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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>(Trust Fund) Administration Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Analytical and advisory services (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIAR</td>
<td>Australian Center for International Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>Africa Region (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHI</td>
<td>Avian and Human Influenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC</td>
<td>Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES</td>
<td>Agriculture and Environmental Services (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td>Australian Government Overseas Aid Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Bank Budget (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTSF</td>
<td>Better Training for Safer Foods (EU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>Country Management Unit (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWG</td>
<td>Communications Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGF</td>
<td>Development Grant Facility (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>East Asia and Pacific Region (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>Europe and Central Asia (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFO</td>
<td>Externally Financed Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agricultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA</td>
<td>US Food and Drug Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSANZ</td>
<td>Food Standards Australia New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCF</td>
<td>Food Safety Cooperation Forum (APEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSTWG</td>
<td>Food Safety Technical Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAPs</td>
<td>Good Agricultural Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFSI</td>
<td>Global Food Safety Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFSP</td>
<td>Global Food Safety Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEWS</td>
<td>(FAO-OIE-WHO) Global Early Warning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GlobalG.A.P.</td>
<td>Global Good Agricultural Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA</td>
<td>Grocery Manufacturers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMPs</td>
<td>Good Manufacturing Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAI</td>
<td>Global Program for Avian Influenza Control and Human Pandemic Preparedness and Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWG</td>
<td>Governance and Fund Raising Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACCP</td>
<td>Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>International Financial Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPTI</td>
<td>International Food Protection Training Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHR</td>
<td>International Health Regulations (WHO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFOSAN</td>
<td>WHO International Food Safety Authorities Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITWG</td>
<td>Information Technology Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIFSAN</td>
<td>Joint Institute for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean Region (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDTF</td>
<td>Multidonor Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Middle East and North Africa Region (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEWG</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIE</td>
<td>World Organisation for Animal Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANSPSO</td>
<td>Participation of African Nations in Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting Organizations (PAN-SPSO),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public-Private Partnership (in the context of the agri-food sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTIN</td>
<td>APEC FSCF Partnership Training Institute Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVS</td>
<td>Performance of Veterinary Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>South Asia Region (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCM</td>
<td>Supply Chain Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small-Medium Size Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDF</td>
<td>Standards and Trade Development Facility (WTO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>United Nations Industrial Development Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>US Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>US Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPU</td>
<td>Vice Presidential Unit (of the World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAHIS</td>
<td>World Animal Health Information System (OIE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>World Bank Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION: A GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR FOOD SAFETY CAPACITY BUILDING

Safe food is of critical importance to public health, agri-food trade and market access, food security, rural livelihoods and, ultimately poverty alleviation. The public and private systems that are intended to mitigate food safety risks and assure the robustness and resilience of the food supply are sorely under-resourced. Notwithstanding a commonality of cause (safe food supplies), the concerned actors (private sector, regulatory agencies, consumer advocates, technical service providers) find it difficult to combine forces to collaborate effectively. Building on the pressing operational and client demands and the initial work undertaken by the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Food Safety Cooperation Forum (FSCF) and its Partnership Training Institute Network (PTIN) as well as other organizations, the World Bank Group sees a unique opportunity to work with international stakeholders to promote a new paradigm of capacity building for food safety as a global public good and global food markets and opportunities for developing countries. Through the establishment and initial administration of a new Public Private Partnership dedicated to food safety capacity building, the World Bank and a network of stakeholders would support improved food safety systems complying with international standards to help ensure safe food, increase food supply chain value, accelerate economic growth and alleviate rural poverty, and improve public health outcomes. This new Global Food Safety Partnership (GFSP) would be designed with a collaborative multi-stakeholder food safety engagement and resource platform and a new multi-donor trust fund (MDTF) dedicated to food safety capacity building. Within the WBG, it is expected that all regional Vice-President Units (VPU), the Sustainable Development VPU/Network, the Human Development (HD) Network and International Finance Corporation (IFC) would want to participate actively in the work of the GFSP.

OBJECTIVE

“The main GFSP program development objective is to support improved food safety systems as demonstrated by enhanced agri-food value chains and improved public health outcomes. These outcomes will be achieved through delivery of a 5-year program for training and capacity building, supported by a public-private-partnership and funded by a multi-donor trust fund (MDTF). The GFSP would contribute to food security, accelerated economic growth, facilitated trade and reduced rural poverty.”


2 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, or APEC, is a prominent forum for facilitating economic growth, cooperation, trade and investment in the Asia-Pacific region. APEC has 21 members - referred to as “Member Economies” - which account for approximately 41% of the world’s population, approximately 54% of world GDP and about 44% of world trade. APEC’s 21 Member Economies are Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, People’s Republic of China, Hong Kong SAR, China, Indonesia, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Peru, The Republic of the Philippines, The Russian Federation, Singapore, Taiwan, China, Thailand, United States of America, and Viet Nam.
These objectives will be advanced through three primary building blocks:

- **Deliver a 5-year work program** (roadmap) of demand-driven food safety capacity building and advisory services for low and middle income countries\(^3\). The 5-year work program would be preceded by an initial programming and preparatory year (2012) that would, nonetheless, include implementation of a series of training programs being developed in partnership with APEC and other partners, leading with a training program on food safety prerequisites and HACCP that was delivered in Beijing in June, 2012. Other initial training programs will focus on agreed priority areas of supply chain management, food safety incident management, laboratory competency, risk analysis and food safety regulatory systems. Four main target audiences have been identified: a) public regulators, inspectors and managers\(^4\); b) private sector agri-food processors, manufacturers and value chain players; c) farmers, producers and associated personnel responsible for on-farm food safety and quality assurance of raw materials; and d) third party food safety auditors, service providers, trainers and certification bodies. Training would encompass operational as well as management competencies.

- **Address critical gaps in coordination** of capacity building initiatives through an open source knowledge sharing platform and community of practice. Capacity building measures supported through the GFSP would create a baseline from which countries could develop food safety practices. Capacity building tools would be based upon, at minimum, accepted international standards, industry defined operational competencies and best practices, applied innovation, and delivered in state-of-the-art and contextually appropriate manner via the best available IT platforms. These activities would draw on a global network of expertise from institutions and food safety professionals who could be mobilized to address high priority risks or threats identified at country, regional or international levels and provide an essential resource of trainers.

- **Establish the GFSP as a Public-Private Partnership** for capacity building to support better food safety practices across the global agri-food sector, encompassing regulatory institutions, private enterprises, producers and other stakeholders. This includes a new food safety multi-donor trust fund (MDTF). The Partnership would be expected to develop and evolve through stakeholder discussions and lessons learnt during implementation of the 5-year roadmap, including gaining experience in collaboration amongst the diverse partners and stakeholders.

During the first five years (approximately 2012-2017), the Partnership would function with a streamlined governance structure, serving as a framework for more intensive and structured collaboration amongst interested stakeholders. The World Bank would provide leadership as convener and facilitator during this period, to enable more effective stakeholder collaboration. The World Bank’s decisions would be informed by the Technical and Thematic Working Groups. Public and private sector entities as well as technical partners (service providers,

---

\(^3\) World Bank Group member countries that are eligible to borrow or receive grant funding

\(^4\) This may include relevant key staff from different national competent authorities/agencies (public health, plant health and animal health systems).
international organizations) would participate in the GFSP based on alignment of their interests and priorities with the objectives of the GFSP and the indicative 5-year roadmap. This first 5-year period would also provide a platform for learning and consultations amongst stakeholders to help determine the future direction of the GFSP.

**Why a Global Partnership for Food Safety?**

Expanding the effective participation of small-scale farmers, handlers, traders, distributors, processors and marketers in the modern agri-food value chains offers an enormous opportunity to help lift the world’s poor farmers out of poverty. But it also raises significant commercial, trade and public health challenges. A key objective is to help both public and private sectors at country level seeking to meet international standards (i.e. CODEX/OIE), while recognizing the concurrent interest for training related to internationally accepted best practice in the context of private food safety specifications. Food and waterborne diseases are leading causes of illness and death in developing countries, with mortality exceeding some 2.2 million each year, mostly children. As a result, stakeholders across the global agri-food system now face the crucial task of strengthening food safety capacity in order to safeguard public health while promoting food security and economic development. By supporting a baseline level of internationally agreed upon standards from which countries, farmers and processors could build capacity for their food safety programs, the GFSP will focus on improving food safety by building capacity in developing and middle income countries.

Responding to this need for a coordinated approach in the Asia Pacific region, APEC established the Food Safety Cooperation Forum (FSCF) in 2007 to address the twin challenges of facilitating trade of food and food products and improving public health within the region. Recent high profile food safety incidents have reinforced the need. Since 2007, the FSCF has built a model of collaboration across a network of food safety regulatory officials, industry food safety professionals, trade officials, academic experts and training service providers through its Partnership Training Institute Network (PTIN). The PTIN’s Steering Group is composed of members representing government, private sector, and academia. This is one of the regional examples that would serve as the basis for scaling up food safety capacity building globally under the GFSP.

**Competing in more profitable, expanding food supply chains: A key to poverty alleviation**

“A...the ability of smallholder [farmers] to compete in growing higher value markets will likely determine the poverty reducing effect of future agricultural growth.”

- Inger Andersen, Vice President of Sustainable Development at the World Bank

Agriculture still comprises a substantial share of rural household income and agricultural growth has proven to be, on average, two to four times as effective in raising incomes of the poor as growth generated in nonagricultural sectors. However, for small-scale farmers and producers to effectively compete, they must understand and be able to meet relevant standards and best practices.

---

for food safety and good agricultural practices.

**Higher value food supply chains, higher risk**

“The world’s food supply is very complex, involving a web of producers, manufacturers, processors, packagers, re-packagers, exporters, and importers and at every step along the way there are opportunities for the introduction of contamination…”

- Dr. Margaret Hamburg, Commissioner of the U.S. Food & Drug Administration

The global agri-food value chain is becoming increasingly integrated across the world. This integration has however meant that food safety hazards that were previously geographically confined can now span across countries and continents with ease. Consumers now demand safe food that meets international standards and practices. This has created a higher value agri-food system delivering consumers more options, but with greater risks and vulnerabilities to food safety events at multiple points.

**Food safety incidents: A leading cause of illness and death**

Food safety is closely linked with public health. Up to one-third of the population of developing countries is affected by food and water borne illness each year, with mortality exceeding some 2.2 million each year, mostly children.\(^7\) In USA, it is estimated that 50 million people suffer from food borne disease every year at a direct cost of over USD $77 billion.

**Food safety incidents: Severe economic impacts**

Substantial negative economic impact (both direct and indirect) can result from food safety incidents for both governments (trade restrictions, increases in health costs, and reduced consumer confidence) and the private sector (worker absenteeism, lost markets and brand value). In the United States for example, recalls have had a significant economic impact, with annual losses estimated at $200 million from tomatoes/peppers (salmonella); $66 million from peanut butter (salmonella); $25-60 million from spinach (E. coli); and more that $40 million from pet food recalls (melamine).\(^8\)

**Food safety: A key component of food security**

Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life.

- World Food Summit, 2009

More than one billion people are hungry and each day more than 17,000 children will die of hunger.\(^9\) Food scarcity can force people to consume whatever food is available even if it is unsafe. Further, a food safety scare in a country already facing food scarcity can severely disrupt the food supply and cause wastage of available food.

There is now a unique opportunity to facilitate the establishment of a multi-stakeholder PPP to address the urgent need for food safety capacity building for the agri-food sector in developing

---

\(^7\) WHO Global Strategy for Food Safety, World Health Organization, 2002.

\(^8\) Grocery Manufacturers Association.

\(^9\) Address by UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon to the World Summit for Food Security, November 2009.
countries and to support the modernization of this sector. Key international organizations and agencies, many IFIs, donors and significant global private sector players are currently attempting to mitigate this food safety capacity crisis through a variety of programs. Within some larger development programs, significant efforts are already being made to promote better coordination in the design and delivery of food safety capacity building activities at global, regional and local level among relevant international organizations, donors and beneficiaries, including the private sector. Yet, additional efforts to improve coordination are needed. There is currently a fragmented collection of training modules and delivery mechanisms, resulting in costly redundancy, while capacity for testing and auditing to verify the capabilities and competencies of food safety managers, auditors, trainers, inspectors and producers is generally not well developed. There is a general consensus amongst experienced food safety experts that a significant proportion (estimates 60-70%) of the necessary contents, tools and programs needed to address this gap already exist, with some redundancy. There is a need for additional training materials on some topics, especially fit-for-purpose programs. An explicit partnership and establishment of an open access collaborative network arrangement would provide the catalyst for these different stakeholders to pull together to align and share their resources within a common platform to address the capacity building needs for a global food safety paradigm. Stakeholder collaboration would be driven by a broad base of vested self-interest and mutual benefit that would allow full disclosure of capacity building content and delivery options, with the expectation that the best and most effective would prevail.

Why should the World Bank get involved?

Food safety: a global public good

Strengthening food safety is critical to the achievement of the three of the World Bank’s core strategic objectives: (i) improving public health outcomes; (ii) enabling farmers and producers to trade food commodities with regional and global partners; and (iii) improving economic growth and ensuring greater food security. Moreover, governments and the food industry will need to make massive investments in food safety capacity to meet the increasing demands of consumers and the global agri-food system, and to access specific markets. IFC has developed an Agribusiness Strategic Action Plan (ASAP) which is part of the WBG’s integrated approach to agriculture. The World Bank Group and other IFIs can play an important role in providing investment funding and access to technical expertise to meet these needs.

Ongoing consultations amongst World Bank regions, partners and donors have clearly identified the broad scope and impact of food safety risks in the context of global trade, public health, smallholder market access, food security, rural livelihood and, ultimately, poverty alleviation. The World Bank for a number of years has invested in improving the food safety capabilities and capacities of client countries. The APEC economies, for example, have identified food safety as one of their top priorities for economic growth through enhanced trade of agricultural products. The May 2011 MOU signed between the World Bank and the APEC Food Safety Cooperation Forum for initial collaboration with the APEC Partnership Training Institute Network

---

10 Once this approach is demonstrated, it may be applicable to other areas such as One Health or the Global Livestock Agenda.
(APEC/PTIN) food safety initiative is further recognition of this demand. However, there remains a relatively urgent need to rapidly and substantially upscale this effort globally. Key public and private stakeholders report a significant human resource gap that requires immediate attention. This gap is echoed by World Bank operational staff supporting agri-food sector modernization projects. A survey of the World Bank lending portfolio and analytical work indicates that almost 350 operations involving some aspect of food safety across all regions have been or are being supported through World Bank operations. As a result, World Bank staff confirmed that substantial capacity gaps exist both within the government regulatory and inspection systems as well as the private food processing enterprises and amongst farmers. Efforts are required to assure that national food safety systems are strengthened and that food chains in developing economies comply with voluntary specifications and mandatory food safety standards.

The World Bank’s role in the proposed GFSP would be three-fold:

(i) to support establishment and operation of the Partnership for an initial 5-year period, the World Bank will draw on its convening power and reputation as a neutral but interested actor, to bring the parties together within a framework for collaboration. This would entail coordinating and supporting the Working Groups, convening an annual Partnership Conference and providing a Secretariat for the day-to-day operation of the Partnership. This would also involve organizing and hosting a new MDTF and grant making for projects and activities in support of the Partnership objectives. During the initial 5-year period, the World Bank would also support consultations amongst the tri-partite of public sector, private sector (including farmers) and service provider groups to explore options for the next phase of the Partnership (e.g. structure, funding, governance, host for the Secretariat, etc.);

(ii) to participate in the implementation and/or supervision of Partnership activities for capacity building, drawing on the World Bank’s knowledge and operational resources to complement those of other partners and transparently catalyze the cooperative effort; and

(iii) to link the Partnership resources (DGF, EFO, BB, MDTF, parallel funding and in-kind support from external donors) with ongoing and future World Bank Group analytical and investment operations.

The World Bank’s comparative advantage for each of these roles rests in its status as a respected neutral convener with international stature, its effectiveness in brokering diverse stakeholder views, its ability to serve as trustee of the MDTF and house Secretariat, its access to strong technical expertise and knowledge resources for development in the agriculture and agri-business sectors (including those of IFC and WBI), and its ability to conduct policy dialogue and finance analytical work and operations in client countries.

What would the Global Food Safety Partnership do?

The GFSP program will be implemented over a five year period starting with the activities already initiated under the APEC/FSCF/PTIN program, for which implementation of an initial three year work plan is already underway. In addition, there are a number of other regional
initiatives that have been started concurrently and which function in parallel to the APEC/PTIN work plan. It is expected that the initial set of activities would focus mainly on eligible APEC economies\textsuperscript{11}.

Concurrently with the initial APEC/FSCF/PTIN activities, the GFSP would begin to be rolled out to 2-3 countries in each of the six World Bank regions on an iterative basis depending on assessed demand and available resources. While intensive GFSP activities would be limited to 12-18 countries, it is expected that many other countries would be able to participate in and benefit from regional workshops and knowledge sharing events, as well as have access to the open source IT platform. There are two reasons for this approach: (i) the GFSP funding and implementation capacity would not be sufficient to work intensively in all countries; and (ii) intensive engagement is considered necessary to have a significant impact on improving food safety. Candidate countries for intensive engagement would be selected based on the following criteria:

\begin{itemize}
  \item **Country policy environment.** While essentially all developing and middle income countries face significant needs for upgrading their food safety systems, the program would initially be rolled out to countries that demonstrate that improved food safety is a high priority through their national policies and programs for agriculture, rural development, public health, trade promotion, etc. Improving food safety at the country level requires strong commitment by the private and public sector. In absence of such commitment, the interventions could not yield expected results. While the GFSP support would provide public awareness raising measures and advocacy support, the initial country commitment would be instrumental for implementation of the program. Candidate countries should include the food safety agenda prominently in their country partnership strategies with the World Bank, and/or have made significant efforts in prioritizing food safety agenda in national plans.

  \item **Potential for scaling up.** The GFSP would seek to support countries with a committed food safety policy environment, existing relevant programs or projects, in order to augment the impact of the support as well as leverage other funding sources. In particular, the candidate countries should have current or planned WB, IFC, other donors or international organization supported investments in the food value chain, as this would be a key factor in ensuring private sector engagement at the country level.
\end{itemize}

The GFSP will build capacity in developing and middle income countries on a needs driven basis through advisory services, education and training in the use of science based international standards and best practices for food safety. International CODEX/OIE standards provide the baseline for this effort. The GFSP supported training modules and advisory services will be rolled out globally. The modules will be adapted to regional and local conditions and will support alignment of practices around international standards. Priority will be given in the first instance to provide education and training based on international standards. Training

\textsuperscript{11} APEC member economies that are World Bank borrowing members are Chile, People's Republic of China, Indonesia, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Republic of the Philippines, The Russian Federation, Thailand and Viet Nam.
modules would address several topics, including alignment of regulatory approaches with basic international standards and core food safety competency. Access to global supply chains for producers in developing and middle income countries will be facilitated by the GFSP through the capacity building programs that will strengthen and bring transformative change to food safety systems.

Should producers wish to participate in schemes that go beyond these core competencies, provision will be made in the GFSP to achieve that goal. For example, users who have established a strong foundation in basic competencies may opt to use the open source platform for further development, particularly in the area of fee-based private specifications and schemes.

The Partnership would facilitate access to the essential resources and delivery mechanisms that would allow stakeholders, participating organizations and end users to meet relevant public and private standards and requirements for accreditation. Four main target audiences have been identified: a) public regulators, inspectors and managers; b) private sector agri-food processors, manufacturers and value chain players; c) producers and associated on-farm food safety and quality assurance of raw materials; and d) third party food safety auditors, service providers, trainers and certification body staff. The program would develop a thorough competency-based needs assessment for each of the above as the basis for tailored capacity building programs.

The GFSP would not be involved in standard setting nor conformity assessment or accreditation, but would rather facilitate access to the essential resources and delivery mechanisms that would allow stakeholders and participating organizations and end users to meet international standards and to proceed towards the requirements for accreditation or certification. The Global Food Safety MDTF and Platform will support global food safety efforts, with defined program content that would reflect regional and country specific priorities and opportunities. Capacity building programs will be regionally customized as they are rolled out and scaled up and also modified to meet specific country and commodity value chain needs.

Initial programs under the GFSP would also be developed and tested in socially, linguistically, geographically, and economically diverse regions and then customized for other regions as they are rolled out and scaled up.

The GFSP would consist of three main components which would be implemented concurrently during the initial five-year phase of the GFSP:

1. Training Program Implementation
2. Global Capacity Building Scaling Up
3. Program Facilitation

---

12 All activities initiated under the APEC/FSCF/PTIN 3-year workplan are designated with (*). Some of these activities are implemented by the World Bank with funding from EFOs, and others are implemented by APEC member countries. Sources of funding for each activity are indicated in the GFSP 5-year roadmap.
The “GFSP Roadmap of Activities” section below provides details for each of the three components.

How will the Global Partnership for Food Safety work?

The management and administration of the GFSP for the first five years will be carried out through a streamlined governance structure to include specific advisory Working Groups (WGs) that would provide technical input to the World Bank with regards to its implementation and/or supervision of the work program, and a small Secretariat. Potentially all stakeholders, including, *inter alia*, donors, technical organizations, service providers and beneficiaries, would participate in an annual Partnership Conference to discuss the progress and review planned activities under the GFSP. It is possible that an organization could participate in the GFSP under more than one capacity (e.g., as a donor/beneficiary country, or both a technical organization and service provider). These relationships can be elucidated as the Partnership evolves.

In particular:

- **The World Bank-hosted Secretariat** would support day-to-day operations of the Partnership. The Secretariat will be responsible for the coordination of the GFSP and implementation of World Bank-funded elements of the work program, informed by regular interaction with the Working Groups (WG) and stakeholders. The Secretariat would administer the MDTF, prepare and implement a communication strategy for the Partnership, and provide reporting and M&E. The Secretariat would support collaboration on the Partnership across the World Bank Group, and would report to World Bank management (Director, AES). The Secretariat would consist of World Bank staff under World Bank management operating under World Bank policies and procedures.

- The first **Partnership Conference** is planned for December 10-12, 2012 in Paris to formally launch the partnership. The Conference will be open to all interested stakeholders (e.g., government agencies, donors, international technical agencies, private sector representatives, academia, regional organizations, IFIs, etc.). It will meet once a year to discuss the progress under the partnership and the planned activities for the next period. The annual Partnership Conferences would be organized by the Secretariat, in consultation with Partners and Working Groups.

- **Advisory Working Groups (WGs)** consisting of experts from both public and private sectors would be formed on an as needed basis and tasked to provide technical input and expertise in the design and delivery of the work programs. Initial WGs are expected to be needed for: (i) establishment of the Open Source IT Platform (ITWG); (ii) communications Strategy (CWG); (iii) technical inputs for topics and content of competency-based training materials, quality control, service provision, and delivery systems (FSTWG); (iv) Monitoring, Quality Control, Coordination and Evaluation (MEWG); and (v) future Governance and Fund Raising (GWG) that would provide recommendations for the next period of operations of the GFSP, after completion of the first 5-year period. The ITWG, CWG and FSTWG would initially be facilitated by Massey University, funded by the DGF grant. The WGs would also be supported by additional resources from the MDTF after implementation of the DGF grant. The
MEWG and GWG would be facilitated by the World Bank in cooperation with Partners. WG participants would not be compensated for their time or intellectual property (this being part of their contribution to the Partnership), but the GFSP would support coordination costs for the WGs (e.g., organizing and convening meetings, preparation and dissemination of working documents). The WGs could become part of the future operational mechanism for an autonomous Secretariat after the initial five year GFSP implementation period.

- **Ad hoc Consultative group**: Prior to effectiveness of the DGF grant and start-up of the GFSP, the World Bank is convening a series of consultations with groups of donors and capacity building partners to clarify their commitment to the Partnership and MDTF, as appropriate. An ad hoc consultative group participated in a technical meeting at the World Bank on June 11-12, 2012, which introduced the GFSP and solicited inputs on the design, work plan, and proposed implementation arrangements. These initial consultations and meetings are being funded from World Bank Budget and the Externally Financed Output (EFO) agreements.

- **Participation by stakeholders**: The key methods for stakeholders to participate in the GFSP include the following:
  
  o **Donors** (government agencies, trade associations, foundations, private sector companies, etc.) would participate in the GFSP by contributing funds to the MDTF through execution of a uniform Trust Fund Administration Agreement (AA) with the World Bank, subject to relevant due diligence by the World Bank. The AA would specify the amount of the contribution, terms for administering the contribution funds, and provisions that the funds would be used to carry out specified activities during the first five years of the GFSP. Donors would be welcome to participate in the advisory Working Groups and the annual Partnership Conference. Donor countries that are eligible for World Bank financing (e.g., middle income countries) could be beneficiaries under the Partnership. Past and future EFO contributors to support GFSP activities would also be considered donors to the GFSP and could participate in advisory Working Groups and the annual Partnership Conference in the same manner as MDTF donors. The World Bank is also a donor to the GFSP through its DGF contribution. Under DGF requirements, sufficient additional funding from other sources would need to be in place for DGF funding to be sustained over the expected three-year period.

  o **Technical Organizations** (international organizations, government agencies, etc.) would participate in the GFSP by serving on the advisory Working Groups, participating in the Partnership Conference and/or serving as service providers. If requested by a technical organization, a declaration of participation in the GFSP (a “Declaration”) would be prepared by the Secretariat for consultation with, and signature by, the requesting organization. A Declaration could indicate the nature of the organization’s participation in the GFSP, including the description of support for implementation of the roadmap.
Service Providers (international technical organizations, universities, institutes, NGOs, trade associations, companies, consulting firms and individual consultants) are stakeholders that would design and deliver capacity building activities under grants or contracts funded by the World Bank. Service providers could participate in the advisory Working Groups, subject to consideration and resolution of conflict of interest concerns, and could participate in the annual Partnership Conference.

Beneficiaries (government food safety agencies and inspectors, private sector food producers, farmers, etc.) and stakeholders in middle income and developing countries would participate in specific training and capacity building programs. Activities in each country would be coordinated through the appropriate World Bank country unit. Beneficiaries would be able to participate in the advisory WGs and the annual Partnership Conference.

Funding Arrangements

The GFSP would be funded through a combination of the following financing sources:

- **EFO-funded activities** implemented by the Bank with US$1.0M funding from industry (Waters Corporation and Mars Incorporated) and the U.S. Agency for International Development. FY12 activities include a) development of a 3-year APEC workplan; b) delivery of a first pilot on food safety good management practices/HACCP (Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points) training in May-June 2012 in China; and c) support to upscaling the APEC model through development of the GFSP. Additional pilot capacity building activities are planned for delivery in FY13. These pilots are supported by the MOUs signed between the World Bank and APEC on May 18, 2011.

- **Development Grant Facility grant of US$1.2M** proposed for FY13 through FY15. The first portion of $400,000 was confirmed by the World Bank Board in June 2012, and annual grant amounts will be requested in FY13 and FY14. The DGF funds will support GFSP activities to organize and initiate activities of the advisory Working Groups. The DGF grant-funded activities will be implemented by Massey University (New Zealand) in cooperation with other university service providers, international agencies, NGOs and trade associations.

- **MDTF contributions anticipated to reach US$40-45.0M** (total to be confirmed) to be implemented over a five year period beginning in FY13. The MDTF will be implemented through both Bank Executed (BETF) and Recipient Executed (RETF) mechanisms. It is anticipated that the main MDTF capacity building activities (e.g., delivery of training programs and advisory services) would be implemented through a combination of grants and/or contracts to service providers that would have specific geographic responsibilities (e.g., by World Bank region or sub-region). University consortia would implement capacity building programs through the consortia members and other qualified service providers such as NGOs, industry associations, national food safety technology centers, etc., under World Bank supervision. The MDTF would also fund Bank-executed support to the GFSP, such as analytical and
advisory services, organization of the annual Partnership Conference meeting, and operations of the Secretariat, which would provide coordination functions, communications, M&E and supervision.

- **In-kind support.** In addition to the funding streams described above, a number of activities that support the GFSP objectives will be funded and implemented by other organizations in parallel with GFSP activities implemented and/or supervised by the World Bank. Much of the in-kind support is expected to be in form of materials, tools, expertise and programs needed for food capacity development.

**Management of a Public-Private Partnership.**

The WB Secretariat would facilitate the formal establishment of the Public-Private Partnership for capacity building to contribute to harmonization of food safety practices across the global agri-food sector encompassing international organizations, regulatory institutions, private enterprises, industry associations, academia, producers and other stakeholders. A key objective is to help at country level both public and private sectors meeting international sanitary standards. This step would include establishment of the Partnership inclusion mechanism together with a new food safety multi-donor trust fund (MDTF).

Enlisting such a wide range of stakeholders would be a catalytic mechanism for rapidly improving understanding and technical competencies that underpin the effective management of food safety throughout the food system, from farm to fork and across the globe. Improved competencies, capacities, protocols, and risk-based management systems and regulations will lead to cascading social and economic benefits – including better health and nutritional outcomes, reduced risk of food-borne hazards, expanded participation of farmers and producers into higher value and global food supply chains, reduction in poverty, and improved food security.

During the first five years (2013-2017), the GFSP would function with a Secretariat and develop a more long-term framework for more intensive and structured collaboration amongst interested stakeholders. The World Bank would provide leadership as convener and facilitator during this period, to enable more effective stakeholder collaboration. The World Bank’s decisions would be informed by the advisory Working Groups and by structured as well as informal consultations with key partners. Public and private sector entities as well as technical partners (service providers, international organizations) would participate in the GFSP based on alignment of their interests and priorities with the objectives of the GFSP and the indicative 5-year work-plan. This first 5-year period would also provide a platform for learning and consultations amongst stakeholders to help determine what kind of partnership structure and governance arrangement would best serve their interests and needs going forward.

The GFSP is comprised of three inter-related components to support food safety capacity building in developing and middle income countries. The GFSP would support promotion of food safety as a global public good and would help build capacity both in public and private institutions across the global food supply chain. It would address country food safety capacity
building needs, and its activities would draw on globally available technical knowledge platforms.

The GFSP 5-year roadmap would include the initial APEC/FSCF/PTIN\textsuperscript{13} activities and would encompass a more comprehensive global approach to food safety capacity building to: (i) develop and implement specific training programs and other capacity building activities, (ii) develop an open-source food safety IT training resource, (iii) establish the GFSP under a sustainable business model, and (iv) provide for streamlined management, monitoring and evaluation. The GFSP activities would be coordinated with other related regional initiatives that are currently ongoing or planned.

It is proposed that the initial set of activities would focus on select APEC/FSCF/PTIN economies and other regions and countries where the World Bank has work underway, but would be extended on an iterative basis depending on demand and available resources. As such, this set of roadmap activities has been divided into those related specifically to the APEC/FSCF/PTIN workplan, for which the three year program has been identified, and the broader set of activities encompassing other regions. The GFSP would consist of three components:\textsuperscript{14}

1. Training Program Implementation
2. Global Scaling Up
3. Program Facilitation

The GFSP would support harmonization of existing donor programs and resources, and would provide a platform for combining resources to maximize impact. The funding for the program would be mainly provided from four sources: EFOs (supported by Mars, Waters Corporation and USAID); a DGF grant (supported by the World Bank); a MDTF (to be supported by public and private sector donors); and in-kind support.

What are the Expected Results and how will we measure them?

The GFSP will support a wide array of beneficiaries. Developing and middle income countries will be able to access food safety training programs and other capacity building support for both private and public sector stakeholders. Food and agribusiness companies worldwide will be able to access a world class knowledge platform and community of practice, providing information and training materials on all aspects of food safety capacity building. Service providers will be able to offer their expertise through the knowledge sharing platform. And ultimately, consumers will have access to safer food. Mechanisms would also be put in place to ensure that countries and beneficiaries are fully engaged as partners and participants in the governance of the partnership.

\textsuperscript{13} Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, or APEC, is a forum for facilitating economic growth, cooperation, trade and investment in the Asia-Pacific region. APEC has 21 members - referred to as "Member Economies" - Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, People's Republic of China, Hong Kong SAR, China, Indonesia, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Peru, The Republic of the Philippines, The Russian Federation, Singapore, Taiwan, China, Thailand, United States of America, and Viet Nam.

\textsuperscript{14} All activities initiated under the APEC/FSCF/PTIN 3-yr workplan are designated with (*)
A comprehensive system is being developed early on in the program to provide for analysis and metrics to evaluate food safety capacity building through needs assessments, economic analysis and impacts, the findings from which would inform further decision-making, resource allocation, funding priorities for the MDTF, World Bank lending, bilateral aid agency grant making, etc. An M&E Working Group (MEWG) would be convened under Component 3 to assist in the development of an M&E and metrics framework and provide guidance on the economic analysis, expected outputs, outcomes and measurable indicators and, together with the other WGs, recommend project design based on existing best practice and experience to date.

The main results assessment actions include:

- **Develop and implement M&E and metrics framework.** The M&E framework is being developed early on in the GFSP program with parallel financial support of the FDA and would be completed in the first year.

- **Food Safety System economic analysis.** This activity would include specific case studies and analytical work to evaluate the economic impact of the GFSP and related training programs for capacity building at the national, regional and global level. The analysis would demonstrate the return on investment (ROI) from investing in safe food systems. The activities would begin with the establishment of a baseline early on in the GFSP and, working closely with other concurrent studies at the global, regional and especially the country level, track the impact of the capacity building program over time, the results of which would be incorporated into the M&E framework. This analysis will strengthen evidence of food safety systems performance and economic analyses for investing in safe food systems that can inform decision-making, resource allocation, and lending priorities.
THE GFSP ROADMAP OF ACTIVITIES

COMPONENT 1: TRAINING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The program will be implemented over a five year period starting with the activities initiated under the APEC/FSCF/PTIN program and for which an initial three year work plan has already been prepared. In addition, there are a number of other initiatives that have been started concurrently in other regions and would function in parallel to the initial APEC/FSCF/PTIN activities. It is expected that the initial set of activities would focus on the APEC region and ECA, but would be extended in other regions on an iterative basis as soon as possible and depending on demand and available resources and budget. The program would be supplemented and combined with other programs which may have been developed, modified and adapted to local needs and conditions in: Africa, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, South Asia, East Asia and Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean, and the Middle East. A clear consensus has emerged that the initial capacity building should focus on the following key areas: (i) Supply Chain Management (SCM), (ii) Food Safety Incident Management, (iii) Laboratory Competency, (iv) Risk Analysis, (v) Food Safety Regulatory Systems.

1.1. Supply Chain Management

1.1.1. SCM Training modules – Pre-requisite programs and HACCP

The purpose of this program is to improve the ability of key stakeholders along the supply chain to manage food safety. It would reinforce supply chain management practices including Good Manufacturing Practices (GMPs) and Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points (HAACP). The target group would be growers, producers, manufacturers, distributors and retailers but with the initial round of training focusing on training of trainers, government regulators and industry. This program is a combination of e-learning (1 month) and hands-on in plant practical training (6 days).

1.1.1.1. Develop GMP & HACCP Modules by international recognized training institution *

1.1.1.2. Deliver HACCP ToT by national institutions in APEC/FSCF/PTIN networks*
   - China Pilot HACCP program – June 2012
   - Vietnam/Malaysia (2012)
   - Turkey (2012)
   - Indonesia (2013)
   - ToT Singapore (2013)
   - Additional location TBD (2014).

1.1.1.3. Roll out HACCP program Globally

1.1.2. SCM Training – Aquaculture *

The purpose of this training is to build capacity in GMP for the aquaculture industry. The target group would be producers and distributors and content would primarily focus on production level management in the industry.

1.1.2.1. Develop Aquaculture modules by internationally recognized training institution*
1.1.2.2. Deliver Aquaculture ToT national training institutions part of APEC/FSCF/PTIN*
- Vietnam (2012)
- China June (2013)
- Philippines or Indonesia (2013)
- APEC-wide ToT (2014) – Malaysia

1.1.2.3. Roll out aquaculture program Globally

1.1.3 On-farm quality assurance program

Working with experienced service providers the GFSP would initiate on-farm, producer based good agricultural practices (GAP), HACCP and food safety assurance programs to promote the production and delivery of safe raw material to specific value chains. The commodity and value chains would be identified through existing World Bank projects together with beneficiary countries and GFSP stakeholder contributions. Training programs would incorporate existing materials, content and delivery systems. The delivery systems would be based on a number of alternative approaches to demonstrate sustainability and might include individual farmers or groups, cooperatives, farmer/herder associations or producers with contractual links to processors, SMEs, etc.

1.1.3.1 Identify value chain links and program content
1.1.3.2 Deliver training programs (2 value chains in each of six regions)

1.2. Food Safety Incident Management Seminar and Training *

The purpose of this training is to improve management of food safety incidents by improving information sharing and communication networks, including on risk assessment, risk management and risk communication and to provide accurate and timely information on emerging food safety issues or in the event of the food safety incident through the APEC FSCF Food Safety Incident Management Network (FSIN). The APEC FSCF FSIN and GFSP food safety incident management training program would assist in developing and implementing agreed approaches to improve food safety incident preparedness, response and recovery mechanisms and strengthen regional participation in INFOSAN and other international networks. The training program would increase the ability to respond to food safety emergencies of international significance. The GFSP would support the previous work of the APEC FSCF and Partnership Training Institute Network (PTIN) and INFOSAN by building upon existing training materials and supplementing these with case studies and practical exercises for e-learning and face-to-face training. Australia is seeking APEC financial support for this program.

1.2.1 APEC FSFCFSIN seminar in Indonesia (May 2013)
1.2.2 Develop reproducible training module
1.2.3 In country training (Chile 2014)
1.2.4 In country training (Thailand 2014)

1.3. Laboratory Competency *

The program would support the development and delivery of a food safety lab training program using multiple trainers and training laboratories. The program would develop hands-on bench training and supplemental technical reference modules or manuals for possible e-learning applications:
• Building laboratory proficiency in a collaborative environment within the global context of facilitating trade.
• Laboratory Collaboration Program Development
• QA, validation, and proficiency testing
• Implementing a quality system and obtaining accreditation.
• Analytical methods and data analysis
• Lab safety and management
• Equipment maintenance and trouble shooting

The program would raise the quality of food safety laboratory testing in a manner that meets international standards through the development and delivery of hands-on training and modules aimed at: improving the rate of compliance with quality assurance, validation & proficiency testing; building confidence in lab results, gaining mutual recognition, and insuring lab sustainability; and ensuring safety and efficiency in labs. The APEC/FSCF/PTIN would undertake a number of regional programs in 2012, some funded by USDA under parallel financing, which would then be rolled out to other countries in the region in 2013 and 2014. Consideration would also be given to concurrent programs from other regions which could be adopted by APEC to avoid duplication.

1.3.1. Complete regional laboratory assessments
1.3.2. Develop lab training content and reference manuals
1.3.3. Develop modules: Lab competency: global food safety (MSU workshop capture - 2012)
1.3.4. Regional ToT (3 countries) focused on analytical methods – validation – fitness for purpose (Peru, Malaysia, Vietnam – 2012)
1.3.5. Regional ToT: QA and Proficiency testing (3 in 2013)
1.3.6. Develop lab training modules for global roll out (2014)

The content from the initial programs (1.3.2) would be captured, adapted and used to develop the content for a globally acceptable set of laboratory training module that approximates with the needs of end users, stakeholders and global markets.

1.3.7 Global roll out laboratory training

1.4. Risk Analysis *

This training program would strengthen the food supply by training key stakeholders on risk analysis and qualitative and quantitative methods for food safety risk assessments techniques through trainings on risk benefit analysis and risk analysis. The risk analysis training program would be developed by an internationally recognized training institutions or incorporate already existing programs. In addition, the program would support harmonization of approaches to capacity building for risk assessment. Essentially, this would help bring together the existing programs by various governments and technical agencies, and systematically harmonize the capacity building within these programs across participating countries.

1.4.1. Risk analysis training adapt for e-learning (2013)
1.4.1.1. Module development with (2) in-country training (2013)
1.4.1.2. Regional ToT in English for reproducible module (2014)
1.4.2. Risk/benefit Analysis specific training
1.4.2.1. Module development with (2) in-country training (2013)
1.4.2.2. Regional ToT for risk-benefit analysis (2014)
1.4.3. Harmonizing Approaches to Capacity Building for Risk Assessment
1.5. Food Safety Regulatory System *

This set of training activities is intended to improve the ability of regulatory bodies to assure the safety of food by conducting seminars on effective government regulation role to assure food safety and developing supporting open source e-learning materials that would then be available more widely. The initial part of the program would target those government agencies that regulate produce and seafood and assist them in conducting an assessment of the current regulatory structure of priority countries, to help regulatory agencies close gaps internally.

The second set of activities under this program relating to export certification would target APEC economies and provide them with training on best practices for doing inspections. This could be achieved by introducing participants on “how to do inspections” (best practices) through programs currently under development. In subsequent iterations and scaling up of this food safety regulatory program it would be modified by service providers to target specific economies and markets.

1.5.1. Regulatory systems and cooperation
   1.5.1.1. Develop training module with in-country training (2) for food standards, laws, regulatory and enforcement systems
   1.5.1.2. Deliver ToT (2014)

1.5.2. Export certification
   1.5.2.1. Export certification workshop (April 2012)
   1.5.2.2. Assessment of certification options (Sept 2012 – no cost)
COMPONENT 2: GLOBAL CAPACITY BUILDING SCALING UP

This component is designed to test and refine the GFSP’s offerings while concurrently rolling them out globally. As the initial capacity building programs are successfully implemented they will be candidates for customization and rollout out to other countries and regions where there is demonstrated demand. It is well recognized that up to 70% of the necessary training materials are already available through the global network of universities, international organizations, governments, institutes and other service providers. These would be incorporated into the GFSP as deemed appropriate to supplement the initial programs and for which many resources and service providers have already been identified world-wide.

Building on the initial work program, and in response to a burgeoning demand, the GFSP would reach out to other regions to support capacity building and training programs with a broad range of stakeholders and countries. Although the initial training as outlined in Component 1 are intended to introduce a number of priority programs, it is recognized that there are many other training programs currently available that could be delivered concurrently in other countries and regions. Efforts would be made to match the initial programs with the client needs, but would be combined with other programs meeting GFSP objectives and country priorities. Although the training programs would start early on in the 5-year roadmap, there is a need to carefully inventory the available training resources which could be tailored to meet the capacity building requirements evolving from a training needs assessment to be completed for other regions and countries.

The entry point for the Global Scaling Up would be a country capacity building needs assessment. The Global Scaling Up would encompass food safety issues along the entire value chain and including the farm level quality assurance programs in terms of raw material supply and market access to emphasize rural development impacts. This is consistent with the program development objectives and is particularly important in Africa and poorer countries where the program is expected to reflect poverty alleviation impacts. Although the GFSP would not fund capital investments, in-country food safety training would also be aligned with the other elements of capacity building investments related to infrastructure and facilities to ensure the training is relevant and applicable.

2.1 Global capacity building needs assessment

The Global program would be based on a capacity building needs assessment in participating countries. Such needs assessments would be implemented through review of existing analytical work in the participating countries, or through utilizing various capacity building needs assessment toolkits developed by the international technical agencies, donors and private sector. The GFSP would develop an inventory of these toolkits. In the meantime, the global program would be expected to emulate the approach used in APEC/PTIN: (i) stakeholder consultations and needs assessments to establish food safety capacity building priorities both nationally and regionally, (ii) delivery of programs adapting from existing materials or developing more regionally appropriate programs, (iii) development of new programs as deemed necessary and appropriate, and (iv) coordination of efforts to take advantage of parallel publicly and privately financed operations which include food safety training.

The approach to scaling up is expected to be funded through project proposals from selected countries for funding under the MDTF. Within the 5-year program, the GFSP would fund 2-3 countries in each of the World Bank regions of ECA, SAR, AFR, MENA and LAC. Although EAP is considered to be largely covered under the APEC/FSCF/PTIN activities through the GFSP, the needs of non-APEC countries in the EAP region would be assessed as appropriate within the Global program.
2.1.1 **Country capacity building and training needs assessments**

These would be completed in the lead countries or champions in each region on an urgent basis utilizing some of the readily available tools and guidance already developed (i.e. FAO, OIE, WHO, WTO/STDF, etc). To the extent necessary the GFSP would support the development of a fully comprehensive food safety assessment tool that would be used to address individual country gaps and alignment with respective markets in a global context. The program would initially target completion of country level needs assessments for three countries in each of the six regions.

2.1.2 **Market responsive activities**

The GFSP would facilitate on an as needed basis the establishment of jointly recognized new activities, technical working groups and projects to take advantage of unanticipated opportunities, client demand, or events that present themselves during the 2nd and 3rd years of the DGF program subject to time, resource and budget constraints. The activities under this may include expert consultations, workshops, delivery of training modules, reports, and pilot initiatives, and would involve financial expenditures for consultations, FSTWG meetings, travel and logistics, and publication of reports.

2.2 **Global and Regional Scaling Up**

The Global and Regional programs would emulate those initial programs implemented under Component 1 which are determined to fit with the needs assessments and would be supplemented by other programs deemed more appropriate for specific regional and country needs. These include:

- Supply Chain Management
- Food Safety Incident Management
- Laboratory Capacity
- Risk Analysis (Risk assessment, Risk Management, Risk Communication)
- Food Safety Regulatory Systems
- On-farm food safety and GAP programs

The GFSP and related training activities would be implemented in close collaboration with number of other food safety capacity building and training programs which are concurrently being developed or delivered at the global, regional and country level and financed through both public and corporate sources. This would ensure that the GFSP activities take full advantage of existing resources, are integrated with already identified priorities and avoid redundancy and overlap.

The country level of the program implementation would be supported through pre-designed framework that would ensure rapid and effective development of the country programs. This framework would provide a menu of options for program activities that could be customized based on each country’s capacity building needs. The latest version of the framework is presented in ANNEX III.

2.2.1 **East Asia and Pacific Region (EAP).**

A notional budget would be allocated for the EAP region and constitute 20% of the DGF and GFSP operational budgets. Given that many of the initial activities have been initiated in the APEC the budget allocation for EAP would be pro-rated to reflect this commitment.

2.2.2 **Europe and Central Asia (ECA)**
The ECA region has many ongoing food safety capacity building projects and programs supported by the World Bank, the EU, USDA, USAID and other donors and which the GFSP could build upon. The GFSP would endeavor to collaborate with a number of food safety initiatives in the region to optimize resource allocations, align efforts with the national needs assessments and, to the extent possible, ensure sustainability of training resources in a given country. The allocation for the ECA region would constitute 10% of the DGF and GFSP operational budgets.

2.2.3 Africa Region (AFR)
A notional budget would be allocated for the Africa region and constitute 20% of the DGF and GFSP operational budgets.

2.2.4 South Asia Region (SAR)
A notional budget would be allocated for the Africa region and constitute 10% of the DGF and GFSP operational budgets. Activities in SAR would be integrated with the ongoing APEC/FSCF/PTIN program.

2.2.5 Latin America and Caribbean Region (LAC)
A notional budget would be allocated for the Africa region and constitute 10% of the DGF and GFSP operational budgets. Activities in LAC would be integrated with the ongoing APEC/FSCF/PTIN program.

2.2.6 Middle East and North Africa Region (MENA)
A notional budget would be allocated for the MENA region and constitute 10% of the DGF and GFSP operational budgets.
COMPONENT 3: PROGRAM FACILITATION

The third component supports the GFSP development and implementation through a number of activities that would provide the IT and technical framework, administration and management. The management and administration of the GFSP will be implemented through a initial governance structure to include advisory Working Groups (WGs), a small Secretariat, and annual Partnership Conferences. These are described in the “How will the Partnership Work?” section above.

This component also includes an Open Knowledge and Innovation Platform for effective capacity building and to provide state-of-the-art, up-to-date resources for the training delivered under Components 1 and 2. This Platform and associated sub-components will provide an enabling, coordinating and facilitation mechanism to bring together the diverse stakeholder community and ensure that best practice solutions, materials, technologies and outcomes for food safety are developed, adapted and translated to be openly shared across the global agri-food industry. This component would also have a regional dimension in implementation, through establishment of regional cooperation focal points, institutions and networks.

3.1 Establish Food Safety Learning Platform and Open Education Resources (OER)

A web-based Open Source Technology Platform for capacity building will be developed to support the Partnership and associated projects. There is a general consensus amongst experienced food safety experts that approximately 60-70% of the necessary materials, tools and programs needed to address this gap already exist with considerable redundancy. The GFSP would address the issue and resolve the remaining critical capacity building gaps through an open source knowledge sharing community of practice. This would be based upon international standards, industry defined operational competencies and best practice, applied innovation, and delivered in state-of-the-art and contextually appropriate manner with the best available IT platforms and hands-on delivery systems. These activities would draw on a global network of expertise from institutions and food safety professionals who could be mobilized at country, regional or international levels and provide an essential resource of trainers and food safety advisors. The Platform could include a distributed network of stakeholders and food safety professionals, open education resource (OER) based food safety materials, resources, programs and qualifications, a registry of professionals, new links and a social network based early warning system. It would draw the open systems technology, platforms and lessons learnt through other open source initiatives, such as the Commonwealth of Learning, MSU Global, Gates AgShare, OERAfrica, and Stream@ Massey University and multiple global food safety knowledge networks. Appropriate industry partners such as Google will be invited to participate and assist in the development of the open technology platform, to ensure that the best technology and systems are used to support the platform. This set of resources available through the IT platform would maintain an inventory of all open-source and freely accessible training content and support both e-learning or traditional face-to-face delivery methods.

3.1.1 IT Working Group (ITWG) Design platform framework

3.1.2 Implement IT platform linked to website

The IT platform would (i) identify collaborators; (ii) establish Technical Working Group; (iii) coordinate a comprehensive analysis and review of appropriate open source platform options and associated protocols; (iv) coordinate the piloting of open source platforms within the regional pilot projects; and (v) continue the development of the core components of the open platform. Activities would include expert consultations, expert working groups, pilot activities and collaborative development of protocols and knowledge structures. In the first year the IT Technical Working Group (ITWG) would report and recommend appropriate platform
technology options, and protocols for the establishment of distributed knowledge and data repository structure. This would provide the basis for platform development and establishment within regional projects.

3.1.3 Food Safety Technical Working Group (FSTWG)

The Food Safety Technical Working Group (FSTWG) would concurrently provide: (i) Comprehensive review of all food safety competencies structures, twinning mechanisms, training materials and credentialed qualification structures on a global basis; (ii) Recommendation for appropriate identification of partnership opportunities to develop materials through associated projects and initiatives, including twinning projects; (iii) Facilitation of delivery of training, module and qualification development through regional programs; and (iv) Initiation of processes for international harmonization of training materials and qualifications at on-farm, post farm gate, manufacturing, regulation and audit. Activities include expert consultations, surveys, workshops/meetings, reports, and impact evaluation (using Monitoring and Evaluating Working Group Data), guidance on development of materials including quality assurance, modules and qualifications within the scope of MDTF support regional programs. Financial expenses include consultations for surveys, FSTWG meetings, travel and logistics, and the development of guidelines for the post-5 year continuation of the programs. In the first year the FSTWG would identify collaborative partners and possible pilot projects, review available content and requirements to make it open source, assist in development of open source materials within the APEC/FSCF/PTIN. In subsequent years the FSTWG would support the development and sharing of open source materials, modules and qualification programs.

3.1.4 Competency-based training modules and content developed and adapted

3.1.4.1 International Food Safety curriculum framework and content

The GFSP would support the development of a curriculum framework for food safety education and training that would provide a specific set of competencies, skills and training content and delivery modes that would facilitate capacity building in these areas. This would include topics and content for undergraduate programs, graduate programs and, more importantly, in-service formal and applied training and education for Government regulators, inspectors and the private sector. The framework curriculum would be developed through a consortium of international universities and would be proposed for accreditation by an appropriate international body and/or private sector representation. One example might include the OIE recommendations for core curriculum and Competencies of graduating veterinarians (“Day 1 graduates”) to assure high-quality for National Veterinary Services.

3.1.4.2 Develop training modules and programs

Training modules, programs and additional content would be developed under the recommendations and guidance of the technical working group to meet the needs of partners and stakeholders and for which programs or materials do not already exist.

3.2 Food Safety Incident Management (IM) Network *

In its first three years, the GFSP will leverage its network of partners and experts, and support capacity building programs to improve food safety incident preparedness, response and recovery mechanisms and
respond to specific food safety incidents and hazards. This activity would facilitate the development of agreed approaches to regional and national networks for information sharing, reporting and rapid response to food safety incidents and incorporate the methods provided under the training programs above and including many of the principles delivered through the APEC/FSCF/FSIN and the Food Safety Incident Management Training (1.2).

An initial Food Safety Incident Management Workshop was held in the margins of the APEC FSCF Partnership Training Institute Network (PTIN) meeting, 14-15 May, 2011. This meeting established the APEC FSCF Food Safety Incident Network (FSIN) and became the first step toward improving incident preparedness and to strengthen linkages with INFOSAN on food safety incident management.

The GFSP would support regular workshops and consultation with food safety experts and senior food regulatory representatives to promote and develop national and regional food safety and incident reporting and response systems linked globally. Additional inputs would include technical assistance for design, implementation and alignment of regional systems and linked to a global food safety platform such as INFOSAN. Representatives of INFOSAN and the APEC/FSCF/FSIN would guide the implementation of this activity. For example, should a specific contaminant be identified as a high priority food hazard by the GFSP then relevant pilot programs that identify the gaps in capacity specific to that contaminant would be implemented on a risk analysis basis. The GFSP would support a network of experts who could be called on to provide advice on an unusual food incident or an unusual food-borne disease. This network of experts will be maintained and accessible to all stakeholders on the global food safety platform.

3.2.1 Food Safety Incident Workshops (semi-annual – 2nd in Indonesia 2013)
3.2.2 Develop FSIN and other regional platforms in consultation with INFOSAN
3.2.3 Support the development of national/regional food safety IM networks

3.3 Communication

3.3.1 Establish Communication Working group (CWG)
3.3.2 Develop and implement communication strategy
3.3.3 Develop and initiate website and social media networks

3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation *

A comprehensive system would be established to provide for analysis and metrics to evaluate food safety capacity building through needs assessments, economic analysis and impacts, the findings from which would inform further decision-making, resource allocation, and lending priorities for the Global Food Safety MDTF programs, World Bank lending, bilateral aid agency lending, etc. An M&E Working Group (MEWG) would be convened to assist in the development of an M&E and metrics framework and provide guidance on the economic analysis, expected outputs, outcomes and measurable indicators and, together with the other WGs, recommend project design based on existing best practice and experience to date.

3.4.1 M & E Working Group

3.4.2 Develop and implement M&E framework
The M&E framework would be developed early on in the GFSP program through the M&E working group to include key members of the partnership.
3.4.3 Food safety system economic analysis:
This activity would include specific case studies and analytical work to evaluate the economic impact of the GFSP and related training programs for capacity building at the national, regional and global level. The analysis would demonstrate the return on investment (ROI) from investing in safe food systems. The activities would begin with the establishment of a baseline early on in the program and, working closely with other concurrent studies at the global, regional and especially the country level, track the impact of the capacity building programs over time, the results of which would be incorporated into the M&E framework. This analysis will strengthen evidence of food safety systems performance and economic analyses for investing in safe food systems that can inform decision-making, resource allocation, and lending priorities.

3.5 Facilitation of GFSP

3.5.1 Establish working group for Governance and fundraising (GWG)
3.5.2 Annual GFSP Partners Conference and ad hoc consultations (start June & Dec/12)
3.5.3 Establish MDTF
3.5.4 Partnership Management Unit administration, GSFP coordination, and management
3.5.5 Fundraising and donor pledging
3.5.6 Establish regional focal points and identify delivery service providers
ANNEX II: GLOBAL FOOD SAFETY CAPACITY BUILDING PARTNERSHIP
BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>$ 3,350,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Food Safety Incident Management Training *</td>
<td>$ 350,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Laboratory Competency</td>
<td>$ 930,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Risk Analysis</td>
<td>$ 500,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Food Safety Regulatory System</td>
<td>$ 400,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Component 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 5,530,000.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Global/Regional Needs Assessments</td>
<td>$ 3,400,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Global &amp; Regional scaling up</td>
<td>$ 30,000,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Component 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 33,400,000.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Food Safety IT Platform</td>
<td>$ 1,025,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Food safety incident network</td>
<td>$ 1,320,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Communication</td>
<td>$ 975,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 M&amp;E</td>
<td>$ 775,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Coordination of GFSP</td>
<td>$ 1,125,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Component 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 5,220,000.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td><strong>$ 44,150,000.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX III: OPERATIONALIZING THE FIVE-YEAR ROADMAP

The Global Food Safety Capacity Building Partnership

This annex would serve as a guidance note for operationalizing the five-year roadmap of the Global Food Safety Capacity Building Partnership. More specifically, it supports the Global Scaling Up component (Component 2). It provides a customizable menu of proposed activities that could be easily adjusted to specific country circumstances to roll-out the activities envisaged in the five-year roadmap. The document would help implement the program at the country, sub-regional and regional levels and would serve as aid to regional teams who would be rolling out the program through funding from the MDTF.

1. Country Selection Criteria

Concurrently with the initial APEC/PTIN activities, the GFSP would begin to be rolled out to 2-3 countries in each of the six World Bank regions. While intensive GFSP activities would be limited to 12-18 countries, it is expected that many other countries would be able to participate in and benefit from regional workshops and knowledge sharing events, as well as have access to the open source IT platform. There are two reasons for this approach: (i) the GFSP funding and implementation capacity would not be sufficient to work intensively in all countries; and (ii) intensive engagement is considered necessary to have a significant impact on improving food safety. Candidate countries for intensive engagement would be selected based on the following criteria:

- **Country policy environment.** While essentially all developing and middle income countries face significant needs for upgrading their food safety systems, the program would initially be rolled out to countries that demonstrate that improved food safety is a high priority through their national policies and programs for agriculture, rural development, public health, trade promotion, etc. Improving food safety at the country level requires strong commitment by the private and public sector. In absence of such commitment, the interventions could not yield expected results. While the GFSP support would provide public awareness raising measures and advocacy support, the initial country commitment would be instrumental for implementation of the program. Candidate countries should include the food safety agenda prominently in their country partnership strategies with the World Bank, and/or have made significant efforts in prioritizing food safety agenda in national plans.

- **Potential for scaling up.** The GFSP would seek to support countries with existing relevant programs or projects, in order to augment the impact of the support as well as leverage other funding sources. In particular, the candidate countries should have current or planned IFC investments in the food value chain, as this would be a key factor in ensuring private sector engagement at the country level.

2. Country selection/approval process within the Bank

In order to select the participating countries for intensive engagement with the GFSP, the Secretariat would launch a consultative process both within the Bank as well as within the Working Groups of the Partnership. The internal consultative process within the Bank would be essential to ensure that the program can capitalize on the existing knowledge base and resources. Consultations would be held with management and regional focal points in each of the six regions, who were nominated by the regions for the program. In addition, consultations would be held with IFC and the Private Sector Development and PREM regional departments. The final country selection would be conducted in close consultation with
the regional VPU to ensure the higher level VPU support of the program. The total number of participating countries per year would be dependent on the available budget and resources.

3. Food Safety Capacity Building Needs Assessment

The initial entry point for a selected country would be the Food Safety Capacity Building Needs Assessment. The country level activities would be supported and guided by the initial assessment focused on two fundamental aspects of food safety - public health and market access. The capacity assessment methodologies have been developed in various international and bi-lateral technical agencies. The GFSP through its Food Safety Technical Working Group would identify the most appropriate assessment methodologies, which then would be employed for in-country assessments. Such assessments would aim at identifying the priorities for food safety interventions. The mapping of the assessment tools is currently underway. Essentially, the food safety capacity building needs assessments can be carried out using methodologies developed by international technical agencies, in particular FAO, WHO, OIE, IPPC, IFC.

With regards to the market access capacity assessment, i.e. the needs assessment for the private sector, the partnership would support value chain approach to capacity building. As such, after identifying the priority value chains at the country level, the partnership would help implement assessment of capacity building needs. Various assessment toolkits have been developed by both international and technical agencies, and can be utilized for implementing the capacity needs assessment. The Food Safety Technical Working Group would review the available assessment tools and would provide recommendations as to what tools could be applied.

Based on the assessment results the GFSP would support the following set of capacity building programs in each participating country.

4. Food Control System Level

Comprehensive training programs for food safety related public agencies, such as ministries of health, agriculture, trade, environment and others. These programs would be focused on addressing immediate training needs of the personnel, and introducing improved capacities for food safety management at the government and public sector level.

4.1. Policy and legislation

The objective would be to train policy makers in key aspects of improved food safety legislation and new approaches to food safety policies. Where appropriate, the trainings would focus on legislative changes in the main markets, e.g. United States, EU, China and others. The specific trainings themes could include:

- Improving food safety policies to address public health issues
- Introduction to international food safety legislation vis-à-vis key trading partners as well as WTO commitments
- Improving policy making process

4.2. Risk analysis

The objective would be to train the country level personnel in key aspects of effective risk analysis of food safety related threats. More specifically, the proper risk analysis may help better target food safety related programs in the country, as well as make the enforcement more effective. The specific training themes could include:
- Introduction of risk analysis in policy process
- Development of risk analysis systems
- Formation of risk analysis teams
- In-country stakeholder consultations and dialogue process

4.3. Inspections and public service

The objective would be to support capacity building of the public service food inspectors. The specific training themes could include:

- Inspector certification
- Variety of plant-based HACCP training for government inspection staff
- Relevant inspector trainings
- Incident management

4.4. Laboratory and public health

A specific training program for the public laboratory personnel to support capacity building. The specific training themes could include:

- Good Laboratory Practices
- Fit-for-purpose testing
- Laboratory competency building
- Training of laboratory management

4.5. Communication and public awareness for stakeholders

The objective would be to train a wide range of public and private stakeholders in communication and public awareness to address food safety related emergencies as well as broader consumer education. The specific training themes could include:

- Training for emergency management for public sector communications staff
- Simulation exercises
- Training on implementation of communication strategies
- Consumer awareness

5. Value Chain, Enterprise and Farm Level

Comprehensive training programs would focus on priority value chains identified through the capacity and needs assessment, and would deliver training to help them produce safer food and meet both domestic and international trade requirements.

5.1. General food safety training

The objective would be to build capacity in the selected value chains with regards to implementation of improved food safety practices. The specific training themes could include:

- Good Agricultural Practices
- Variety of HACCP training for identified priority value chains
5.2. Laboratory and certification

This set of trainings would focus on building capacity in private sector laboratories, including those in food plants, certification laboratories and others, to help improve the capacity for improved food safety related analyses.

- QA, Validation, and Proficiency Testing
- Implementing a quality system and obtaining accreditation.
- Analytical Methods and Data Analysis
- Lab safety and management
- Equipment maintenance and trouble shooting

6. Academic curriculum development

Where appropriate the program would help support development or introduction of advanced academic curriculum for food safety and linking the national universities with internationally recognized scientific and educational institutions. The specific themes could cover:

- Undergraduate or graduate level food safety related curriculum training for national university staff
- Twining arrangements with internationally recognized universities