


Overview of the STDF / OECD Work on SPS Indicators

Marlynnne Hopper, STDF Secretariat

**STDF/ OECD Technical Working Meeting
on SPS Indicators**

Geneva, 1 July 2010



Aims

- Sensitize the SPS community about the importance of managing for results and the need for indicators.
- Identify, pilot test and refine an indicative set of indicators to measure the performance of a national SPS system.
- Develop guidance materials to help measure the performance of a national SPS system.

Synergies and linkages with:

- STDF/OECD work on good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation
- Other STDF work (including on SPS action planning, use of economic analysis, etc.)
- Aid-for-Trade Initiative through focus on monitoring results at an operational, issue-specific level

STDF Work Plan on SPS Indicators (2010-11)

In collaboration with the OECD:

- Draft working paper on SPS indicators. Discuss. Revise.
- Technical working meeting, 1 July 2010.
- Pilot testing activities in selected countries.
- Possibility to organize 2nd technical working meeting.
- Revise working paper and produce guidance materials.


Scope and focus of our work

- **Aims to** identify indicators that can be used to track and measure the performance of a national SPS system (*macro* level).
- Does **not** attempt to develop indicators for specific SPS projects or programmes (*micro* level).
- Does **not** aim to duplicate or replicate sector-specific indicators (OIE PVS, PCE tool, etc.).

Approach

- Based on the logical framework's results chain and OECD terminology.
- Expect this to be a long-term, iterative and participatory process.
- View the resulting indicators as a starting point for adaptation by countries to suit their conditions.
- Facilitate country ownership of SPS capacity building and priority setting.


What do we mean by a national SPS system?



Intervention logic for a national SPS system

Purpose (medium-term)

**Functioning, resourced
and transparent SPS
system** with capacity to
ensure food safety,
animal and plant health
(incl. ability to meet int'l
SPS requirements)



Goal / Impact (long-term)

**Contribute to national
development
objectives**
(e.g. ↑ employment,
income generation,
↓ poverty, improved
public health)

Purpose (medium-term): Functioning, resourced and transparent national SPS system

OUTCOMES

- Gov't agencies, private sector, consumers and donors understand importance of meeting SPS requirements.
- SPS decision-making is collaborative and transparent.
- Policy, legal and regulatory framework for SPS management.
- Stakeholders have capacity to carry out roles based on national legislation, SPS strategy, action plans, etc.
- National agencies able to engage with trading partners, int'l standard-setting bodies, regional bodies, WTO, etc.

Expected benefits

- Enhance synergies and effectiveness in reporting, monitoring and evaluation (especially given often fragmented state of SPS information).
- Potential as tools to support SPS policy and decision-making.
- Support monitoring of SPS action plans.

Purpose of today's meeting

- Discuss the use of a logframe approach to measure the performance of a national SPS system.
- Discuss the purpose, outcomes and indicators in the draft working paper.
- Make recommendations to advance this work on SPS indicators.

Break-out Sessions

Break-out sessions

- Group 1: Room A – Kenza Le Mentec
- Group 2: Room B – Melvin Spreij
- Group 3: Room C – Kees van der Meer
- Group 4: Room D – Panos Antonakakis
- Group 5: Room D – Sheelagh O'Reilly

Break-out sessions – Questions to discuss

- Are the purpose (medium-term outcome) and five outcomes in the draft logframe complete and coherent?
 - Are there any obvious gaps? Anything missing in the outcomes? If so, identify the gaps and define the missing outcome(s).
 - Rank the outcomes in priority?
 - Could a logframe – with outcomes and indicators similar to these – assist in the development and/or strengthening of the SPS system in your country?

Break-out sessions – Questions to discuss

- Select the outcomes that your group ranked as first and/or second priority. Discuss the indicators proposed in the draft working paper to measure this outcome(s).
 - Consider their practicality, data availability / gaps, etc.?
 - Are there any missing indicators? If so, what?