

## **Ex-Post Evaluation of the Project STDF 173:**

### ***“Strengthening capability to assess the capacity building needs of food control systems and develop capacity building action plans in developing APEC Member Economies”***

**June 2009**

#### **Executive Summary**

This document provides an evaluation of the project “*Strengthening capability to assess the capacity building needs of food control systems and develop capacity building action plans in developing APEC Member Economies*,” funded by the STDF and implemented between August 2007 and September 2008 with contracting obligations extended until April 2009. The project proposition was to provide food safety authorities with the tools for carrying out structured capacity-building needs assessments of national food control systems, and to train them in the use of those assessment tools. Following this training, participants were expected to apply the tools in their home countries, however, the project did not include specific support activities to guide/support these country teams in this process. A five-day workshop with the purpose of introducing a methodology to identify and assess capacity building needs of national food control systems was expected to improve the knowledge and skills of selected participants from the food safety authorities to undertake capacity-building needs assessments and was also to serve in assisting them in learning how to develop national action plans based on identified needs.

Thus, while a coherent approach for the workshop was developed, the project set quite ambitious outcomes for the five-day training activity. The participants were expected to carry out capacity building needs assessments following this training and, on the basis of this assessment, to prepare a national action plan. These national action plans, highlighting priority capacity needs, were expected to be presented to the APEC Food Safety Cooperation Forum (FSCF), contributing to the prioritization of potential capacity building activities at the regional level. A survey/questionnaire to be undertaken at the end of the project, would provide the basis for assessing the achievement of the project outcomes, and consequently used as indicators of project success.

In practice, the approach to monitor project outcomes fell short of expectations. The final surveys and communications with participants point, however, toward positive outcomes in some countries. In the Philippines, support was requested from FAO to assist in the process of undertaking a needs assessment and an action plan was elaborated by pulling together the action plans prepared by individual institutions. Thailand and Viet Nam mentioned that needs assessment workshops were carried out and action plans were elaborated. Peru reported that the guide was used to support the process of developing the Country Food Safety Law and PNG reported that a need assessment was undertaken last November. Workshop follow-up activities would have been very useful in improving the understanding of the specific contribution of the project to these processes.

While the workshop fulfilled its purpose of introducing a structured methodology to assess capacity-building needs—a methodology that was found to be very useful by the participants and that can be applied in different contexts—the project was less successful in ensuring the application of this structured methodology at the country level and in demonstrating that *priority* capacity-building needs of each country food control system were compiled in a national action plan to feed into the *prioritization* process of potential regional capacity-building activities.

In spite of the above shortcoming, overall, the training activity has been very positive and, as per the responses of the participants, the assessment tools would continue to serve as reference for facilitating assessment of capacity-building needs in a variety of contexts or serve as tools to improve the understanding of the functioning and structuring of national food control systems (NFCS), roles of institutions, types of capacities needed and other issues.

From the perspective of the STDF, the project was evidently instrumental in the dissemination of useful evaluation tools/training materials and in supporting the exchange of experiences among participants regarding common challenges, the functioning and structure of national food control systems, etc., which is a critical part of the coordinating and information-sharing role of the Facility.

## 1. Introduction

Food control encompasses a number of activities to provide consumer protection and ensure that all foods provided for human consumption are safe, wholesome, conform to safety and quality requirements, and are honestly and accurately labelled as prescribed by law (FAO, 2003). Therefore, an effective food control system is critical to maintaining consumer confidence in the food supply and in providing sound foundations for domestic and international trade. Inarguably, for a national food control system (NFCS) to perform effectively, efficiently and in a sustainable manner, it is required that a broad set of capacities be put in place at the individual, institutional and system levels, including capacities to: undertake required legislative adjustments (laws/regulations); define/implement food control management policies; undertake inspection/analysis functions; gather, analyze, and provide information, etc. Food control systems in developing countries often face weaknesses at different levels, and consequently, require the establishment of process-based capacity development strategies to enhance their performance. An initial step in the process of capacity-development is the identification of the ‘gap’ to be filled through capacity-building activities. Some donors/technical agencies, including FAO, have been active in the elaboration of tools providing guidance on how to undertake a structured process for assessing capacity-building needs—from the perspective of various stakeholders—and in the dissemination of these tools through workshops and training activities with the specific objective of training participants as users to apply these tools in their country contexts. The Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) complements these efforts in two main ways: (i) through sharing information on capacity needs assessments, evaluations, training materials, etc. in line with its coordination role; and (ii) through assistance to countries to assess their capacity needs in the SPS area – including through the use of available capacity evaluation/assessment tools – as a means to identify priorities, develop bankable projects and help secure financing to address the identified needs.

In the specific case of the project being evaluated here, a five-day workshop on *Assessing the Capacity-building needs of National Food Control Systems*, organized and financed by FAO in Rome in December 2006, provided the reference methodology for the project. The workshop had as specific objectives the training of participants as users to apply the recently developed FAO tools to assess capacity-building needs<sup>1</sup> and as facilitators/resource persons for future regional or sub-regional training. As a follow-up to this workshop, proposals to undertake regional/subregional workshops were to be developed.

Following the interest expressed by the Food Standards Australia-New Zealand (FSANZ) in these FAO tools, FSANZ and FAO agreed to work together, on behalf of the APEC Food Safety

---

<sup>1</sup> i) Strengthening National Food Control Systems: Guidelines to Assess Capacity Building Needs, published in 2006 and ii) Strengthening National Food Control Systems: A Quick Guide to Assess Capacity Building Needs (in Draft stage in 2006)

Cooperation Initiative (FSCI), to develop a proposal for consideration by the STDF. The proposal was to be implemented as part of the APEC Food Safety Cooperation Initiative (FSCI), which is co-chaired by the General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine (AQSIQ), People's Republic of China and Australia, represented by FSANZ.<sup>2</sup> The APEC FSCI had been operating since 2005 and had identified a need for the prioritization of potential capacity-building activities in the region. The FAO tool was considered as an appropriate instrument to help countries undertake structured capacity-building need assessments. The priority capacity-building needs identified by the countries would then be presented to future APEC food safety Forum meetings and, thereby contribute to the prioritization of potential capacity-building activities in the region.

The proposal to undertake a five-day workshop aimed at strengthening the knowledge and skills of developing APEC countries in identifying and addressing capacity-building needs in national food control systems was developed in this context. The request was submitted to the STDF by the General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine (AQSIQ), PR China; FSANZ assumed a direct responsibility for implementation of the project, together with FAO. The workshop was complemented by pre- and post-workshop activities. Prior to the workshop, a survey allowed for the identification of participants/country experiences in the assessment of capacity-building needs, which would then be reflected in the workshop's content, while a survey to be undertaken six months after the culmination of the train-the-trainers workshop would serve to assess progress on the workshop's follow-up activities (Capacity-Building ("CB") need assessment workshops and an action plan). The complete description of project objectives, activities and outputs is presented in Table 1.

The project was targeted at public officials, yet the training addressed and promoted the involvement of concerned stakeholders from farm to table in the assessment of capacity-building needs. Representatives of private sector industry associations in economies where the government had previous experience involving the private sector in capacity-building activities related to food control were expected to be invited to attend the workshop.

After incorporating the recommendations of the STDF, a final proposal was submitted, and a contract between the STDF and FSANZ was signed in August 2007. The total budget of the project reached US\$192,000. Contributions from STDF reached US\$113,000 to support costs associated with the five-day workshop. The contributions of FAO/FSANZ, estimated at US\$79,000, related to activities associated with pre- and post-survey questionnaires, reporting, and coordination of the workshop. Contributions from China, the requesting country, were not estimated in the budget—the funds to contract a local person in Beijing to provide workshop logistical support was to be covered with STDF grant funds. The time-frame for the implementation of the project was estimated at 14 months, but the period for the contractual agreement was longer, from 1 August 2007 until 30 April 2009.

An *ex-post* evaluation of the project was initiated in May 2009, with the following objectives:

- i) verify whether the project achieved the objectives set out in the project document;
- ii) identify if the project has achieved any of the higher level objectives of the STDF, for example, measurable impacts on market access, improved domestic and, where applicable, regional SPS situations, and poverty reduction;
- iii) identify key lessons learned for the benefit of both recipients and donors and for future STDF programme development.

<sup>2</sup> See Workshop Report [ftp://ftp.fao.org/ag/agn/food/meetings/2006/fao\\_tot\\_workshop.pdf](ftp://ftp.fao.org/ag/agn/food/meetings/2006/fao_tot_workshop.pdf).

**Table 1. Description of the Project (objectives/activities/outputs)**

<b>Overall goal</b>		
Improved capacity of developing APEC Member Economies, to develop and implement activities that <u>enhance the safety and quality of food</u> as a means to improve public health and facilitate trade.		
<b>The specific objectives</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to improve the knowledge and skills of food safety regulators from developing APEC Member Economies to plan and conduct capacity building needs assessments regarding their national food control systems;</li> <li>• to assist food safety authorities in APEC Member Economies on how to develop national capacity building actions plans based on the outcome of the assessments.</li> </ul>		
<b>Activities</b>		
<b>Activity 1: Survey of experiences in capacity building needs assessment of participating economies (Month 1-3)</b>	<b>Activity 2: Provision of training on capacity building needs assessment and the development of related capacity building action plans (Month 4-8)</b>	<b>Activity 3: Development of national action plans (month 14)</b>
The purpose is to obtain information from the participants on their experiences in capacity building needs assessment and related programmes, and seek nominations of experts to attend the training. This information will be used to improve the design and delivery of the training activities and ensure they are tailored to the situation and requirements of the participating economies.	A five-day training workshop is delivered on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) how to carry out a capacity building needs assessment of the national food control system</li> <li>ii) how to develop capacity building strategies and action plans using two new FAO tools</li> </ul>	An evaluation survey will be designed and carried out six months after the training workshop to monitor and assess progress in the assessment of capacity building needs and development and implementation of national action plans in follow-up to the training workshop.
<b>Outcomes/Indicators of Success</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of a network of trainers who could facilitate and lead future training on capacity building needs assessment and follow-up activities in developing APEC Member Economies and other developing economies;</li> <li>• Organisation of national workshops by participating economies on assessing the need for capacity building in the national food control systems in participating APEC Economies;</li> <li>• Development of action plans by participating economies for strengthening the capacity in the national food control systems in participating APEC countries within six months of completion of the training workshop;</li> <li>• Summaries of national experiences by participating economies in applying the FAO tools to assess food safety capacity have been prepared; and</li> <li>• Development and testing of an approach and methodology for training in the assessment of capacity building needs, which could be further replicated in other regions in the future.</li> </ul>		

The Evaluator is an international consultant with wide experience in international development and with specific focus on SPS capacity-building related activities. The evaluator has worked previously as a technical officer and consultant for FAO and has been a consultant for the World Bank in Washington, DC, for the past three years. No potential conflicts of interest have been identified.

## 2. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation was conducted as a desk study, including the following phases:

i) *Detailed review of the documentation*: this included a review of project reports, survey questionnaires, workshop materials, etc., and correspondence related to the project sent to the evaluator by the STDF Secretariat. FAO, APEC, STDF and other web sites were also consulted for related information.

ii) *Gaining insights/views from the participants*: this was done through phone/email communication established with all participants. Annex 1 presents the list of participants contacted, indicating those that were contacted by phone, and those that responded to the email sent. Phone communications were established with participants from Peru, Chile, and Philippines. The remaining participants were contacted via email, with replies received from Indonesia, Thailand, China (a participant), and Papua New Guinea.

The contacts were oriented toward: i) gaining clarification on the responses to the post-workshop survey questionnaire; ii) collecting participant views/insights on the different ways the project design and/or implementation could have been enhanced or improved; iii) collecting participant insights into the perceived impacts of the project; and iv) assessing perceptions on the need to conduct further follow-up activities.

iii) *Gaining views/insights from relevant stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project*: phone and email communications were established with Sonia Bradley from FSANZ, Marlynne Hopper (then with FAO), and Peter Hoejskov from the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.

A draft of the evaluation was provided to STDF Secretariat, which provided feedback and request for revisions.

The methodology applied has limitations, including the following:

- a) Ability to accurately determine the impacts of the activity at the country-level is problematic due to the possible bias that can be introduced by the different project stakeholders during the interviews, and specifically by the workshop participants, as they may feel that their performance is being assessed against the commitments to undertake follow-up activities. This subjectivity can be reduced by supported documentation such as workshop agendas, reports of activities, and national action plans. Thus, the almost absence of this type of documentation introduces a high level of uncertainty in the assessment of the follow-up activities, and consequently of the achievement of project outcomes.
- b) It is quite challenging to quantify the impact of SPS-related capacity-building activities in terms of higher level objectives of the STDF, for example, countries' trade performance, improved overall SPS situation, poverty reduction, etc; but it is particularly challenging, in the context of very short-term training activities, which is the case of the project being evaluated here. Thus, to establish a link between the project activities and the achievement of higher order objectives of the STDF becomes problematic/difficult.

### **3. Main Findings**

#### **3.1 Relevance**

The importance given to food safety and the establishment of effective food control systems in the APEC region is demonstrated by the support of the establishment of the APEC FSCI in 2005, under which an *ad hoc* Steering Committee (SC) was put in place, with activities including an inventory of current food safety activities and need assessments. The SC suggested to the APEC Sub-Committee on Standards and Conformance (SCSC) the formation of the APEC Food Safety Cooperation Forum with the purpose of improving and strengthening information sharing and capacity-building activities in food safety and to identify, *prioritise* and coordinate capacity-building activities in the APEC region. In April

2007, the APEC Food Safety Cooperation Forum met for the first time in Hunter Valley, Australia. During the meeting, the Forum agreed on a set of operating principles, the following being particularly relevant to the context of the project evaluated here:

-Under **5-Scope of activities**, 5.1. *The Forum will develop a work program that identifies, prioritises and coordinates potential capacity building activities in food safety in the APEC region. It will also assist Member Economies in their delivery and participation in these activities by providing advice, information and networking support from Forum members.*

- The Forum also recognized the importance of guides/tools to support the assessment of the progress made in improving food safety control systems; for example, it explicitly highlights the use of the FAO/WHO *Guidelines for strengthening national food control systems*, published in 2003, as the reference document to be used to assess the progress made in the improvement of food safety systems.<sup>3</sup>

Thus, the rationale for the project was that the project activities (a workshop) would assist developing APEC member economies in the identification of *priority* capacity-building (“CB”) needs. Those priority needs would then be presented to future APEC food safety Forum meetings, thereby contributing to the prioritization of potential capacity building activities in the region. The documents attached to the project proposal indicate that Food Safety Capacity Evaluation was included among the Capacity Building Priority Areas of the APEC Food Safety Cooperation Initiative (Final Report of *Ad Hoc* Steering Group, September 2006). Yet, it was only considered as a high priority area for a few countries including China, Mexico, Australia, Chinese Taipei, and Thailand (as of April 2007).

The project proposition was to provide food safety authorities with the tools for carrying out structured capacity-building need assessments of national food control systems or their components, and to train them in the use of those tools. The project would not include budgeted activities to guide/support the country teams in the process of applying the tools at the country level. The five-day workshop was expected to improve the knowledge and skills of selected food safety regulators to undertake capacity-building need assessments and was also to serve in assisting them in learning how to develop national action plans based on identified needs.

In Annex 2, an effort is made by the evaluator to recreate the project’s logical framework, including the evaluator’s understanding of the project’s underlying assumptions. Some of those assumptions include:

- i) By engaging high-level government officials within decision-making authorities, the project ensures the technical/financial/time commitment required to undertake follow-up activities, including need assessment workshops and the establishment of a national action plan, yet, when this was not possible, the commitment of the participant supervisor would ensure the implementation of follow-up activities associated with the *training of trainers workshop*.
- ii) The participants—having a role in identifying food safety capacity building priorities for their economy— would be able to play a leading role in integrating the workshop follow-

---

<sup>3</sup> FSCF Operating Principles, numeral 6-Tasks: Review progress to improve food safety systems in APEC, drawing on a self-assessment by each Member Economy of their progress over the previous two years using the FAO/WHO Guidelines for strengthening national food control systems. The Guidelines delineates the overarching principles of food control systems, and provides examples of possible infrastructures and approaches for national systems (singly, multiple agency, etc.).

- up activities within the framework of on-going national country dynamics related to strengthening food-safety control systems; and
- iii) A six-month time frame would be enough time for significant progress to occur in the assessment of capacity-building needs and allow for the elaboration and at least partial implementation of a national action plan.

Thus, some of the underlying assumptions proved to be difficult to apply in practice. Engaging high-level officials was not always easy. The participants from Chile, and to some extent, also from PR China (China accounted for a quarter of the total workshop participants) were mostly professionals occupying middle-level government positions with little authority to lead a process targeting the strengthening of the national food safety system or one of its components on the basis of the assessment of CB needs. Mexico withdrew from participating in the workshop due to other activities. Although efforts were made to frame the project as a process-based approach and not an isolated workshop/training activity, upon review of the documentation, particularly the template for the country letters of support to the project, it seems that, in practice, participating countries, and perhaps also the implementers, proceeded along the lines of the later. The country commitments, as described in the letters of support, were quite general, stating that *“the training provided will be applied to improve the capacity of the country to develop and implement activities that enhance the safety and quality of food as a means to improve public health and facilitate trade.”* There was no specific reference to the expectation that the country representatives would subsequently proceed in undertaking national CB need assessment workshops and elaborating a national action plan of the FCS. Not surprisingly, in the final evaluation of the workshop, a key priority for most participants was the need to gain high level support from relevant authorities.

The evidence seems to suggest that those country teams where initiatives were already in place, for example, those initiatives calling together representatives of different agencies and ministries involved in food control activities to foster collaboration, were in a better position to use/apply the knowledge gained in the workshop through the on-going processes. For example, in the case of Peru, a National Multisectoral Commission, in charge of formulating the legal framework for food safety in the country, was established through ministerial directive in 1 October 2007, with participation of SENASA, the Ministry of Production, and the Directorate of Environmental Health, DIGESA. The participants reported that as a result of their participation in the workshop held in Beijing, they were able to extend the duration of a workshop that had already been planned funded by the OPS and IICA to facilitate the use of the FAO guide. The Peruvian workshop took place on 28 November 2007. Thus, Peru’s team considered that the FAO guide was very instrumental in supporting the process of establishing the national food safety law, mainly in terms of clarifying institutional roles.

Similarly, in the case of Thailand there was already a National Food Committee set by the Government aimed at setting-up /revising the food control system along the food chain. Thailand reported that two workshops took place on 23-25 Aug 2008 and 4-6 Sep 2008 and that a final draft of the Plan of Action would be revised and submitted to the National Food Committee. Viet Nam reported that from the use of the FAO guide, the Ministry of Health has submitted a proposal for a new food control system. In the case of the Philippines, the commitment of the country team and availability of financial resources made it possible to undertake a structured process to assess capacity-building needs. In other countries, for example, Papua New Guinea, lack of funding delayed the process, yet, with WHO support, the participant reported that a capacity-building need assessment workshop was held in November 2008, but an action plan has not yet been prepared. In Indonesia, budgetary constraints

restricted the possibility of undertaking a national capacity-building needs assessment involving different stakeholders. The assessment carried out only involved staff from the National Agency of Drug and Food Control.

In terms of the project design and implementation, some areas reflect ambiguities and/or fell short of expectations, as presented below:

*- The training the trainers approach*

As opposed to the pilot workshop held in Rome in December 2006, which had a clear objective of training participants as users of the guides so they could apply them as facilitators/resource persons in future regional or sub-regional training, within the context of the project STDF 173, the trainer of trainers approach is less clear. While the workshop methodology specifies that *“A practical, hands-on approach will be used and material on training of trainers will be incorporated to provide a basis for the participants to pass on their new knowledge and skills to others in their economies”* no evidence was found that this component was part of the training. Yet, it is difficult to discern whether the expectation of the workshop was that the trained participants would undertake capacity-building need assessment workshops with the objective of “assessing needs” in the NFCS, or to undertake in-country activities to train/familiarize other stakeholders with the use of the guide, or perhaps both. In the documentation of the project, reference is made to: “follow-up activities associated with the training of trainers’ workshop.” Interviews with the project implementers revealed, however, that the objective was for participants to use the guide to undertake CB need assessments of the NFCS.

*-The “demonstration effect” was missing*

Although, overall, the participants noted a high level of satisfaction with the methodology followed by the workshop (e.g. group discussions, fictional case studies, etc.), two participants mentioned during the phone conversations that the presentation and discussions of real country situations would have been very useful. The FAO guides had already been tested in the field (e.g. in a few African countries), thus, in the evaluator’s view, bringing those real experiences together to illustrate challenges and limitations of applying the guides could have been very useful. Also, involving presenters with practical experience in the application of the guide would have helped to provide context and evidence of the challenges/constraints/limitations associated with the practical application of a structured CB need assessment process and elaboration of action plans. Similarly, it is clear that the methodology presented by the FAO guides is strong in terms of highlighting the steps to be undertaken when carrying out a CB need assessment of a NFCS, yet, they are less explicit on the application of various techniques for prioritizing capacity needs and analyzing possible solutions (e.g. SWOT analysis, cost-benefit analysis, regulatory impact assessment), which was one of the focus areas of the workshop (see Box below). In this regard, the workshop focused heavily on SWOT analysis, yet, as highlighted by one of the participants, *“the SWOT analysis is very useful and helped to identify strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and threats, yet it is highly qualitative and therefore it is hard to make conclusions/decisions based only on this.”* This participant was applying the guide in assessing the CB needs to establish a reference lab in the region.

Presenting examples of countries that have applied different ranking criteria and other qualitative and quantitative techniques to prioritize the needs and to draw up action plans could have contributed to enhancing the knowledge of the participants in this area. However, it is challenging to find examples of practical application/use of these techniques in real situations.



Main foci of the workshop:

- Identifying capacity-building needs based on the gaps between the current situation of the national food control system and the desired future situation (vision).
- Practical aspects of conducting a capacity-building needs assessment (e.g. involving stakeholders, obtaining high-level commitment, using indicators to monitor progress, etc.).
- Use of tools and techniques to support the identification and prioritization of capacity needs (e.g. SWOT analysis, cost-benefit analysis, regulatory impact assessment).
- Development of capacity building strategies and action plans.
- Benchmarks for monitoring and evaluating the impact of capacity building activities.

*-The involvement of the private sector*

Regarding targeting, this seems to be sometimes ambiguous. The project document highlights that the project was aimed at improving the ability of food safety regulators and *private sector representatives* from developing economies in APEC to assess the capacity-building needs of their national food control system and develop capacity-building action plans. In the objectives, reference is made exclusively to improving capacities of food safety regulators. Although two representatives of private sector industry associations (from China and Thailand) participated in the workshop held in Beijing, it is not clear the role that these actors were expected to play in follow-up activities. Similarly there is no clear evidence of the explicit ways the project leveraged private sector participation in the workshop held in Beijing to enhance the process of capacity-building need assessments on the basis of broader stakeholder participation. One would expect that their engagement in the workshop discussions would have opened opportunities for this. However, one also gets the impression that the rationale/role for private sector participation in the workshop held in Beijing was rather vague or not very well understood, and therefore needed better elaboration.

*-On the methodology and indicators chosen to assess outcomes*

As mentioned before, efforts were made to present the workshop as part of a broader process and not only as an isolated training activity. The process involved three clear phases: (i) an initial phase aimed at gaining some insights into country experiences in undertaking a structured process of CB need assessment through a survey and country presentations at the workshop; (ii) followed by a workshop to introduce a methodology to undertake structured need assessments; and (iii) ended with a process of application of the methodology at the country level. The project coordinators would assume responsibility for introducing the methodology and gathering insights of pre and post workshop country dynamics through surveys/questionnaires while the country teams would assume full responsibility in the application of the methodology in-country.

The pre-workshop surveys were expected to identify the participant/country experiences in carrying out structured assessments of capacity-building needs and, from those experiences, enhance the workshop's contents. However, most of the materials and case studies used to conduct the training were those tested in the pilot workshop held in Rome in 2006. The presentations made by the country teams during the workshop were restricted to describing the country food control systems with little focus on presenting the country experiences with need assessments. It is apparent, however, that the discussions that took place during the workshop contributed to the exchange of experiences among participants in

this regard. Moreover, if a quick review of the major initiatives carried out in the region on this topic (e.g. the National Food Safety and Agricultural Health Action Plan prepared for Viet Nam, under the Integrated Framework in 2006) had been undertaken it would have also served to provide context, highlight limitations and complexities of the need assessment process.

In terms of post-workshop activities, clearly the expectations were very high, given the fact that no budgeted activities were included for providing assistance and monitoring the process of application of the methodology at the country level. The mechanism chosen (a final survey) to assess the application at the country level of the knowledge gained during the workshop was found to be lacking in its ability to clearly discern the extent to which countries applied the knowledge gained.

During the last day of the workshop held in Beijing, the country teams (1 or 2 participants per country, five in the case of China and three from Thailand) prepared an action plan highlighting the follow-up activities that each team was expected to undertake at the country level. Yet, the assessment of the progress made through the final survey did not reference these activities; rather the questionnaire was very straightforward in assessing project outcomes. The survey asked simply whether a workshop to assess capacity-building needs was implemented or not, if an action plan was elaborated or not and the degree of implementation, etc. Clearly, not all countries committed themselves to undertaking national capacity-building need assessments, nor did they commit to undertaking national action plans (e.g. Peru, Chile). Some country teams, recognizing their limitations to commit their country to undertaking such ambitious processes at the national level, elaborated very modest action plans offering to undertake one or two activities to share the guide with other colleagues and communicate the message of the importance of undertaking structure capacity-building need assessments (e.g. Chile). Other countries elaborated very robust action plans (e.g. Viet Nam and Malaysia). Yet, as per the responses to the workshop questionnaires, it is difficult to assess if these robust set of activities were implemented as planned.

It is difficult to discern from the responses to the survey/questionnaires several key factors: the different ways in which the guide was applied; the processes that were already underway and the contributions the guide/methodology made to those processes;<sup>4</sup> whether national workshops undertaken were really targeting a structured assessment of capacity-building needs; the challenges/constraints/limitations associated with the application of the guide/methodology in the efforts to undertake this structured process at the national level; the different criteria/tools applied to prioritizing needs; the lessons learned that can enhance the application of the methodology in other regions, etc.

### **3.2 Effectiveness**

As outlined above, the purpose of the workshop/training was to introduce a methodology to assess capacity-building needs in a structured manner and how to develop national action plans based on the needs identified. Thus, the training delivered was expected to provide knowledge and skills on how to undertake those processes. The project defined a set of outcomes/indicators of success. Indicators of

---

<sup>4</sup> Also including coordination with projects/initiatives that were already under implementation or planned, for example, in Viet Nam, FAO was implementing a project on improving food safety and its management by strengthening the regulatory framework for food safety; upgrading scientific, technical and managerial capacities of food labs and inspection services; increasing awareness among consumers and SMEs; and strengthening foodborne disease surveillance. Regional activities were also planned, such the project on enhancing food safety by strengthening food inspection systems in ASEAN countries (2007-2012).

**Table 2. Assessment of project achievements**

Project objectives	Indicator	Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to improve the knowledge and skills of food safety regulators from developing APEC Member Economies to plan and conduct capacity building needs assessments regarding their national food control systems;</li> <li>to assist food safety authorities in APEC Member Economies on how to develop national capacity building actions plans based on the outcome of the assessments.</li> </ul>	i) need assessments workshops undertaken; ii) action plans prepared and under implementation	Achieved. The participants were introduced to a structured methodology to undertake capacity-building need assessments. Yet, it is difficult to assess the extent to which this methodology contributed to prioritization of capacity-building needs and selection of options to address them through NAP. The evidence suggest that tools such as SWOT analysis were very much appreciated by the participants. SWOT was used as a tool to undertake assessments, if not always at the national level, at least within specific participants' contexts. In terms of assisting countries on 'how' to develop NAP, this was achieved within the frame of the workshop. Yet, assistance was not provided to support the application of the guide in real situations.
<b>Activities &amp; Outcomes</b>		
<b>Activity 1: Survey of experiences in capacity building needs assessment of participating economies (Month 1-3)</b>		
Information on country experiences in capacity building needs assessment and related programmes is obtained and used to enhance improve the design and delivery of the training activities (activity 2) and ensure they are tailored to the situation and requirements of the participating economies.	i) survey undertaken; ii) training program elaborated on the basis of the survey findings	Partially achieved. Little evidence that the information gathered substantially contributed to adjusting/defining the workshop contents "to customize the training" based on prior country experiences on need assessments. Yet, the presentations made by the participants and the compilation of the survey results supported the exchange of experiences among participants on the dynamics going-on in the countries (projects funded), the organization of FCS and to identify common challenges.
<b>Activity 2: Provision of training on capacity building needs assessment and the development of related capacity building action plans (Month 4-8)</b>		
A-week training workshop is delivered on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>how to carry out a capacity building needs assessment of the national food control system; and</li> <li>how to develop capacity building strategies and action plans using two new FAO tools.</li> </ul>	i) 20 food safety regulators and private sector representatives were trained during a week. ii) Actions plans on workshop follow-up activities were prepared by the country teams.	Achieved. Participants were introduced to the use of a methodology to assess capacity-building needs of FCS and on how to elaborate national action plans.
<b>Activity 3: Development of national action plans (month 14)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creation of a network of trainers who could facilitate and lead future training on capacity building needs assessment and follow-up activities in developing APEC Member Economies and other developing economies</li> </ul>	i) Evaluation survey designed and implemented within six months after the training workshop to monitor and assess progress. ii) Summary of experiences	Achieved. However, the lack of follow-up makes it difficult to understand the learning that took place in the field in order to support the exchange of experiences and provide better tools for the participants to be able to lead future training on this topic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organisation of national workshops by participating economies on assessing the need for capacity building in the national food control systems in participating APEC Economies</li> </ul>	i) Evaluation survey designed and implemented within six months after the training workshop to monitor and assess progress.	Although the majority of the participating countries indicated that capacity-building need assessment workshops were undertaken and an action plan elaborated, the information provided by the countries fell short in providing substantial evidence of the specific contribution of the methodology proposed to the preparation of these plans/workshops, and whether the capacity-building plans are really filling the gap in terms of helping to identify and prioritize capacity-building activities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of action plans by participating economies for strengthening the capacity in the national food control systems in participating APEC countries within six months of completion of the training workshop;</li> </ul>	i) Evaluation survey designed and implemented within six months after the training workshop to monitor and assess progress.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summaries of national experiences by participating economies in applying the FAO tools to assess food safety capacity have been prepared; and</li> </ul>	i) Final project report	Partially achieved. The absence of monitoring of the process of implementation of the guides at the national level made it difficult to gather substantial and accurate information on the dynamics/experiences of the participating countries in the use of the guide.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development and testing of an approach and methodology for training in the assessment of capacity building needs, which could be further replicated in other regions in the future.</li> </ul>	i) Final project report/Survey results	Partially achieved. The project methodology was appropriate to support the introduction of a methodology to assess capacity-building needs and to illustrate how to prepare NAP, based on those needs. Yet, the methodology turned out weak in supporting the achievement of the very ambitious project outcomes.

performance for each activity were not explicitly defined, but can be easily identified through the project proposal (Table 2 above).

The workshop fulfilled its purpose of introducing a structured methodology to assess capacity-building needs—a methodology that was found to be very useful by the participants and can be applied in different contexts, particularly the SWOT analysis—as per the results of the evaluation of the workshop, the responses to the final survey, and the interviews undertaken by the evaluator. Yet, the project was less successful in providing sound evidence of the application of this structured methodology at the country level, and in demonstrating that *prioritized* capacity-building needs of each country food control system were compiled in a national action plan to feed into the process of *prioritization* of potential regional capacity-building activities, as expected by APEC. From the perspective of the STDF, the project was evidently instrumental in the dissemination of useful evaluation tools/training materials and in supporting the exchange of experiences among participants regarding challenges and organization of food control systems, which is a critical part of the coordinating and information sharing role of the facility.

Yet, if the objective was to assist countries in how to undertake national CB need assessments and national action plans based on the assessment of their own needs, it appears this goal was only partially achieved, as the support provided by the project was limited to training based on practical exercises. The lack of comprehensive and budgeted activities to monitor progress and to support country teams in the application of the knowledge gained was a clear shortcoming of the project, which limited the understanding of the achievement of the project outcomes.

In reviewing Table 3 below, which compiles the results of the end-survey questionnaires and information provided by the participants to the evaluator, it can be concluded that the assessment of the achievements of the actions plans become problematic, both from the perspective of the application of the guide and the prioritization of needs, since the documentation available providing evidence on these activities is rather weak. Reports of the activities would have been useful in helping to understand the dynamics of the activities implemented at the country level. Similarly a follow-up activity in which the participants shared their experiences would have been very useful in providing a better understanding of the processes followed by the country teams and of the overall outcomes of the project.

### 3.3. Efficiency

In terms of efficiency, the project certainly delivered what could have been expected if the activity would have been planned as a “training” activity to familiarize/train the participants in the use of these FAO guides. In that sense, the use of the grant/support from STDF would have been sufficient to support a process of this nature. Yet, in the rush to demonstrate impacts, the project established a set of ambitious outcomes, but did not include appropriate tools/activities and budget to support or monitor their achievement.

The final surveys and communications with participants point toward positive outcomes in some countries:

- In the Philippines, support was requested from FAO to assist in the process of undertaking a needs assessment and an action plan was elaborated by pulling together the action plans prepared by individual institutions, yet the participants indicated there was no time to train the staff of the institutions that were undertaking the individual assessments in the use of the guide and this was a shortcoming of the process.

**Table 3. Summary of follow-up activities undertaken by the country teams**

Economy	Needs Assessment Workshops	Stakeholders	National Plan	At the time of the evaluation
China	No		No	No (only one participant replied)
Chile				No workshops or action plans were implemented
Indonesia	November, 2007 February 2008	Only within National Agency of Drug and Food Control.	Yes	Workshop for assessing the capacity building needs to establish the reference laboratory in regional office on the basis of the quick guide, the outcome of this activity being the decision of supporting 10 regional laboratory for testing of DNA/GMO and 8 regional laboratory for the testing of Sterility. For additional we use the Quick guide for establishing a Grand Strategy Program of NADFC.
Malaysia	2-3 July 2008 (no reference to this was found in the documentation provided)	Food Safety and Quality Division involving all the sections in the Division, ie, the different categories of officers: doctors, food technologists, health inspectors, health education officers - from farm to table; government agencies, private sectors, professional organisations, NGOs.	Yes	The action plan attached/submitted as evidence was prepared in 2002. No additional information was provided at the time of the evaluation.
Papua New Guinea	Planned for September 2008	Standards Council, Agriculture Dept., Consumers Council, Private Sector, Training Institutions, Food laboratories, Food Handlers & Food regulators.	To be completed.	The stakeholder training was conducted in November 2008. POA has not been finalized due to busy schedules.
Peru	November 28, 2007	National Service of Agrarian Sanity - SENASA, Technological Fishing Institute - ITP, General Direction of Environmental Health - DIGESA, with the support of the Pan-American Organization of the Health - OPS and the Interamerican Institute of Cooperation for the Agriculture - IICA. Farmers, cattlemen, laboratories, industry, markets, inspectors, investigation organisations, universities, consumers, government's entities.	Yes.	Peru, with support of the OPS/IICA previously to the workshop had initiated a process to establish the 'food safety law'. The participants mentioned that the quick guide was instrumental in clarifying roles and supporting the development of the law. No action plan was submitted, the approved law was attached as evidence.
Philippines	January-February 2008	Bureau of Animal Industry (BAI), National Meat Inspection Services (NMIS), Bureau of Plant Industry (BPI), Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), Agribusiness Marketing and Assistance Service (AMAS), Sugar Regulatory Authority (SRA), Philippine Coconut Authority (PCA), Bureau of Agriculture and Fisheries Product Standards (BAFPS) of the Department of Agriculture (DA); and the Bureau of Food and Drug (BFAD) of the Department of Health.	Plan to be drafted at workshops August and October 2008.	The plan was drafted with contributions of the individual agencies, which were designated to prepare their own action plan.
Thailand	23-25 July 2008	1. Government sector (directors and experts in different areas) that involves in food supply chain, public education, and national policy evaluation sectors i.e. Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Ministry of Public Health from central office and provincial public health offices, the cabinet office for official human resources development, 2. Private sectors i.e. industrial assembly, restaurant assembly, laboratories, and accreditation body, 3. Consumer sector.		Two workshops took place: 23-25 Aug 2008 and 4-6 Sep 2008. Final draft of the Plan of Action in Thai version, should be revised and submit to the committee before the step of action plan setting (November-December 2008)
Viet Nam	8-Jan-08	Health, Agriculture, Science and Technology, Environment and Natural Resource, Industry and Trade, Culture Sport and Tourism Ministries, Consumer Protection Association.	Yes (not yet translated into English)	No additional information was provided at the time of the evaluation

- Peru reported that the guide was used to support the process of developing the Country Food Safety Law.
- In Thailand and Viet Nam the process also seemed to be quite successful, but no specific documentation is available to assess the contributions of the Beijing workshop to the processes undertaken.
- PNG indicated that a need assessment workshop was undertaken last November.

- Some countries report less structured processes, in which the guide seemed to be used to help support need assessments within institutions/divisions (e.g. Indonesia).

Most of the countries reported that action plans were elaborated, but do not provide evidence or the evidence provided is weak (Table 3 above).

Therefore, although the evidence points toward an overall positive impact in the implementation of the knowledge gained in the workshop, the project design was weak in capturing these outcomes. As the project implementers have since realized this shortcoming, they have requested STDF support for a follow-up activity aimed at gathering insights on the experiences of the country teams. At this time of this report, this request was still under consideration by the Facility.

In terms of the time frame, organization of the workshop, implementation of surveys, reporting activities, etc., the project implementation was very smooth, with the main regret being the inability to undertake a follow-up workshop/activity and to budget the costs of workshop planning activities.<sup>5</sup> Although the project activities ended in September/October 2008 (14 months in total), the rationale behind keeping the contractual relationship until April 2009 is not clear.

### **3.4. Impacts**

By providing training the project has supported the participating countries with new knowledge and skills in the use of the FAO tools to undertake CB need assessments/elaborate action plans; yet, the ways in which this would be reflected in the improved performance of the national food control system to provide a safe supply of food for consumers, and therefore, contributing to improved public health, is difficult to assess. The number of capacity-building activities intended to enhance food safety and quality at the national level that are to be implemented as a direct result of need assessments and national action plans carried out using the knowledge and experiences from the workshop would certainly be a clear indicator of the impact of the project. For example, the Philippines mentioned that as a result of the process that was led by their team, they are planning to carry out other training activities, for which they are also requesting support from the STDF. However, the assessment of these potential impacts has not been systematic.

The project outcomes were also expected to lay the groundwork for, and enhance the operation of activities to be carried out within the framework of the APEC Food Safety Cooperation Forum. In this regard, the training was expected to enable developing APEC Member Economies to better identify priority capacity-building needs and communicate this within the context of the Forum. Yet, the project impacts at this level cannot be explicitly assessed, as there is not a clear understanding of the content and scope of the action plans elaborated by the country teams. The summary of country experiences, which was to be shared at the APEC Forum, is, in its present state, too general in substance and does not provide evidence of prioritization of capacity-building needs at the country level and therefore it cannot be used to determine potential priority CB activities for the region.

## **4 Sustainability**

Similar to the challenges described above, it is also a challenge to assess the sustainability of the benefits derived from the project activities, as this is highly dependent upon the ability of the countries to implement the prioritized activities that were included in national action plans. Certainly, it could be assumed that those countries able to undertake structured assessments and to elaborate coherent and

<sup>5</sup> A meeting for coordination of project activities held in Rome between FAO and FSANZ was not estimated in the project budget.

relevant action plans would be in better positions to contribute to sustainable project outcomes. However, without knowing in detail the specificity of the action plans elaborated and the activities undertaken, it is difficult to discern the action plans' contribution to improved coordination and decision making on priority capacity building activities. On the other hand, the evidence points toward the use of the FAO guides and their potential to continue be used/applied as reference material in carrying out improvements in food safety systems, and this is *per se* a very positive outcome of the project.

## 5 Conclusions and recommendations

An enormous challenge for donor/technical organizations supporting capacity development processes, particularly as it relates to training, is to ensure the practical application of the knowledge/skills gained by the beneficiaries. A critical assumption often made is that by enhancing knowledge/skills the beneficiaries will be in a position to apply this knowledge in real world situations. Clearly, the possibilities of leveraging improvements out of the training received would depend upon several factors, including the incentives provided, the perception of the benefits derived from applying the knowledge, and the availability of other critical resources and capacities such as time, funding, leadership, etc.

Within the framework of the project, the overall assumption was that there were enough incentives, interest, and resources at the country level to undertake a structured process of CB needs assessment, followed by the elaboration of national action plans. In spite of the efforts made by the project implementers to gain the commitment of the participant countries to support the project, the poor level of engagement of some countries in follow-up activities could reflect either: i) a poor understanding of the scope of the commitments resulting from the participation in the workshop; ii) countries may have seen the activity (CB need assessment/national action plan) as important, but not as a priority within the setting of other more relevant needs/on-going country processes; or iii) countries/participants found it challenging and ambitious to coordinate a process of this nature at the national level. Most of the participants, when asked what they consider as the key factor for these types of initiatives to succeed, clearly indicated that a strong, high-level commitment is fundamental.

Undoubtedly, the project approach was assertive in trying to link the training activity to prior and post workshop country dynamics. However, it was quite ambitious in terms of the expected outcomes of a five-day training activity. If the overarching objective was to train country participants in the use of the assessment tools, and highlight the importance of structured CB need assessments/action plans, then the project fully achieved its objectives. If the overarching objective was to contribute to prioritization of capacity-building needs and support decision-making process, then the project approach has clear shortcomings. For the latter, a process-based strategy would have been more appropriate.

Overall, the training activity has yielded positive results. As per the responses of the participants, the assessment tools will continue to be a reference document to either facilitate assessment of capacity-building needs in several contexts, serve as a tool to improve the understanding of the function and structure of a NFCS, the institutional roles, the type of capacities needed, etc.

As for the need to undertake a follow-up activity at this point in time, the question to be answered is what are the expected benefits of undertaking this activity and how does this relate to the achievement of the overarching objectives of the project. If the expected benefit of the follow-up activity is to improve the methodology to train users in the application of the FAO guides, a follow-up activity may provide insights into the challenges/limitations of applying the guide, contributing to a better picture of the areas that would require improvements. Yet, if the objective is to use the outcome of a

follow-up project to improve resource allocation and the decision-making process, then a workshop can provide valuable contributions to the understanding of the scope of the action plans and their contribution to the prioritization of potential CB activities. In both cases, however, it is strongly recommended that the objectives be broadened and that the activity is linked to the on-going dynamics in the region in order to be cost/effective. A good option could be to bring the country experiences (four or perhaps five of the country experiences seem to be most successful) within the framework of FAO's on-going projects within the region or through APEC/FSCF/PTIN.

## **6 Lessons Learned**

- Clearly, a lesson to be learned from this process is that quite often a letter of support is not enough to ensure a smooth process of project implementation. When the right incentives or the appropriate resources are not in place, it is often necessary—and almost certainly part of 'good practice' in project design—to include complementary measures aimed at creating incentives for countries to apply the knowledge gained or directly supporting the application of the knowledge. Additionally, clear communication is critical for providing a good understanding of the scope of the commitments of the participant countries and of the possible implications in terms of financial, technical, and other resources that may be required.

- When training is linked or responding to on-going country dynamics, the possibilities of achieving positive outcomes are higher. Therefore, a key challenge for FAO, STDF, and other donor/cooperating institutions is to incorporate or link the application of evaluation and assessment tools within on-going institutional dynamics (e.g. as a critical part of project design/preparation and or project implementation). This strategy will contribute to demonstrating the practical benefits that structured CB needs assessment may bring, and would encourage its application.

- Training activities need to be understood to be a component of a broader strategy for capacity development. When applied as an isolated activity it becomes more difficult to understand its impacts.

- Capacity development should also be understood to be a process, thus requiring that appropriate mechanisms are in place to facilitate the monitoring of the progress made and to support the implementation/application of knowledge gained and skills developed through training activities.



## Annexes

### Annex 1. List of persons contacted

Country	Participants Name	Organisation	Reply
Chile	Dr Claudio Badilla	Contacted by Phone	Yes
Chile	Ms Elena Orellana	Contacted by phone	Yes
China	Ms Zhang Rong, Dr Fei Yuan, Dr Jianjun Li, Dr Zhigang Song	Contacted by Email	Only one participant
Indonesia	Miss Sumaria Sudian/ Ms Setia Murni	Contacted by Email	Yes
Malaysia	Ms. Shamsinar Binti Abdul Talib	Contacted by Email	Yes
Papua New Guinea	Ms Rose Kavanamur	Contacted by Email	Yes
Peru	Mr Oscar Jose Pineda Coronel	Contacted by Phone	Yes
Peru	Mr Jorge Jave Nakayo	Contacted by Phone	Yes
Philippines	Karen Kristine Roscom	Contacted by Phone	Yes
Thailand	Ms Jongkolnee Vithayarungruangsi	Contacted by Email	Yes
Viet Nam	Dr Nguyen_hung_long@yahoo.com/ Dr Phuong Van Nhu	Contacted by Email	Yes
FSANZ	Ms Sonia Bradley	Contacted by Phone	Yes
STDF/Formely FAO	Ms Marlynn Hopper	Contacted by Phone	Yes
FAO	Mr Peter Hoejskov	Contacted by Phone	Yes

Annex 2. Logic Framework--Ex-Post Evaluation Project STDF 173—Strengthening capability to assess the capacity building needs of food control systems and develop capacity building action plans in developing APEC Member Economies		
Overall goal	Objectively verifiable indicators	Assumptions
Improved capacity of developing APEC Member Economies, to develop and implement activities that <u>enhance the safety and quality of food</u> as a means to improve public health and facilitate trade.	i) in the mid and long term, number of capacity-building activities to enhance food safety and quality at the national level, that are undertaken on the basis of the outcomes of need assessments/action plans	i) prioritization of capacity-building needs is fundamental to supporting decision making and resource allocation. ii) Lack or scarce application of comprehensive/structured methodologies to assess capacity-building needs was identified as a gap to be filled. iii) capacity-building activities that are based on comprehensive need assessment deliver better outcomes.
<b>The specific objectives</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to improve the knowledge and skills of food safety regulators from developing APEC Member Economies to plan and conduct capacity building needs assessments regarding their national food control systems;</li> <li>to assist food safety authorities in APEC Member Economies on how to develop national capacity building actions plans based on the outcome of the assessments</li> <li>to develop and test an approach and methodology for training in the assessment of capacity-building needs, that can be replicated in other regions.*</li> </ul>	i) number of need assessments workshops undertaken; ii) number of action plans prepared and under implementation	Interest and commitment of the participant countries
<b>Activities/Outputs</b>		
<b>Activity 1: Survey of experiences in capacity building needs assessment of participating economies (Month 1-3)</b>		
Information on country experiences in capacity building needs assessment and related programmes is obtained and used to enhance improve the desing and delivery of the training activities (activity 2) and ensure they are tailored to the situation and requirements of the participating economies.	i) survey undertaken; ii) training program elaborated on the basis of the survey findings	Interest and commitment of the participant countries
<b>Activity 2: Provision of training on capacity building needs assessment and the development of related capacity building action plans (Month 4-8)</b>		
Participant's skills and knowledge on how to identify and address capacity building needs in national food control systems is enhanced/developed. A-week training workshop is delivered on: . how to carry out a capacitybuildingneeds assessmentof the nationalfood control system;and . how to develop capacity building strategies and action plans using two new FAO tools.	i) 20 food safety regulators and private sector representatives were trained during a week. ii) Actions plans on workshop follow-up activities were prepared by the country teams.	Interest and commitment of the participant countries
<b>Activity 3: Development of national action plans (month 14)</b>		
It is expected that after the workshop, the participants led the implementation of the following activities: i) national workshops on assessing the need for capacity building in the national food control systems were implemented within six months after completion of the workshop; ii) Action plans for strengthening the capacity in the national food control systems in participating APEC countries were prepared, six months after completion of the workshop; iii) summaries of national experiences in applying the FAO tools to assess food safety capacity prepared and shared with the STDF, FAO, FSANZ, and the APEC Food Safety Cooperation Forum.	i) Evaluation survey designed and implemented within six months after the training workshop to monitor and assess progress. ii) analysis of survey results and prepare summary of national experiences	Interest and commitment of the participant countries. Activities proposed in the project fill a gap and are considered a priority by the institution participating in the project. Capacity/convening power of the institution and the staff taking part of the training to lead the process toward the preparation of a national action plan. There are no budgetary constraints. Time frame of six months is appropriate to undertake: need assessments, prepare a plan, and make progress in its implementation.
* This appears as an objective in the project proposal, but not in the attachement to the contract agreement.		