

(PERIOD COVERED: AUGUST 2008 - JULY 2009)

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PROJECT REPORT IS TO DESCRIBE THE PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT AGAINST MILESTONES AND THE BROADER AIMS OF THE PROJECT. IT SHOULD CLEARLY DESCRIBE PROGRESS WITH EVIDENCE THAT THE MILESTONES TO THIS STAGE HAVE BEEN ACHIEVED.

Project Name:	Capacity building in the use of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Tool in the Pacific		
Executing Agency:	Secretariat of the Pacific Community	Project supervisor:	The International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat
PROJECT DESCRIPTION ¹ : [Enter 4 to 7 lines of text broadly describing the objectives / scope of the project].	<p>The objectives of this project are to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Conduct a regional training workshop on the PCE tool and (ii) Apply the PCE tool in 6 selected countries in the region. <p>The regional training workshop on use of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool developed by the IPPC Secretariat will be organized and facilitated by the SPC with resource personnel from the IPPC Secretariat and will involve participants from all of the Pacific island countries and territories.</p> <p>Following the training SPC will assist 6 selected National Plant Protection Organisations undertake their phytosanitary capacity evaluation with technical/advisory assistance from the IPPC Secretariat. These six countries have been selected by the PPPO executive committee in consultations with IPPC Secretariat and are representative of each sub regions of Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia. The national evaluation team will conduct, evaluate, discuss, develop/suggest solutions to the gaps identified in the evaluation and prepare a report on the project.</p> <p>The selected countries for the second phase of the project are: Cook Islands and Samoa (Polynesia), Kiribati and Palau (Micronesia) and Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea (Melanesia).</p>		
Project Start Date:	01 August 2007	Project End Date:	31 July 2009 (Extended to 31 December 2009)

¹ Note that this is not expected to change from one reporting period to the next, unless a change to the project objectives/scope is approved by the STDF Secretary

Budget overview:

	STDF contribution (US \$)	In-kind contribution (US \$)	Total (US \$)	% of Total project cost
Projected Total Project Budget (US \$)	*230,215	57,430	*287,645	100
Total expenditure to date (US \$)	**148,825	45,353	**194,178	67.5
Expenditure for reporting period (US \$)	34,151	0	34,151	11.9
Unspent funds (US \$)	*81,390	12,077	*93,467	32.5

* This is amount includes the USD 51,215 channelled directly to FAO under a separate Supervisory Assignment Agreement concluded between FAO and WTO

** Amount excludes costs incurred by the IPPC Secretariat which is covered under a separate agreement

GENERAL REPORTING

A. BROAD PROGRESS ACHIEVED TO DATE:

The first part of the project was delivered jointly by the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and involved a week long training workshop on use of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool during the week of 29th October to 2nd November 2007, in Nuku'alofa, Kingdom of Tonga. The workshop was attended by representatives from 11 independent Pacific Island Countries (PICs), 3 French dependent territories (OCTs), Australia and New Zealand. These countries and territories were Cook Islands, Fiji Islands, French Polynesia (France), Kiribati, Nauru, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia (France), Niue, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Wallis & Futuna (France), Australia and New Zealand. The PICs were funded by the project, French OCTs participation was funded by SPC whilst Australia and New Zealand funded their own participation.

SPC staff also attended the workshop in order to learn the PC evaluations methodology in order to assist PIC's Australia and New Zealand participants were to ensure PIC 's participants used the PCE outcomes in designing their bilateral and multilateral interventions.

By the end of July 2009 national phytosanitary capacity evaluations have been undertaken in all six selected countries and four additional countries of Fiji, Niue, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. The outstanding modules in Fiji and Papua New Guinea were also completed.

The PCE results were analysed and presented at a regional roundtable discussion on WTO and regional trade agreements organized by FAO-SAPA and NZ Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade in Wellington, New Zealand in September 2008. A ranking scale of 1 to 5 was used with a rank of 1 having or providing the required level of phytosanitary service, while 5 having numerous gaps in the services provided by the NPPO.

Mr Melvin Spreij of the WTO STDF Secretariat undertook a project monitoring and evaluation visit to SPC Suva in October 2008. Mr Spreij made a presentation on the WTO and STDF to invited participants from the private sector, NGOs and various Government agencies in Fiji.

A progress report on this project was presented at the 6th triennial Meeting of the Pacific Plant Protection Organisation in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea in July 2009. The meeting endorsed the report, encourage the 4 remaining countries to complete their national evaluations and agree for SPC to use and share the PCE results with donors and another development partners..

The PCE results now are being considered in the designing a number of Biosecurity related projects in the region. These are:

1. The AusAID funded 'Pacific Horticultural and Agricultural Market Access (PHAMA) program. This project will assist in market access issues in five countries; Fiji, Samoa, Tonga, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands. The project will identify priority commodities and provide assistance to gain market access mainly to Australia and New Zealand markets but also to the EU, USA and Japan.
2. A research proposal to the Australian Centre for International Agriculture Research (ACIAR) for identifying treatment regimes to disinfest commodities using hot water and Varpormate[®] fumigation in agricultural and horticultural crops with the view to gain market access for Pacific Islands produce is been discussed and funding has been approved. This project will be based in Fiji but results will be extended to other Pacific Island countries. The project commences in December 2009.
3. Proposed STDF project titled 'Strengthening plant protection and quarantine in the Solomon Islands'. A proposal is being discussed to seek assistance from the Standards facility to assist the Solomon Islands capacity building in Plant Protection and Biosecurity services for promoting

exports and market access. Solomon Islands needs were identified during the PCE evaluation.

4. AusAID – Agriculture Research and Development Support Facility – Papua New Guinea. This is a project funded by AusAID to strengthen the research and development activities in Papua New Guinea. Discussions are being held to include strengthening the Biosecurity service and includes issues identified during the PCE evaluation such as utilizing available technical expertise in pest diagnostics.
5. A separate project is being considered for the Least Developed Countries; Kiribati, Tuvalu, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Vanuatu and Palau to strengthen their plant protection and biosecurity services. The proposed project will include pest and disease surveillance, improve inspections at entry and exit points, pest diagnostics, update biosecurity legislation and have documented procedures available electronically. Further discussions will be held during the one day workshop planned in November 13, 2009.

This is the second (12 months) progress report since the project commenced in August 2007.

B. BROAD WORK ACHIEVED THIS PERIOD:

- The progress and preliminary finding were also presented as part of the PPPO presentation at the 20th Technical Consultation amongst Regional Plant Protection Organisation held at the FAO-HQ, Rome, Italy from 25-28 August 2008.
- The results for the evaluations have been compiled and summarised by SPC and will form the baseline phytosanitary capacity status for each country evaluated. Summarised results present in Annex 1 below. Final full report will be provided in December after the completion of all the countries and as a project termination report. It is anticipated that SPC and development partners will use these baseline data in designing and delivering target technical capacity building activities in these countries. The preliminary results are already used and will be used to justify the projects listed above.
- Results of the legislative module were used in the paper titled 'Harmonisation of biosecurity laws in Pacific prepared and presented by SPC at the Pacific Community Heads of Agriculture and Forestry Services and the Ministers of Agriculture and Forestry Services held in Apia, Samoa from 3-5 September and 8-9 September 2008, respectively. The reference to the outcomes of the evaluation in the paper consolidated efforts of the SPC to encourage the enactment of the regionally harmonised versions of the biosecurity bill enacted in the Pacific ACP Countries.
- Niue national PCE training and evaluations were conducted in November 2008. The have been compiled together with the other countries following the workshop.
- Vanuatu national PCE training workshop and evaluations were done in July 2009. The PCE results have been compiled following the workshop.

The results of the national PCE have been used in discussions by SPC in the 'aid for trade' discussions. Two of the gaps identified were; review of the biosecurity legislations to comply with the IPPC revised text of 1997 and the WTO SPS measures and the lack of or outdated documented procedures for import and export inspections. These are being addressed through the Regional Trade Facilitation Programme with funding from the European Union. Further discussions with the EU and Australia and New Zealand

are been held to continue the activities. From the 14 countries only two and six countries respectively have been able to deliver. Consultations with the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat are continuing on 'Aid for trade' issues regarding biosecurity.

C. BROAD WORK REMAINING FOR NEXT PERIOD AND BEYOND:

The four remaining countries; Tonga, Nauru, Federated States of Micronesia and Marshall Islands will be completed by the end of November, 2009

- The PCE for Nauru was completed in September, the Federated States of Micronesia was completed in early October and Tonga was completed in late October. PCE for the Republic of Marshall Islands will be completed in November from the 23-27, 2009
- The remaining funds have been and will be used to complete the remaining countries mentioned above and a one-day workshop. Staff from the IPPC Secretariat will be conducting workshop to review and discuss the results with possible 'aid for trade' projects the main topic of the discussions.
- Discussions with the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and other donor agencies on Aid for Trade negotiations are ongoing. Once priorities in technical capacity building are identified, donors will be approached using the 'Aid for trade' banner.
- Country Specific and Regional projects proposed; Solomon Islands, PNG; Regional Tonga, Samoa, Fiji, Cook Islands, Vanuatu, Results to be presented in documentation presented to donor as a means of project justification.
- A supervisory visit by the IPPC Secretariat is scheduled for November 10-14, 2009 to review the results and give guidance regarding the interpretation and use of the information for strategic development of phytosanitary capacity in the region.

D. OTHER COMMENTS:

SPC conducted a preliminary analysis of the PCE results from the 10 countries evaluated thus far and the rankings of the individual countries respective to modules are given at the end of this report.

There were fewer activities in the first six months of 2009 than anticipated due to absence of one officer on prolonged sick leave and the other commitments staff of the biosecurity and trade facilitation unit had in other programmes.

By December evaluations in all countries would be completed and a final project termination report should be available by late December, 2010.

Deliverable / Milestone Table (Log-frame)

Item ID	Item Description	Target Finish	Actual or Forecast	Status: (% Complete)	Comments
---------	------------------	---------------	--------------------	----------------------	----------

		Date	Finish Date		
1	Contract signed			Complete	
2	Liaise with partner organizations and collaborating NPPOs regarding resource persons, date and venue for the workshop	Aug/Sept 2007	August 2007	Complete	
3	Identify resource people for the workshop	August 2007	August 2007	Complete	Mr. Jeffrey Jones (FAO-AGPP-Plant Quarantine Officer - Rome) Mr. Richard Ivess (FAO-IPPC Coordinator)
4	Confirm date and venue	Aug/Sept 2007	August 2007	Complete	
5	Workshop details including date and venue published on the IPP, SPC website and in LRD newsletters	September 2007	September 2007	Complete	
6	Finalize logistical arrangements for the workshop	September 2007	November 2007	Complete	
7	Prepare training and resource materials	September 2007	November 2007	Complete	
8	Workshop conducted	October 2007	29 th Oct – 2 nd Nov 2007	Complete	29 th Oct – 2 nd Nov 2007, Faonelua Convention Centre, Nuku'alofa Tonga
9	PCE CD-Rom and relevant resources materials distributed to participants	October 2007	29 th Oct – 2 nd Nov 2007	Complete	
10	Workshop evaluation conducted	November 2007	29 th Oct – 2 nd Nov 2007	Complete	
11	Workshop outcome and evaluation responses analyzed	November 2007	November 2007	Complete	
12	Workshop report completed and submitted to STDF, IPPC Secretariat, SPC and other interested parties	December 2007	March 2008	Complete	Report submitted to STDF Secretariat in April 2008
13	News article on the workshop and workshop outcomes published in the LRD newsletters	December 2007	April 2008	Complete	Article on the PCE report in the April 2008 edition of the SPC-LRD newsletter
14	Distribute CD-rom, training and resources materials to PICTs that did not participate in the regional training	December 2007	On-going	On-going	All PICTs given PCE tool Antivirus program has been changed to allow compatibility in the SPC network and computers.

15	Select 2 countries from each sub-region to participate in the project	February 2008	November 2007	Complete	Samoa, Cook Islands, Palau, Kiribati, PNG, Solomon Islands were selected
16	Resource persons (preferably local expert) identified to facilitate this phase of the project, if required	February 2008	December 2007	Complete	SPC-biosecurity and trade support staff assisted those trained at the workshop to undertake national evaluations
17	Commence project in the selected countries	March 2008	Commenced February 2008	Completed	National evaluations in the selected countries started in Palau in February
18	Conduct monitoring visit to the participating countries	March-August 2008	On-going	On-going	Initial visits and undertaking of evaluations are completed. Additional visits are to be undertaken as part of the general support services provided by SPC.
19	Compile outcomes of evaluation exercise and conduct national consultation or meeting discuss the outcomes	Sept-Oct 2008	On-going	On-going	SPC compilations of PCE results done.
20	IPPC Technical Supervisory Services	November 2008			November 2009
21	Project report written up including suggested mitigation measures to address the gaps	November 2008			December 2009
22	External Project evaluation undertaken	November 2008			
23	Outcomes of this phase of the project published in the LRD newsletters	January 2009			Postponed to January 2010
24	Disseminate skills learnt to other PICTs.	Jan-June 2009			Ongoing
25	Project Conclusion	July 2009. Extended to December 2009			To be completed by December 2009
26	Project external evaluation	November 2009			Not Started
27	Facilitate continue use of skill learnt (SPC)	Feb-July 2009	On-going		On-going

Milestone Slippage Notes. The following information is not required if a milestone is both complete and the information has been provided in a previous project report. If a milestone/s has slipped or is likely to slip, provide:

A) <i>Likely impact on the project.</i>	
B) <i>Reason for slippage.</i>	
C) <i>Corrective action planned to be taken, if any.</i>	
Item ID	Milestone Slippage Notes.
14	

Mid (End)-project financial statement

Description	Budget	Expend.	Budget Available	Expend. Rate
Phase 1 – STDF Funding				
Regional Training Workshop participants costs (accommodation, airfares, Per diem) for 14 PICs	75,000	72,352	2,648	96
**Technical and Advisory Support Services from FAO	51,215	-	-	-
Airfares and per diem for 3 SPC staff (project manager and 2 technicians involved in Phase 2 implementation)	17,000	9,230	7,770	54
Workshop material	2,000	2,394	(394)	120
Phase 1 – In Kind Contributions				
Conference room and associated costs (Host country)	5,000	2,785	2,215	56
Administrative assistant for duration of workshop (Host country)	250	273	(23)	109
Local transport hire (Host country)	2,000	600	1400	30
Attendance of non-STDF funded participants (SPC)	10,000	18,587	(8,587)	186
Administrative assistant to organize workshop (SPC)	250	0	250	0
SPC management and administrative support	6,965	6965	0	100
Phase 2 – STDF Funding				
Evaluation team costs (domestic air travel, subsistence allowance for out-of-site days)	50,000	20,773	29,227	42
Meetings (including consultation with national stakeholders) – domestic travel costs	10,000	1,475	8,525	15
SPC monitoring of the project in the selected countries (one visit per country)	10,000	8,450	1,550	85
Cost of independent external evaluation at the end of the project	15,000	-	-	-
Phase 2 – In Kind Contributions				
SPC monitoring of the project in the selected countries – two visits per country (SPC)	20,000	5,225	14,775	26
Staff time (3 people for 2 days) and field visit costs for 6 countries (Host country)	6,000	9,038	(3,038)	151
SPC management and administrative support	6,965	1,880	5,086	27
Total STDF Funding	230,215	114,674	115,541	49.8
Total In Kind Contributions	57,430	45,353	12,077	79.0
TOTAL PROJECT COST	287,645	160,027	127,618	55.6

The above financial statement excludes costs incurred by the IPPC Secretariat which is covered under another agreement between the FAO and WTO. The amount of USD 51,125 though not available to SPC is considered in the calculation of the overall expenditure as reflected above. The expenditure rates on funds available to SPC are 64.1% of the total STDF funding and 67.7% of the total project funding.

Annex 1: Results of the PCE evaluations in 10 countries

Phytosanitary capacity evaluation

Component No	specific area	Fiji	Samoa	PNG	Tuvalu	Kiribati	Cook Islands	Palau	Solomon Islands	Niue	Vanuatu
1	Country background										
2	Legislation	2	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	2
3.1	Pest Diagnostic Capabilities (Human resources & facilities) <i>Resources - Human Resources - Facilities</i>	2	3	2	4	4	2	3	4	3	3
3.2	Pest Diagnostic Capabilities - Entomology equipment	2	2	2	3	4	3	3	4	3	3
3.3	Pest Diagnostic Capabilities - Fungal and bacterial equipment	3	3	2	5	5	3	4	4	5	5
3.4	Pest Diagnostic Capabilities - Nematology equipment	3	3	3	5	5	4	5	5	5	5
3.5	Pest Diagnostic Capabilities - Virology equipment	3	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5

3.6	Pest Diagnostic Capabilities - Weed science equipment	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	5
4	Pest Risk Analysis Resources - Human Resources - Facilities Documented procedures	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
5	Surveillance Resources - Human Resources - Facilities Resources - infrastructure Documented procedures	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
6	Pest free areas of , places and sites of production Resources - Human Resources - Facilities Documented procedures	3	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	3	3
7	Pest reporting Resources - Human Resources - Facilities Documented procedures	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3
8	Pest eradication Resources - Human Resources - Facilities Resources - infrastructure Documented procedures	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2

9	Inspection systems at Points of entry and exit	2	1	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2
	Resources - Human										
	Resources - Facilities										
	Resources - infrastructure										
10	Documented procedures										
	Export certification	1	1	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	2
	Resources - Human										
	Resources - Facilities										
11	Resources - infrastructure										
	Documented procedures										
	Institutional aspects	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Resources - Human										
	Resources - Facilities										
	Resources - infrastructure										
	Documented procedures										

Ranking

- 1 = very good (documented procedures, human capacity, equipment and materials, data management and traceback)
 2 = good (documented procedures, human capacity, equipment and materials, data management and traceback)
 3 = satisfactory (documented procedures, human capacity, equipment and materials, data management and traceback)
 4 = inadequate (documented procedures, human capacity, equipment and materials, data management and traceback)
 5 = poor (documented procedures, human capacity, equipment and materials, data management and traceback)

The above analysis shows that across all the countries evaluated, there are substantial gaps in the legislative, pest diagnostic capacity, pest free areas, places and sites of production and export certification aspects of the NPPO. Most countries do not have adequate technical expertise/ specialists. They also have inadequate or poor diagnostic equipment and facilities (infrastructure). Communication especially access to internet requires substantial improvement in some countries. Funding of biosecurity services by governments is inadequate. The biosecurity legislations existing in most countries need to be updated as they are not compliant with WTO and IPPC requirements.

In terms of country comparisons Fiji fare slightly better followed by similar levels of capacity in Cook Islands, PNG and Samoa. The least developing countries of Tuvalu, Kiribati and Solomon Islands as expected had the greatest deficiencies in phytosanitary capacity.

Many countries have separate export regulations from the main plant quarantine regulation.

It should be noted that all countries have good institutional capacity and are strong at inspection at the points of entry and exit and in dealing with pest eradications. Which are indications of the respective national government and development partner inputs into these areas of the NPPOs. When prioritising their needs work activities most modules fall under the very high and high priority categories indicating and urgent need for refurbishment and improving facilities, equipment, training and information resources. These are the areas (capacity building) where donor assistance through programs such as 'Aid for Trade' could assist.