SECRETARIAT OF THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY
Land Resources Division
PRIVATE MAIL BAG, SUVA
FIJI
CABLE ADDRESS:
"SOUTHPACOM" FIJI
TELEPHONE: (679) 3370 733 CETC 3391 033
FAX: (679) 3370 021 or 3386 326

SECRÉTARIAT GÉNÉRAL DE LA COMMUNAUTÉ du PACIFIQUE
Division RessourcesTerrestres
PRIVATE MAIL BAG, SUVA
FIDJI

ADDRESSE TÉLÉGRAPHIQUE:
"SOUTHPACOM" FIDJI
TÉLÉPHONE: (679) 3370 733 CETC 3391 033
TÉLÉCOPIEUR: (679) 3370 021 or 3386 326

PROJECT TERMINATION REPORT

Project Title: **Capacity building in the use of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Tool in the Pacific**

1. Introduction

1.1 Project background

The Pacific must stay current with the global changes in trade, cargo and passenger facilitation practices. Globalisation has seen increased movement of goods and people across borders and the region is no exception. The Pacific Island Communities have experienced increased cargo and people flows in the region which has increased the potential of risk of entry of regulated pests and diseases that pose a serious threat to agriculture, livelihood and fragile ecosystems. The environment in which agriculture commodities are traded has changed and more so with the introduction of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and in particular the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement) and the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT Agreement) that together aim to reduce unjustified non-tariff barriers to trade whilst safeguarding plant, animal, human health and well being, and the environment. With these new rules another layer of complexity was introduced to the already resource constrained and under-equipped biosecurity and trade facilitation services of the Pacific Island States resulting in a larger hurdle to overcome in terms of trade facilitation. These countries have limited ability to facilitate any capacity building endeavours nationally (the exceptions being Fiji, PNG, New Caledonia and Samoa).

The Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool was developed by the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) as a tool for use by countries to self assess their capacity to implement the Convention and the application of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). The tool is presented as a software application consisting of 11 modules, with each module comprising a set of questionnaires. The tool has been applied in over 70 countries worldwide and has been used effectively to document the capacities and lack thereof as well as to form a basis for the development of strategic direction for governments.

The Pacific Island Communities are generally aware (by anecdotal evidence) of the deficiencies in their national biosecurity (phytosanitary) services, however they are unable to systematically evaluate the gaps and formulate measures to address these gaps. The project was developed to address these deficiencies and consisted of two approaches: (i) conduct a regional training workshop on the PCE tool and (ii) apply the PCE tool in 6 selected countries in the region. The project was expanded in its first year of implementation to include the remaining 8 states in the Pacific Island Community, with remaining funds. In order to successfully apply the PCE tool in all these countries, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), a regional technical organization working in this area, with experience on phytosanitary issues, therefore applied to implement the project. The SPC is well placed to assist

countries in the region to apply the PCE tool, and to continue to support capacity building efforts as part of its ongoing work.

The concept for this proposal was endorsed by the Pacific Plant Protection Organization in 2006, and was formally supported by individual Pacific Island countries and territories. The project was funded by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF).

1.2 Outline of official arrangements

The project was approved in August 2007 by the STDF (project STDF 133, entitled "Capacity building in the use of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool in the Pacific") with a budget of US$ 175,000. Implementation of the project was supervised by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and included a budget of US$ 51,215. The project started in August 2007 and ended in December 2009.

The SPC provided staff and in-kind resources to conduct training and implementation of the PCE tool in the selected countries with remaining funds and funds sourced from other related projects. The FAO, through the IPPC Secretariat, provided technical staff to conduct training on the use of the PCE tool and staff to supervise implementation of the project. Reference is made to Appendix 1 for the project staff list.

1.3 Objectives of the project

The project aimed to assist the National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) of the countries of the Pacific Island Community to evaluate their capacity to implement international phytosanitary requirements, facilitate trade, and better deliver official and commercial phytosanitary services to their clients and meet their international obligations.

The principal objective of the project was to improve the capacity of the countries of the Pacific Island Community to systematically evaluate the gaps in the application of phytosanitary measures through their plant protection/biosecurity services and formulate measures to address them.

The expected outputs of the project were:

- adequately trained national NPPO staff in most, if not all, of the island and territory of the Southwest Pacific FAO region,
- national phytosanitary capacity evaluations undertaken in 6 selected countries, and establish an adequate skills base both at national and regional level to facilitate application of the PCE tool.

These project outputs have been achieved as a regional workshop was conducted and staff from all NPPO's attended the training, which was conducted in October 2007. In additional national phytosanitary capacity evaluations were completed in all 14 countries including the original six selected countries as indicated below. Staff that attended the in-country workshops were trained on how to use the PCE tool. The user manual was provided and each participant followed the manual to respond to the questions.

The project targets achieved were;:

- training for 39 potential practitioners of the PCE tool in 21 territories of the Pacific Island Community and regionally were trained.
- Introduce the concepts of international trade in plants and plant products, the SPS Agreement and international standard setting process to about the same number of people in the region and facilitate networking of biosecurity personnel in the region.
- Direct application of the PCE tool in 14 countries, eight more than the initially selected six countries.

- The participating 6 countries would produce a report (summary of results) of the evaluation and distribute it widely to relevant stakeholders in their respective countries. The reports would also be distributed to the other participating countries and will be published on the SPC website.

The project will impact on the individual countries ability to evaluate its phytosanitary and, more broadly, its biosecurity service and identify gaps in the service. It will enable the individual country to better plan (development strategy) and deliver its biosecurity services. The project will aid other countries who are in the process of developing their national export strategy and contribute to the following outcomes:

- Improved biosecurity of trade in the region.
- Identification of impediments to trade in potential products.
- Informed decision making by Pacific Island countries and territories regarding biosecurity risk management.

The above outcomes have been achieved to a limited extended in some countries. They have identified the gaps and are seeking bilateral donor assistance, included in their strategic plans and planned activities in capacity building.

2. Phases and methodology of PCE Evaluations in PICs

PHASE 1: Regional PCE Training workshop

The first part of the project was delivered jointly with the STDF partner organization, 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 developed by the IPPC Secretariat during the period 29th October – 2nd November 2007 at the Faõnelua Convention Centre, Nuku'alofa, Tonga. It 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, OCTs participation was funded by SPC whilst Australia and New Zealand funded their own participation.

SPC staff also attended the workshop and learned how to do undertake the PC evaluations as they would be assisting the countries and territories undertake their respective national evaluations. Whilst Australia and New Zealand representatives participated at the workshop to ensure that the outcomes of the national evaluations were considered in the design of their bilateral and multilateral interventions in the region.

PHASE II: Application of PCE tool in countries

The national phytosanitary capacity evaluations were undertaken in all six initially selected countries; Samoa, Cook Islands, Palau, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands and additional two countries Fiji and Tuvalu by the end of July 2008. The project was extended to December 2009 during which Niue, Vanuatu, Nauru, Federated States of Micronesia, Tonga and Marshall Islands were completed. Hence all 14 Independent states

In each country a week long national workshop was organised and participants from state and private sector agencies were invited to attend and use the evaluation tool in group discussions. Each module question was discussed and relevant agreed information added onto the answer sheet.

The SWOT Analysis and prioritisation have been completed in all countries and full reports are attached in Annex 1. The summary table provided in Annex 2 is a comparison of all 14 countries

3. Results and conclusion

3.1 Methodology and procedures

The project was delivered in 2 phases. The first phase involved building capacity of representatives from countries and territories of the Pacific and establishing teams that would conduct national PCE evaluations. The second phase of the project was the conduct of the national PCE evaluations in six countries pre- selected by the Pacific Plant Protection Organization executive committee in consultations with IPPC Secretariat and are representative of each sub regions of Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

The first phase was delivered jointly with the STDF partner organization, the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and involved training of country teams from the countries and territories of the Pacific. To implement the first phase, a regional approach was preferred. A regional training workshop on use of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool developed by the IPPC Secretariat was organized and facilitated by the SPC with resource personnel provided by the IPPC Secretariat .

The second phase of the project was implemented by trained staff of the SPC who undertook missions to each of the six preselected countries to conduct national PCE evaluations. These countries were: Cook Islands and Samoa (Polynesia), Kiribati and Palau (Micronesia) and Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea (Melanesia). Technical/advisory assistance in performing these national evaluations was provided by the IPPC Secretariat. The national evaluations were performed by national evaluation teams trained in the first phase of the project. The objectives of the national evaluations were to conduct, evaluate, discuss, develop/suggest solutions to the gaps identified in the evaluation and prepare a report on the project. SPC staff trained in the use of the PCE were expected to conduct visits to the project sites at least three times during the course of the project to monitor progress and offer any assistance that may be required during project implementation. Support during visits would include: promoting the training with national stakeholders; supporting the training; and providing technical advice to National Plant Protection Organisations. SPC staff would also support country implementation by providing technical advice through telephone and email contact with National Plant Protection Organisations.

Due to the success of the second phase of implementation of the project and interest by more countries of region the project was extended to December 2009, the initial end date of the project was set for July 2009.

At the conclusion of the project the IPPC Secretariat made a final supervision mission to review the achievements of the project. Refer to Appendix 2 for a list of activities undertaken during the project. Appendix 3 lists the principal reports produced during the project timeframe.

3.2 Project achievements

14 countries (Solomon Islands, Tonga, Samoa, Tuvalu, Niue, Vanuatu, Papua New Guinea, Marshall Islands, Fiji, Palau, Cook Islands, Kiribati, Nauru, and the Federated States of Micronesia) were supported by the project to complete national phytosanitary capacity evaluations. A total of 105

persons (34 females; 71 males) were engaged during the implementation of the project, the majority of these, in the capacity of participants at trainings and national evaluations. Refer to Appendix 4 for a list of participants at the main milestone events conducted during the project.

In the first phase of the project, representatives from 11 independent Pacific Island Countries (PICs), 3 French dependent territories (OCTs), Australia and New Zealand participated in a week long regional workshop on the use of the PCE. It was attended by 36 representatives from 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, OCTs participation was funded by SPC whilst Australia and New Zealand funded their own participation. Workshop outcome and evaluation responses were analysed and published in the Land Resources News (LRD) Newsletters. SPC staff also attended the workshop and learned how to do undertake the PC evaluations. They then assisted the selected countries and territories to undertake their respective national evaluations. Australia and New Zealand representatives participated in the first phase to ensure that the outcomes of the national evaluations were considered in the design of their bilateral and multilateral interventions in the region.

The IPPC together with the SPC conducted a final review workshop with representatives of 7 of 14 countries of the Pacific Community that undertook national PCE evaluations. Appendix 6 provides the schedule of delivery of project activities.

3.3 PCE findings

The major gaps identified and the general phytosanitary capacity of the respective NPPOs of the 14 countries that undertook national evaluations yielded similar results. Notable was that the countries had weak or inadequate legislative framework to cover the multitude of roles and functions they were required to perform under the IPPC, weak and/or limited export facilitation procedures and limited documentation of processes and procedures of the NPPO. On the positive side evaluations indicated that the NPPO had relatively strong import controls, inspection and clearance procedure for imports and were in a good position to take advantage of their geographic position to declare areas free of specific plant pests. Most of the NPPOs evaluated had limited documented operations manual and/or work instructions. Annexed to this report is the Excel spreadsheet containing the comparative analysis of all the countries that participated in the project and conducted the PCE evaluations.

At the final workshop held jointly with the IPPC and the SPC in November 2009 a survey was made to gather a general impression the subset of countries present on their views on improving biosecurity of trade in the region, identification of impediments to trade in potential products and modalities for making informed decision making by Pacific Island countries and territories regarding biosecurity risk management. Refer to Appendix 5 for details on the responses received to the survey. Capacity development and training of biosecurity personnel to implement technical requirements and function in market access negotiations, improving access to phytosanitary information, development of documented procedures, market access support, policy and strategy development, improved linkages with private stakeholders to facilitate trade and infrastructure improvements and investments were all highlighted as essential to improve general biosecurity in the region.

3.4 Application of the PCE findings

Palau was able to undertake SWOT analysis, prioritisation and development of a logical framework matrix for their legislative module and applied it to develop an action strategy to expedite the enactment of their regionally harmonised national Biosecurity bill.

Results of the legislative module were used in the paper entitled '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 (http://www.spc.int/lrd/). The outcomes of the evaluation referred to 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. SPC undertook a preliminary analysis of the PCE results and presented the outcomes 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, NZ from 15-19 September 2008. The progress and preliminary finding were also presented as part of the PPPO overview at the 20th Technical Consultation amongst Regional Plant Protection Organisation held in the FAO-HQ, Rome in August 2008.

3.5 Conclusion

PCE results summarised by the SPC will form the baseline for each country evaluated. SPC and development partners are expected to use the data for targeted capacity development in the region. The results have been disseminated to all countries and some potential donors for them to use in identifying the issues, priority areas and plan strategies to build their capacities. Government Ministries responsible for Biosecurity and plant protection services in individual countries can also use the information to seek increased national government budgetary allocation through preparation of information papers, strategic action plans and presentation of expected outcomes.

Each country will be or are being assisted to develop their capacities in specific areas such as post entry quarantine facilities, export and import inspection and treatment facilities, develop export commodity specific dis-infestation/infection pathways, update national biosecurity legislations to be WTO SPS compliant and how to regulate these legislations, establish electronic information databases on pest interception and treatments, sanitary and phytosanitary certification, national pest list database including invasive species, eradication and containment procedures and guidelines and pest incursion response plans, pest reporting and improve their import permit regulatory systems.

The PCE therefore is a important toll in identifying these gaps, used for planning for capacity building activities. All 14 Pacific Islands countries have realized the significance of this tool and have been collaborative and envisage further use in the future to assess their capacity to improve their service delivery.

4. Recommendations

4.1 Lessons learned

The region faces serious challenges to maintain and upgrade biosecurity services. Many NPPOs of the region, i.e. quarantine/biosecurity services, operate on small budget allocations, national resources are limited and many of these countries depend on donor assistance. As a result there is limited technical capacity (staff, equipment, facilities) and the few experts that exist are interspersed throughout the islands. Regular refresher training of NPPO staff is required. Communication systems are unreliable and transport and logistics between islands is complicated and requires fore-planning. Altogether, planning training workshops in well in advance is a pre-requisite.

4.2 Next steps

The following are general recommendations made on the basis of the PCE results and consultation with SPC, IPPC, and staff of a number of NPPOs.

1. *Seek new donor funded projects to improve capacity building*

It is evident that the countries need a long term strategy for improving biosecurity in the region. SPC as an organization has been and intends to continue providing technical expertise and assistance to the countries of the region. SPC will therefore continue to play a central role in the capacity development of the NPPOs of the region. SPC will therefore work with partners in the region, including FAO, to strengthen the gaps identified in all countries of the Southwest Pacific that conducted the phytosanitary capacity evaluation. Appendix 7 lists some initiatives that are in the region.

The results of the PCE will be provided to the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat to use in the aid for trade discussions. Regular scheduled informal and formal meetings with PIFS and SPREP are being held and these results presented for their information so they can also use in their project formulations.

The PCE preliminary results were provided to the AusAID consultant teams during their visits to SPC. In addition SPC had been heavily involved in discussions from the onset with the PHAMA project consultants to include capacity building strategies for issues identified during the PCE in the five selected countries where project activities will be concentrated and have agreed to support the other nine countries by supporting through SPC.
SPC has seek assistance under aid for trade and one of its proposal was approved for funding in the 10th EDF. This proposal is facilitating export through support of private sector enterprises in the region. The preliminary results of the PCE from only the six initial countries were available during the negotiation phase and hence not all results could be presented. A separate proposal that included plant health was however not approved. SPC will endeavour to develop new proposals using these results and provide to donors as well as participate with other partners to such as the regional food safety project to facilitate capacity building in implementation of SPS measures.

2. *Training required to build up technical skills of biosecurity officials in all countries, improve laboratory facilities and equipment for pest diagnostics and carry out pest and diseases surveys and update pest records*

While there is some expertise, the PCE analysis indicates that there is a need to improve capacity overall. The several countries have proposed that a centre of excellence be established that could draw on the skills of the few experts residing in the region. SPC intends to progress this and approach donors to establish a centre of excellence. SPC already has similar facilities for plant genetic resources to assist Pacific Island countries and had been assisting the countries in Plant protection and Quarantine since the 1950's.The centre of excellence would be established in Fiji within the SPC Land Resources Division's structure. Such a centre would provide needed pest diagnostics support. SPC however is considering establishing three subregional centres of excellence in Plant protection and quarantine. The three locations would be in Fiji, SPC subregional centre in Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia to cover the Micronesian subregion and in Papua New Guinea for the western Pacific Subregion, where SPC already have a country office including an area Veterinarian and animal health laboratory. These centres would have pest diagnostic capabilities, training facilities and would maintain biosecurity information facilities including pest databases, trade information databases and commodity treatment.SPC has also been conducting research to develop best pest management practices and quarantine disinfestations treatments for regional pests such as taro beetles *Papuana* species, coconut rhinoceros beetle *Oryctes rhinoceros*, diamond back moth *Plutella xylostella*, fruit fly species *Bactrocera* spp, etc. The centre of excellence would provide the additional benefits as research on pest management and quarantine disinfestations these regional pests could be in these centre of excellence. Few countries have limited capacity to conduct research in pest management and quarantine disinfestations treatments.

3. *Improve access to information, storage and retrieval of information*

Communication and information management is currently unreliable and thus is an area requiring urgent attention. With the exception of Australia and New Zealand, NPPOs in the region have not been able to maintain an active presence on the International Phytosanitary Portal, the official

information exchange tool of the IPPC. For applied applications such as pest diagnostics, NPPOs could explore use of modern video and camera technology for data capture, storage and retrieval. These could be linked to a regional centre that can facilitate the access to information and its storage and retrieval.SPC intends to assist countries in this area and will be actively seeking donor assistance. This would be part of the centres of excellence.

4. *Update procedure manuals and information exchange*

Documented procedures is another weak area for NPPOs of the region. Collaboration with Australia and New Zealand as well as the SPC could be greatly enhance and similar biosecurity documentation could be adopted inter-regionally.SPC has been assisting to certain degree to update procedure manuals but do not have adequate funding resources.SPC also intends to assist countries to maintain electronic databases and records of trade related data(export certification, import permits, etc) and to improve information exchange within NPPOS and between NPPOs, RPPO's, IPPC and trading partners. This would also be part of the proposed centre of excellence.

5. *Improve capacity in trade facilitation (import risk analysis, implementation of SPS measures, etc)*

A regional approach to assist Pacific Island countries in improving their capacity to trade agricultural commodities by meeting the SPS requirements of importing countries has been taken for the past years and will continue to be the approach. However selected individual countries with higher prospect of increasing their export capacity are being given higher priority by some donors such as AusAID. Other smaller countries with limited or no export potential however should still be assisted due to the increasing spread of emerging pests including invasive species which may not directly affect trade but food security and livelihood which have an indirect impact on trade. Most if not all countries do not have adequate resources; funding allocations, technical expertise, laboratory facilities, equipment and documented procedures to deal with the threats of plant pests and invasive species from the wider range of commodities and trading partners from a wider geographical range.

SPC is well positioned to lend this type of support as well as serve as key element in a long term regional strategy as an institution with the capacity to train on a regular basis staff of the NPPOs of the region or provide services in a variety of areas. SPC would like to be strengthened in order that it could enhance its potential to provide the services needed by its members. In terms of performing pest risk analysis (PRA) PRA, SPC is assisting countries to conduct and provide relevant information on a request basis by countries.

Pest surveillance seems to be strongest in the islands due in part to the size of the countries and the limits placed by transportation that limit inter island trade. The dispersed geography of the countries coupled with the limited movement of goods and people makes for easy establishment and maintenance of pest free areas. However there is increasing movement of pleasure crafts including tourist vessels and increasing number of air travellers that increases the risks. SPC intends to continue the assistance provided to countries by conducting regular general, crop specific and pest specific surveys. SPC also provides assistance in pest surveillance activities including specific activities for fruit flies and invasive ants. However SPCs capacity is to continue the assistance in a sustainable manner is limited by resources it receives from donors. A clear strategy and action plan needs to be developed to attract donor funds.

There are a number of well managed programmes of invasive species in the region, these include the biological control of the water hyacinth, biological control of water weed *Salvinia molesta*, biological control of the witches broom weed *Sida rhombifolia*. Biological control of the coconut rhinoceros beetle *Oryctes rhinoceros* using baculovirus to management populations. Natural enemies were introduced, reared and distributed by SPC's plant Health programme in collaboration with NPPOs. The proposed centre of excellence will also assist in safe importation, testing and release of natural

enemies for both invasive species and cultivated crop pests. The NPPOs should emphasize environmental and cultural preservation of local plant resources as a basis for phytosanitary measures in particular in those countries where the value of trade is small.

The PCE results should be used a baseline for gauging phytosanitary capacity of the countries of the region and for developing the strategies for closing the gaps identified. The PCE can be repeated on an annual basis or as frequently as desired but it is recommended that it should be performed at a minimum every 2 -3 years. The next evaluation should be undertaken in 2012using the revised PCE evaluation tool.

5. Financial Report

The allocated funds were inadequate to complete the planned activities and therefore SPC used funds from other sources to complete the activities in the hope that after the submission of the finals report and receiving the final payment, funds will be paid back to the other sources funding the activities.

Table 1: Summary of the budget expenditure until December 2009

	STDF contribution (US $) Funds received	In-kind contribution (US $)	Total (US $)	% of Total project cost
Projected Total Project Budget (US $)	179,000	57,430	236,430	100
Total expenditure to date (US $)	158,416	45,354	203,770	86.2
Funds received	125,300	45,354	170,654	70
Balance	33,116	12,076	*33,116	

Note: * A balance of USD 33,116 is overspent from available funds which is an outstanding payment to SPC upon acceptance of this termination report..

Table 2: Summary of income over the project duration

Income	STDF contribution (US$)	In kind contribution (US$)	Total (US$)
Funds received 2007	71,600	0	71,600
Funds received 2008	26,850	45,353*	72,203
Funds received 2009	26,850	0	26,2850
Total income	125,300	45,353	170,653

*This is actually the total in kind contribution for 2007 and 2008

Table 3: Summary of total expenses from the last report as per activity

Expenditure	USD budget 2009	Previous expenditure	Expenditure 1/9/2008 – 31/12/2009	Balance	% of total costs
Evaluation team costs	50,000	20,773	164	20,937	13.2
Meetings	10,000	1,475	0*	1,475	1
SPC monitoring of project in selected countries	10,000	8,450	24	8,474	5.3
Independent external project evaluation	15,000	-	-	-	-
Workshop materials	2,000	2,394	93	2,487	1.8
SPC staff costs	17,000	9,230	27,681	36,911	23.3
Workshop & meeting costs	75,000	72,352	15,781	88,133	55.6
Total budgeted	179,000	114,674	43,742	158,416	
In kind contributions	USD budget 2009	Previous expenditure	Expenditure 1/9/2008 – 31/12/2009	Balance	% of total project costs
Attendance of non STDF funded participants	10,000	18,587	0*	18,587	41
Workshop & meeting costs	7,500	3,658	0*	3,658	8.1
SPC monitoring of project in selected countries	20,000	5,225	0*	5,225	11.5
Staff time	6,000	9,038	0*	9,038	19.9
SPC management & Administrative support costs	13,930	8,845	0*	8,845	19.5
Total in Kind contributions	57,430	45,353	0*	45,353	
Total	179,000	160,027	43,742	203,770	

*Expenditures that were incurred as in kind contributions were not available at time of reporting. There were significant in kind contribution from staff as well SPC including the management fee which is normally 7% project activity total. duing the reporting period.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: PROJECT STAFF

Name	*Designation*	*Address*	*Email*
Jeffrey Jones (retired Dec 2009)	Plant Quarantine Officer	International Plant Protection Convention, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Rome, Italy.	Jeffrey.jones@fao.org (no longer active)
Orlando Sosa	Agriculture Officer	International Plant Protection Convention, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Rome, Italy.	Orlando.sosa@fao.org
Sydney Suma (retired October 2009)	Advisor, Biosecurity & Trade Facilitation	Land Resources Division, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji Islands	sidneys@spc.int
Roy Masamdu	Biosecurity & Trade Facilitation Officer	Land Resources Division, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji Islands	roym@spc.int
Angeline Goundar	Biosecurity Information Facility Technician	Land Resources Division, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji Islands	angelineg@spc.int
Luisa Korodrau	Information Assistant	Land Resources Division, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji Islands and Resources Division	luisak@spc.int
Nacanieli Waqa	Biosecurity Technician	Land Resources Division, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji Islands Land Resources Division	nacanieliw@spc.int

Appendix 2: FELLOWSHIPS AND STUDY TOURS

Countries visited

Country visited	Name of Project Staff	Start date (dd/mm/yy)	End date (dd/mm/yy)	Brief summary of achievements
Tonga	Jeffery Jones	25/10/2007	04/11/2007	Delivered a one week training on the PCE tool and IPPC and international trade to 36 participants from countries and territories of the Southwest Pacific region.
Tonga	Richard Ivess	25/10/2007	04/11/2007	Delivered a one week training on the PCE tool and IPPC and international trade to 36 participants from countries and territories of the Southwest Pacific region.
Solomon Islands	Roy Masamdu	28/4/08	02/05/08	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Tonga	Roy Masamdu	26/10/09	30/10/09	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Samoa	Angeline Goundar	07/07/08	10/07/08	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Tuvalu	Angeline Goundar	02/06/08	03/06/08	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Niue	Roy Masamdu	12/11/08	19/11/08	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Vanuatu	Luisa Korodrau	7/6/09	14/6/09	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Papua New Guinea	Sidney Suma	15/2/08	22/2/08	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1 and modules 3.1 -3.6. A second follow up workshop was held to complete remaining modules in 2009.
Marshall Islands	Roy Masamdu	21/11/09	27/11/09	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Fiji	Roy Masamdu	22/3/08	28/3/08	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1 and modules 3.1 -3.6. A

				second follow up workshop was held to complete remaining modules in 2009.
Palau	Sidney Suma	3/3/08	9/3/08	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Cook Islands	Angeline Goundar	1/3/08	3/3/08	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Kiribati	Roy Masamdu	15/7/08	22/7/08	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Nauru	Luisa Korodrau	12/9/09	19/9/09	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Federated States of Micronesia	Nacanieli Waqa	24/9/09	3/10/09	One week workshop in which all modules were completed except module 1. Country provided relevant information later
Fiji	Orlando Sosa	19/11/09	22/11/09	Supervision and review mission and project closure. Completed a review of the project with SPC staff and conducted a 1 day project review workshop with representatives from 7 of the 14 countries that conducted national PCE evaluations.

Appendix 3: DOCUMENTS PREPARED DURING THE PROJECT

Author	*Title*	*Date*
Jeffrey Jones	Back to Office Report: To provide Technical and Supervisory Support Services to STDF 133: Capacity building in the use of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Tool in the Pacific	November 2007
Sidney Suma	STDF project 133: WG project status report	March 2008
Sidney Suma	STDF project 133: Project Progress Report - August to December 2007	March 2008
Sidney Suma	STDF project 133: WG project status report – June 2008	June 2008
Sidney Suma	STDF project 133: WG project status report – September 2008	September 2008
Sidney Suma	STDF project 133: Project Progress Report – January - August 2008	September 2008
Sidney Suma	STDF project 133: Project Summary August 2008 to November 2008	November 2008
Roy Masamdu	STDF project 133: Project Progress report August 2008 to July 2009	July 2009
Secretariat of the Pacific Community	Excel Spreadsheet: Comparative analysis of the PCE results (14 country overview)	December 2010
Orlando Sosa	Back to Office Report: Fiji – Supervision mission – Project STF 133 – Capacity building in the use of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool in the pacific. November 2009	March 2010

Appendix 4: PERSONS TRAINED

Training title	*Date*	*Country*	*Name*	*Gender*
PCE evaluation workshop	15-22, July, 2008	Kiribati	Burangke Tabeibeti Nukate Teaotai Neeti Kiritaake Tanana Tareti Nakabuta Teuriaria Roota T. Manako Ioane Ubaitoi Rakentai Kaiuea Ata Binoka Tokataane Moantewa Tianeti Ioane Beenna	M M F F M F M F M F M
PCE evaluation workshop	October 26-30, 2009	Tonga	Penisimani Vaea Sione Foliaki Villiami Kami Siutoni Tupou Ma'afu Manisela Vunivesis Minoneti Manaiah Halafihi Tevita Tukunga Lolo Fili Salesi Kaitu'u Heimuli Likiafu	M M M F M M M M M M M
PCE evaluation workshop	22-28 March 2008	Fiji	Hiagi Forate Iliatia Boa Ateca Cakautini Iliasa Dakaica Satya Nand Luke Tirimaidaika Ana Turanganitabua Mere Salusalu Suresh Prasad Sairusi Vunitabua Osea Ratuyawa Paula Waqainabete Kulinio Bola Kaukimoce Moti Lal Autar Joseva Vueti Losalini Leweniqila Virendra Karan	M M F M M M F F M M M M M M M F M
PCE evaluation workshop	28 April -2 May 2008	Solomon Islands	Francis Tsatsia Helen Tsatsia Irene Nanau Jean Eroa Crispus Finau	M F F F M

			Maximin Kalubolona Jean Bosita Galo Ellen Iramu Conellius Donga Jack O'oi Ms Upu David Ramo Jack Koti Patteson Akipu Daniel Wagatora John Pupulu Hearly Artepule Simon Baete Micheal Hoata Roy Masamdu	M F F M M F M M M M M M M M M
PCE evaluation workshop	1-3 April, 2008	Cook Islands	Moetu Tangitamaiti Tetupu Apara Tiera Mataora Maja Poeschko Ngatoko Ngatoko Pavai Taramai Tina Akame Avaiki Apera John Akavi Teina Tou Ngatokono Teina Sonny Poara Albert Rani Nooroa Tokari Takapi Kora Edwin Apera Tiria Pere	M M F F M M F F M F M M M M F M M M
PCE evaluation workshop	2-3 June 2008	Tuvalu	Sam Panapa Matio Lomaloma Evolini MAMI	M M F
PCE evaluation workshop	June 2009	Vanuatu	Benuel Tarilongi Timothy Temukon Merriam Seth Linnette Berukilukilu Bai George Silverio Bule Francis Qarani Stantly Livingstone	M M F F M M M M

			Syleverio Bule Amstrong Sam Christie Jonas A Scott Kaltavara O'niel Dalesa Mark Vurobaravu Tiata Sileye Dorine Kaitip Connelia Wylie Yannick Stevens Sylvie W Boulekouran Dorine Kaitip	M M F M F M M F M M F F F
PCE evaluation workshop	September, 2009	Nauru	Rennier Gadabu Evalyne Deteranamo Tremaine DICK Mason DICK Hanssen Bam Codney Bill Paul Kun Gemmyma Eoe Pat Cook	M F M M M M M F M
PCE evaluation workshop	November 2008	Niue	Crispina Konelio New Testament Aue Colin Etuata	F M M
PCE evaluation workshop	26-30 May 2008	Papua New Guinea	Pere Kokoa David Tenakanai Tony George Gunua Leka Tom Alphonse Bannick Ilagi Puana Marjorie Kame	M M M F M M F
PCE evaluation workshop	11-14 February 2008	Palau	Hilda Etipson Emoket Ngiriou Everson Sadang Caleb Tekriu Harlan Derbai Devron Andreas Fred Sengebau Konrad Engleberger Raynold Skilang Pascal Ongos Sidney Suma	 F M M M M M M M M M M

PCE evaluation workshop	7-10 July, 2008	Samoa	Anoano Seumalii Talei Fidow-Moors Afolau Malae Pine Paenoa Billy Enosa Tauala Aoelua Faalelei Laiti Taualai Mauga Tapeni Frost Rigmor Letufugu LogomapuMafiti Kasein O'Brien Ale Pelenato Fonoti	F F F M M M F M M M M F M
PCE evaluation workshop	November 23-27, 2009	Marshall Islands	Billy Edmond Wesley Beasha Karmes Kusto Helmar Lejjena Henry Capelle Rebecca Lorennij Roselynn Teico Alfred B Calvin Carlos Lajram Kenema Arnmonth	M M M M M F F M M M
PCE evaluation workshop	September, 2009	Federated States of Micronesia	Gibson Susumu Konrad Engelberger John Wichep Moses Asher	M M M M
Regional PCE training workshop	October, 2007	Tonga	Hiagi Foraete Kulinio KAUKIMOCE Ateca Caukatini Sione Foliaki Viliame Manu Francis Qarani Pavaii Taramai Teturu APERA Leon MU Kimaere ABIATA Nukate Rooti TEOTAI Alfred Calvin Tremaine DICK Mason DICK Frederick GIMAT Crispina KONELIO Charlene FUNAKI Hunter MOI Pere KOKOA	M M F M M M M M M M F M M M M F F M M

			Logomapu MAFITI Talei Jacinta FIDOW Daniel WAQATORA Patteson AKIPU Sam PANAPA Evolini MAMI Linnette BERUKILUKILU Julien BARBIER Sally GRIFFIN Joanna Hamilton Jeffery JONES Richard IVESS Sidney SUMA Konrad ENGLBERGER Nacanieli WAQA Madi KWARARA Angeline GOUNDAR Luisa KORODRAU Roselynn TEICO Moses ASHER	M F M M M F F M F F M M M M M F F F F M
Regional PCE assessment workshop	20 November 2009	Fiji	Teaaro Otiuea Pavaii Taramai Francis Qarani Patteson Akipu Ateca Caukatini Olive Jayto Roy Masamdu Dale Hamilton Orlando Sosa	F M M M F F M M M

Appendix 5 – BIOSECURITY IN THE SOUTH WEST PACIFIC SURVEY RESULTS

Project STF 133 – "Capacity building in the use of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool in the pacific". The following survey was presented to the Secretariat of the Pacific Community and distributed to participants from 7 countries in the region at the final workshop held November 2009.

1) Goal of project: Improved biosecurity of trade in the region.

1. To what extent can your countries achieve this goal?
   a. What are the current risks/challenges?
      - Inadequate technical and operational capacity to mitigate biosecurity risks
      - Inadequate technical and operational capacity for trade facilitation
      - Low priority in budgetary allocation by national governments

   b. What are the options to manage these risks/challenges?
      - Regular training for staff and increased staffing
      - Optimize utilization of existing facilities and equipment
      - Acquire new equipment and refurbish existing facilities
      - Networking with industry and other state agencies to facilitate safe trade
      - Improve accessibility to information and information sharing
      - Update procedures and implement
      - Pest & disease surveillance, increase capacity to respond to incursions
      - Update Biosecurity legislations

   c. What resources are needed?
      - Training facilities and training manuals
      - Facilities & equipment for improved diagnostics capacity
      - Procedures manuals such as systems approach for exports fresh produce exports, risk analysis procedures, inspection procedures, etc
      - Equipment for inspections such as x-ray machines and inspection kits
      - Computers & accessibility to information sources, storage and retrieval capacity

   d. What are the priorities?
      - Training on biosecurity activities (inspection, treatments, certification procedures, diagnostics, etc)
      - Updating biosecurity legislations
      - Access to information and information archiving
      - Infrastructure and equipment for diagnostic capacity
      - Procedure manuals
      - Networking with state and industry stakeholders to facilitate exports and imports
      - Development of appropriate treatment protocols for new commodities

2. What concrete steps are being taken at the national level?

Country	**Risk/Challenge**	**Actions**
Solomon	• Inadequate technical capacity to mitigate	• Improve networking with industry and other state agencies to facilitate safe trade

Islands	biosecurity risks • Inadequate capacity to deal with exports/imports • Staff training • Improve accessibility to information and information sharing • Improve infrastructure and equipment for pest diagnostics & post entry quarantine • Low government priority in Agriculture & biosecurity issues	• Revision and updating the existing biosecurity legislation • Develop a biosecurity information facility for storage of import & export data as well as biosecurity procedures • Revise and update lists of regulated quarantine pests • Conduct surveillance & public awareness for cocoa pod borer • Develop incursion response plans for cocoa pod borer, giant African snail, invasive ants, invasive species • Explore opportunities for training of biosecurity staff • Explore opportunities for donor assistance • Develop policy papers, strategies and plans for Biosecurity within the Agriculture Development plan • Explore market access opportunities • Explore opportunities for staff training, eg discussions with SPC, NZ Aid, AusAID, FAO SAPA
Fiji	• Inadequate technical capacity to mitigate biosecurity risks • Inadequate capacity to deal with exports/imports • Inadequate diagnostic capacity • Reduced staff training opportunities	• Improve networking with industry and other state agencies to facilitate safe trade • Promulgated new biosecurity bill and develop and update existing regulations to enforce legislation • Develop a biosecurity information facility for storage of import & export data as well as biosecurity procedures • Revise and update lists of regulated quarantine pests • Conduct surveillance & public awareness for fruit flies • Facilitate export of fresh produce commodities • Explore opportunities for training of biosecurity staff • Explore opportunities for donor assistance • Develop policy papers, strategies and plans for Biosecurity within the Agriculture Development plan • Explore market access opportunities • Explore opportunities for staff training, eg discussions with SPC, NZ Aid, AusAID, FAO SAPA
Samoa	• Inadequate technical capacity to mitigate biosecurity risks • Inadequate capacity to deal with exports/imports	• Improve networking with industry and other state agencies to facilitate safe trade • Revision and updating the existing biosecurity legislation • Develop a biosecurity information facility for storage of import & export data as well as biosecurity procedures • Revise and update lists of regulated quarantine pests • Conduct surveillance & public awareness for pest incursions such as the cane toad, mongoose and the giant African snail • Develop incursion response plans for invasive species

		and pests • Explore opportunities for training of biosecurity staff • Explore opportunities for donor assistance • Develop policy papers, strategies and plans for Biosecurity within the Agriculture Development plan • Explore market access opportunities • Explore opportunities for staff training, eg discussions with SPC, NZ Aid, AusAID, FAO SAPA
Kiribati	• Inadequate technical capacity to mitigate biosecurity risks • Inadequate capacity to deal with exports/imports	• Improve networking with industry and other state agencies to facilitate safe trade • Revision and updating the existing biosecurity legislation • Develop a biosecurity information facility for storage of import & export data as well as biosecurity procedures • Revise and update lists of regulated quarantine pests • Conduct surveillance & public awareness for invasive species and plant pests • Explore opportunities for training of biosecurity staff • Explore opportunities for donor assistance • Develop policy papers, strategies and plans for Biosecurity within the Agriculture Development plan • Explore market access opportunities • Explore opportunities for staff training, eg discussions with SPC, NZ Aid, AusAID, FAO SAPA
Vanuatu	• Inadequate technical capacity to mitigate biosecurity risks • Inadequate capacity to deal with exports/imports	• Improve networking with industry and other state agencies to facilitate safe trade • Revision and updating the existing biosecurity legislation • Develop a biosecurity information facility for storage of import & export data as well as biosecurity procedures • Revise and update lists of regulated quarantine pests • Conduct surveillance & public awareness invasive species and plant pests • Develop incursion response plans for invasive species such as ants • Explore opportunities for training of biosecurity staff • Explore opportunities for donor assistance • Develop policy papers, strategies and plans for Biosecurity within the Agriculture Development plan • Explore market access opportunities • Explore opportunities for staff training, eg discussions with SPC, NZ Aid, AusAID, FAO SAPA
Cook Islands	• Inadequate technical capacity to mitigate biosecurity risks • Inadequate capacity to	• Improve networking with industry and other state agencies to facilitate safe trade • Revision and updating the existing biosecurity legislation

	deal with exports/imports	• Develop a biosecurity information facility for storage of import & export data as well as biosecurity procedures • Revise and update lists of regulated quarantine pests • Conduct surveillance & public awareness for invasive species & plant pests • Develop generic incursion response plans for invasive species • Explore opportunities for training of biosecurity staff • Explore opportunities for donor assistance • Develop policy papers, strategies and plans for Biosecurity within the Agriculture Development plan • Explore market access opportunities • Explore opportunities for staff training, eg discussions with SPC, NZ Aid, AusAID, FAO SAPA

3. What concrete steps are being taken at the national level?
   - Update existing biosecurity legislations
   - Conduct regional and national in-country training on ISPMs, pest diagnostics, systems approach to fresh produce exports, import risk analysis, facilitate safe movement of plant germplasms, develop plans and assist in pest incursion responses, information storage and retrieval systems, pest surveillance and development of information material such as pamphlets, posters, etc for public awareness
   - Provide technical assistance on import risk analysis and commodity treatments
   - Develop biosecuirity information facility
   - Establish and maintain a helpdesk for biosecurity and other crop production and protection issues including trade facilitation issues
   - Assist in facilitating trade between countries

2) Identification of impediments to trade in potential products.

1. List the products that have potential for export. The list of products have been identified and market access requests will be made shortly hence no further details are available

Country	***Product***
Solomon Islands	Taro; Cassava; Firewood; Kava; Vanilla; Bush limes; Pineapples; eggplant
Fiji	**Vi***; cucurbits; **jackfruit***; Cut flowers*; Ginger; breadfruit; chillies; jackfruit; eggplant; mango; Papaya; breadfruit
Samoa	Breadfruit; papaya; avocado; Vi*; pineapple*; Tahitian chestnut*; limes*; rambutan*; *Citrus* spp.*; Kava; noni juice; Taro*; banana*
Kiribati	Pandanus; Noni juice
Vanuatu	Ginger; Vi*; banana*; breadfruit*; capsicum*; mango*; tomato*; Various nuts (*Canarium* spp. etc); kava; Taro
Tonga	Breadfruit; papaya; mango; Pineapple*; beans*; okra*; peas*; pele leaves*; baby corn*; taro
Cook Islands	Papaya; Taro; Banana; *Citrus* spp.; ornamentals

2. What are the current difficulties experienced for trade in these products?
- Difficulties in negotiating market access
- Implementation of commodity chain hampered by lack of appropriate resources
- Poor infrastructures in the commodity supply chain
- Inadequate entrepreneurship skills
- Lack of opportunities for credit facilities
- Low technical capacity of staff to understand and implement SPS measures
- Inadequate financial support from the government to private stakeholders
- Inconsistent production and quality

3) Informed decision making by Pacific Island countries and territories regarding biosecurity risk management

1. What are the national policies in place for establishing and sustaining biosecurity?

Country	*Policies*
Solomon Islands	National Agriculture Development Plan
Fiji	National Agriculture Development Plan
Samoa	National Agriculture Development Plan
Vanuatu	National Agriculture Development Plan
Tonga	National Agriculture Development Plan
Kiribati	Agriculture Development Plan
Cook Islands	Agriculture Development Plan
Papua New Guinea	National Agriculture Development plan
Tuvalu	Agriculture Development plan
Niue	Agriculture Development plan
Nauru	Agriculture Development plan
Federated States of Micronesia	Micronesia biosecurity plan, Agriculture Development plan, Micronesia Invasive species plan
Palau	Micronesia biosecurity plan, Micronesia invasive species plan
Marshall Islands	Micronesia biosecurity plan, Micronesia invasive species plan

2. What regional mechanisms and initiatives can be tapped to improve countries decision making capacities?
   - Regional Plant Protection Organisation
   - Regional Heads of Agriculture and Forestry meetings
   - Regional Heads of Animal Health and Livestock Production
   - Pacific Islands Trade and Investment Commission

3. What capacity building initiatives are available currently or in the foreseeable future for countries to be able to improve their decision making processes where biosecurity is concerned.

- Revision and updating of biosecurity legislations
- Biosecurity information facility
- Maintenance of regional trade statistics database
- PHAMA (Pacific Horticulture and Agriculture Market Access) project to comment in August 2010 will assist in market access for priority commodities.
- Market information available for niche products
- Training Import risk analysis and technical market access documentation
- Establishment of a regional training and information centre for pest diagnostics

Appendix 6: Delivery of scheduled project activity

Item ID	Item Description	Target Finish Date	Actual or Forecast Finish Date	Status: (% Complete)	Comments
1	Contract signed			Complete	
2	Liaise with partner organization 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	29th Oct – 2nd Nov 2007	Complete	29th Oct – 2nd Nov 2007, Faonelua Convention Centre, Nuku'alofa Tonga
9	PCE CD-Rom and relevant resources materials distributed to participants	October 2007	29th Oct – 2nd Nov 2007	Complete	
10	Workshop evaluation conducted	November 2007	29th Oct – 2nd 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	Completed	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	Completed	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	December 2009	complete	All PICTs have been given PCE tool systems CD. PCE software is not compatible with 'BifDefender' antivirus software therefore in can't be installed on SPC network and computers and others that use Bifdefender as their antivirus program
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 will assist 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		Complete	Visits taken as part of related activities
19	Compile outcomes of evaluation exercise and conduct national consultation or meeting discuss the outcomes	Sept-Oct 2008	December 2009	Complete	SPC compilations of PCE results done.
20	IPPC Technical Supervisory Services	November 2008	December 2009	Complete	Technical visit for regional workshop in November 2009
21	Project report written up including suggested mitigation measures to address the gaps	November 2008	December 2009	Complete	Refer to this report
22	External Project evaluation undertaken	November 2008		complete	
23	Outcomes of this phase of the project	January 2009		To be completed	

	published in the LRD newsletters				
24	Disseminate skills learnt to other PICTs.	Jan-June 2009	ongoing	ongoing	Part of activities implemented by SPC
25	Project Conclusion	July 2009	December 2009	complete	
26	Project external evaluation				
27	Facilitate continue use of skill learnt (SPC)	Feb-July 2009	On-going	Ongoing	Part of activities implemented by SPC

Appendix 7: Biosecurity and Plant Protection Capacity building assistance to Pacific Island countries

Project Title	***Donor***	***Specific area of assistance***	***Stage of Implementation***
Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations (PACER)	Australia and New Zealand	• Risk analysis • Export facilitation • Information exchange • Support Pacific Plant Protection Organisation Secretariat • Pest surveillance • Incursion response and containment • Maintain regional plant pest list database	Ending in June 2010
Pacific Economic Integration Project (PACREIP)	European Union	• Update biosecurity legislation • Establish biosecurity information facility	Ending in June 2010
Pacific Horticulture and Agriculture Market Access (PHAMA)	Australia (AusAID)	• Market access • Support Pacific Plant Protection Organisation Secretariat • Maintain national and regional plant and animal pest and disease list database • Conduct crop specific pest surveys • Information retrieval and exchange between countries and trading partners • Maintain trade statistics database • Provide training on produce inspection, certification	Commencing in August 2010. Duration 4 years
PC 2008/118 –Export disinfestations treatments	Australian Centre for International Agriculture Research (ACIAR)	• Research into suitable treatments to disinfest pests in fresh produce for exports especially taro and cutflowers • Develop commodity specific systems approach top dis-	Commencing in June 2010. Duration 4 years

		infestation/ infection of pests • Maintain quality of produce	
Pacific Agriculture Research and Development Initiative - PARDI	AusAID through ACIAR	• Promote collaborative research and development jointly with private sector and government agencies in selected countries • Targeted commercial, food security and biodiversity issues	Commence July 2010. Duration 5 years
FACT – Facilitating Agricultural Commodities Trade	9th European Development Fund	• Develop and assist private sector enterprises to export selected commodities. Assistance includes production, processing and packaging and ensure appropriate internationally accepted SPS measures (food safety, plant health and animal health) are understood and implemented by entreprenuers	Commenced July 2006. Duration 5 years
Extension of FACT – Facilitating Agricultural Commodities Trade	10th European Development Fund	• Develop and assist private sector enterprises to export selected commodities. Assistance includes production, processing and packaging and ensure appropriate internationally accepted SPS measures (food safety, plant health and animal health) are understood and implemented by entrepreneurs	Commenced July 2011. Duration 5 years
Micronesia Biosecurity plan	US Department of Defence and US Wildlife and Forest services, USDA APHIS	• Pest risk assessment for plants and animals including aquatic organisms • Develop biosecurity policies • Capacity building in biosecurity	Commence September 2009 for Palau, Federated States of Micronesia and Marshall Islands

Enhancing Pacific Biosecurity/ Quarantine Services	New Zealand Aid	• Pest diagnostics • Biosecurity information exchange • Pest surveillance	Proposal under discussion