IICA Offices and also provides an opportunity to work more closely with Codex Alimentarius and PAHO. The WTO has expressed strong interest in collaboration with IICA in this area.

Expected outcome: i) formation of professionals who have the technical as well as management and leadership skills to oversee programs and conduct new initiatives; ii) formation of regional and hemispheric networks of individuals that provide ongoing support once formal training has concluded; and iii) individualized projects in each participating country that apply technical expertise and management skills to defined problems.

Operating expenses: US\$250,000 (40 individuals, 6 advisors, 4 modules and collaboration with the aforementioned organizations; it is expected that external resources can be secured for projects).

Staffing requirements: 0.75-IPP, 1.0-LPP, 1.0-GSP

Estimated total cost: US\$400,000

3. Activity: Technical working alliances with institutions that can provide financial resources

Type of activity and timeframe: Core activity, ongoing

Strategic line of action: Primarily 1, 3 and 4 and indirectly 2

Explanation: Most of the external resources allocated for upgrading national AHFS services have been for eradicating specific diseases and pests and capital facilities for technical functions. Many of the financial institutions have limited expertise in agriculture and even less in AHFS. The countries' future needs extend beyond what has been funded traditionally and although financial institutions are beginning to recognize the importance of agriculture and AHFS services, much more education and collaboration is required. This presents an important opportunity to educate, form alliances and demonstrate how the approach outlined in Activity 1 can help them, the countries and IICA. This will require a steady and focused investment of technical expertise and time to build credibility, raise awareness of the need for investing in AHFS services, and provide technical collaboration that does not currently exist. It also requires close collaboration with IICA's Office in Washington.

Expected outcome: i) increased awareness by financial institutions of the importance of investing in national AHFS services, following an integrated approach; ii) development of shared approaches for evaluating AHFS services, which are helpful in securing loans; and iii) active alliances that can be tapped when opportunities arise because relationships and contacts exist for working together.

Operating expenses: US\$50,000 (largely travel and collaborative meetings)

Staffing requirements: 1.0-IPP, 0.35-GSP

Estimated total cost: US\$160,000

4. Activity: Coordinate a “country-to-country” short-term technical assistance program

Type of activity and timeframe: Core program activity, ongoing

Strategic line of action: Primarily, 1, 3, and 4 but can also include 2

Explanation: This activity takes advantage of technical expertise that exists in countries that are willing to make this expertise available to other countries. The role of IICA’s AHFS program would be to match expertise with need, which could be accomplished by using the variables of the approach proposed in Activity 1. IICA’s AHFS program would facilitate and keep information on country needs and expertise up to date, but any resources for travel or support will come from the participating countries. IICA’s AHFS program will also monitor and assess whether the activity is providing the value anticipated.

Expected outcome: i) greater horizontal technical cooperation between countries; and ii) increased level of non-quota resources invested in AHFS.

Operating expenses: US\$25,000 (for evaluation and associated travel)

Staffing requirements: 1.0-LPP, 0.50-GSP

Estimated total cost: US\$90,000

5. Activity: Provide timely analysis of and reporting on norms, standards and SPS trade-related issues

Type of activity and timeframe: Core program activity, ongoing

Strategic line of action: Primarily 2 and 4, but can also include 3.

Explanation: This activity extends current efforts with the publication “Access,” which is distributed in more than 48 countries, and would include additional analysis, reporting and distribution of information on norms and standards being developed in the OIE, IPPC and Codex Alimentarius. “Access” is geared to decision makers in the public and private sectors who have limited time, but who may be impacted by decisions taken in the WTO/SPS committee. The purpose of this activity is not only to provide information and raise awareness, but also to encourage more active participation by the countries, with the support of the different sectors. Although SPS is a topic of discussion in the FTAA, this activity does not anticipate any actions within that forum as IICA does not currently have a place in its committee on agriculture.

Expected outcome: i) increased awareness on the part of the different public and private sectors leading to increased participation by countries in the WTO and international standard-setting organizations; and ii) analysis and dissemination of critical information on threats and opportunities, to help countries better position themselves and prioritize their efforts.

Operating expenses: US\$75,000 (for analysis, reporting, distribution and meetings)

Staffing requirements: 1.0-IPP, 1.0-LPP, 1.0-GSP

Estimated total cost: US\$250,000

6. Activity: Collect and disseminate information through Agro-Salud, including successful examples of national AHFS services

Type of activity and timeframe: Core program activity, ongoing

Strategic line of action: Primarily 1, 3 and 4

Explanation: This activity follows from a 1997 IABA resolution calling for an information network on AHFS. The website is called Agro-Salud and needs ongoing development and improvement. Enhancements would include a fully operational version in English, news releases in AHFS (currently Saninet), the electronic version of the publication "Access," information on specific regions (e.g., Caraphin for the Caribbean) and other documents of timely importance. Emphasis will be placed on quality over quantity of information (be more selective). This activity will also document cases of countries that have successfully restructured their national AHFS services, which can be of benefit to other countries, and can include cases of countries outside the hemisphere whose demographics are similar or whose approaches could benefit countries in the Americas. To increase effectiveness, a standardized format would be used in each case.

Expected outcome: i) distribution of important information originating from the AHFS program and related activities; ii) timely and relevant information on pressing issues and opportunities of use to the countries; iii) practical information on what countries have done successfully and how they have overcome obstacles; and iv) new approaches or initiatives undertaken by countries based on the experiences of other countries.

Operating expenses: US\$115,000 (US\$40,000 for software and hardware renewal and maintenance, data subscriptions, license renewals and US\$75,000 for short-term consultancies for preparing cases)

Staffing requirements: 1.75-LPP, 1.0-GSP

Estimated total cost: US\$230,000

Attachment B: Limited-timeframe activities for all countries

Limited-timeframe activities are listed below in order of priority, taking into account the external assessment. Resources and staffing are for each particular activity and activities to be implemented would be based on funds provided.

1. Activity: Increase the participation and effectiveness of countries in the WTO/SPS committee

Type of activity and timeframe: Limited time frame (3 years)

Strategic lines of action: Primarily 2 and 1 but also supports 3 and 4

Explanation: This is a continuation of the USDA/IICA-funded initiative that has resulted in almost every country being present in three consecutive SPS meetings. Countries have attended not on these meetings, but also preparatory meetings in which countries learned from other countries, the SPS Secretariat and other organizations about how to be more effective in Geneva and at the national level. Many countries still have not institutionalized the SPS agreement in their national services. Continuation of this program will require that countries assume more responsibility, including taking steps to make their continued presence sustainable.

Expected outcome: i) formation and operation of country-level SPS committees or SPS coordinating groups to articulate efforts among relevant ministries within each country and to consult with appropriate representatives of public and private sectors; ii) development and implementation of national SPS agendas; iii) attendance and effective participation at the WTO/SPS committee meetings; iv) enhanced coordination between the national SPS coordinating committee and the mission in Geneva; and v) increased effectiveness of the national enquiry point and notifications to the WTO/SPS, including assessment of notifications of other WTO members to determine possible trade effects.

Operating expenses: US\$475,000 (mostly for travel and meetings in Geneva)

Staffing requirements: 0.5-IPP, 0.75-LPP, 1.0-GSP

Estimated total cost: US\$588,000

2. Activity: Strengthen food safety and national mechanisms to increase and sustain effective participation of Latin American and Caribbean countries in Codex Alimentarius

Type of activity and timeframe: Limited-timeframe (2 years)

Strategic line of action: Primarily 3, 2 and 1 but also supports 4

Explanation: The importance of Codex Alimentarius has increased with the expansion of global agricultural exports. Harmonization of food safety standards is necessary to better protect public health and reduce non-tariff trade barriers. When agricultural trade disputes have arisen, the WTO has adopted Codex norms as the reference base for settling such disputes. Participation in the Codex process helps ensure a country's competitiveness, as well

as the quality of and market access for their agricultural export products. In coordination with other international agencies, IICA plans to assist a limited number of developing countries (two in each of IICA's regions) to identify and establish an effective and sustainable national structure capable of investigating, analyzing, and responding to proposed international Codex standards. It also plans to develop intra-governmental and private-sector linkages and concrete mechanisms for initiating and monitoring Codex initiatives at the national level.

Expected outcome: i) increased active member participation and representation at international Codex standards meetings; ii) formulation and submission of more comprehensive national consensus positions and comments; iii) increased awareness by governmental policy makers of the regional and national importance and impact of proposed Codex standards; iv) greater inter-governmental and private-sector communication, cooperation and trust; v) stronger national capacity to implement and manage national Codex initiatives; vi) identification and prioritization of needed national improvements; and vii) increased timely communication of analyzed Codex information made available to National Codex Committees and contacts.

Operating expenses: US\$350,000

Staffing requirements: 1.0-IPP, 0.75-LPP, 1.0-GSP

Estimated total cost: US\$512,000

3. Activity: Support for the OIE agenda for the Americas

Type of activity and timeframe: Limited-timeframe for 2 years

Strategic line of action: Primarily 2 and 1 but also supports 3 and 4

Explanation: The OIE recently announced that its regional office for the Americas will be located in Panama as of January 2004. In addition, a new president and specialist have been named and will be formulating a regional OIE agenda for the Americas. The importance of the OIE for animal health and food safety in the Americas continues to rise. This point was made even clearer with the first domestic case of BSE in the Americas. The Director General of the OIE has explicitly expressed a strong interest in more regional collaboration with IICA. This also provides an opportunity to collaborate with PAHO and OIRSA.

Expected outcome: i) an OIE agenda for the Americas and activities that reflect IICA's strategic lines of action as set out in its Medium Term Plan; ii) increased participation of countries in OIE meetings and standard-setting process; iii) strengthened alliance between the OIE and IICA; iv) increased collaboration between IICA, OIRSA and PAHO; v) identification of topics of common concern for all of the Americas, and implementation of specific actions.

Operating expenses: US\$80,000

Staffing requirements: 0.5-IPP, 0.50-LPP

Estimated total cost: US\$155,000

4. Activity: Collaborate with the IPPC and serve as technical secretariat of the Inter-American Group for Coordination in Plant Health (GICSV in Spanish)

Type of activity and timeframe: Limited-timeframe (2 years)

Strategic line of action: Primarily 2 but also supports 4

Explanation: The IPPC is the WTO-recognized standard-setting body for plant health. The secretariat is part of the FAO. It is worth noting that IICA has developed a good working relationship with the IPPC and has assisted in structuring regional consultations as part of the IPPC's standard-setting process. GICSV is comprised of the five regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) of the Americas and is part of the IPPC. A formal agreement exists between GICSV and IICA under which IICA agrees to serve as technical secretariat (this arrangement can be terminated by either party). The most active RPPO's are NAPPO (North America) and COSAVE (South America). IICA's role would be to provide continuity and support for the meetings and initiatives to be carried out. A critical issue is the lack of participation of the Caribbean countries. This should be part of the evaluation to be conducted at the end of the two-year period to determine if IICA should continue in the role of technical secretariat of the GICSV.

Expected outcome: i) increased collaboration between IPPC and IICA on activities involving IICA's strategic lines of action, as set out in the Medium Term Plan; ii) increased participation of countries in IPPC meetings and standard-setting process; iii) strengthened alliance between the FAO and IICA; iv) increased awareness of activities being carried out by the RPPOs; v) increased level of preparedness, including greater coordination of positions regarding technical standards to be considered during IPPC meetings; vi) development of common standards for all of the Americas; and vii) strengthened Caribbean participation in the IPPC process.

Operating expenses: US\$80,000

Staffing requirements: 0.5-IPP, 0.50-LPP, 0.35-GSP

Estimated total cost: US\$155,000

Attachment C: Limited-timeframe activities for selected countries

Taking into account the external assessment, limited-timeframe activities for selected countries or particular regions are listed below. Some activities are underway and none of the projects, either underway or proposed, will use IICA quota funds. Resources and professional staff will be dedicated to the given activity. No priority is assigned, as implementation will depend on resources provided by the beneficiary countries. It is important to know that the Carambola fruit fly project, a project begun by IICA several years ago, has been halted due to lack of funding. This deserves special consideration as the fruit fly has more than 100 different hosts, is not found outside of the countries noted, and can easily spread to the rest of the Americas.

Activity: Carambola fruit fly eradication

Description: Presently, the Carambola fruit fly is only known to exist in Suriname, French Guyana and Northern Brazil; Suriname is 80% free. IICA has been the lead agency in the eradication effort, which receives support from FIDA, FAO, the governments of Holland, United States, Brazil, France, Guyana and Suriname. Progress continues through national efforts in French Guyana and Brazil, but the IICA-led program is currently halted in Suriname. Left unchecked, reinfestation in clean areas in Suriname and Guyana is likely. It is estimated that it will take US\$1.5 million over two years to finish the program in Suriname. The fly is not present in other countries in the Americas, but could quickly become a hemispheric issue. Since IICA has been involved from the beginning, special steps should be taken to secure funding and finish the eradication effort.

Activity: Classical swine fever eradication and improving national services in Haiti

Description: Classical swine fever is now endemic in Haiti. With funding and support from USDA/APHIS, IICA has embarked on a program of vaccination and eventual eradication. The initiative will also seek to modernize components of the national services and to collaborate with efforts being funded by the EU.

Activity: Enhancing beef productivity, quality, safety and trade in Central America

Description: This activity aims to address poverty by increasing small-farm productivity and enhancing the trade in beef through improved meat quality and safety. The project's goal is to improve the livelihoods of small producers, make quality and safe animal-source foods affordable and available to consumers, and increase the intra- and inter-regional beef trade in Central America. The project is funded with external resources and involves several agencies; IICA's component has to do with beef quality, safety, standards and controls. The project covers Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama.

Activity: Strengthening agriculture and quarantine systems (SAQS)

Description: The objectives of the SAQS initiative are to increase compliance with the requirements of the SPS Agreement of the WTO and the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), improve national capabilities to comply with these trade standards, upgrade the institutional and technical capabilities of national animal and plant quarantine services, prepare guidelines for individual countries to adapt model plant and animal health legislation, and enhance regional cooperation. SAQS will also prepare the preliminary documentation for establishing the Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA), with the ultimate goal of providing sustainable regional coordination of agricultural health systems and information. This project is being funded by the European Union.

Activity: Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA)

Description: The objectives of CAHFSA are to provide support and regional coordination for animal and plant health activities, systems and infrastructure and to facilitate increased trade in safe food products, while ensuring that all food products consumed in the Caribbean, whether produced locally, imported or exported from the Caribbean, conform to acceptable standards that ensure the health and safety of consumers. CAHFSA will contribute to this by collaborating with the respective national AHFS services. The feasibility study for CAHFSA is in its final stages; location and external funding are yet to be determined.

Activity: Secretariat support for COSAVE

Description: COSAVE is the regional plant protection organization for Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay. For several years, IICA has provided logistic and technical support of regional meetings and initiatives. Based on the classification criteria, this would continue, but on a full-cost recovery basis.

Activity: Support for the recently formed Standing Committee on Animal Health for Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay and Bolivia.

Description: This recently formed committee of chief veterinary officers of each country has met, and interest was expressed that some time in the future, when its work agenda is more clearly defined, IICA would be asked to cooperate.

Activity: Pest surveillance initiative involving Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru

Description: For years, IICA has provided technical expertise and support for a Mediterranean fruit fly surveillance and control initiative in Chile and Peru. IICA's technical support will end shortly when the regional specialist is transferred and retires. Some countries have expressed interest in forming a larger initiative involving four countries, with continued IICA support.

Activity: SPS support for the Central America Free Trade Area (CAFTA)

Description: CAFTA covers many different sectors and an increasingly important topic within the agricultural sector is SPS. IICA has already provided expertise and information to several organizations that have received USAID contracts to address SPS measures in Central American countries.

Activity: Regional center of excellence for risk analysis in Central America

Description: It is the responsibility and right of importing countries to assess the sanitary or phytosanitary risk of export products before they are allowed to enter their country. This risk assessment can be quite extensive and time consuming and if many products need to be examined, this can result in a backlog of risk analyses. To facilitate this process, Colombia recently opened a center of excellence for risk analysis to carry out much of the analysis. While this does not replace the responsibilities and rights of importing countries, it can facilitate the process and shorten the timeframe. There is interest in adopting the approach taken in Colombia by one or more countries in Central America.