Standards and Trade Development Facility

STDF - CABI - ICCO PROJECT:

"CocoaSafe": Capacity Building and Knowledge Sharing in SPS in Cocoa in Southeast Asia (STDF/PG/381)

REPORT OF

PROJECT INCEPTION WORKSHOP

Boulevard Hotel, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

27-28 November 2013

Prepared by

P. Swarbrick, J. Crozier, S.S. Sastroutomo & J. Ngim

December 2013

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

This report summarises the key messages conveyed during presentations and discussions at the Project Inception Meeting of the STDF funded project PG381 'CocoaSafe: Capacity Building and Knowledge Sharing in SPS in Cocoa in South East Asia'. The meeting was held over two days in Kuala Lumpur on 27-28 November 2013, with representatives from all partners and other participants. All involved expressed gratitude to the staff of CABI South East Asia for their efforts in organizing this successful meeting.

PARTICIPANTS, see Annex 1
In addition to project representatives from each organization/country, FAO (Ms. Shashi Sareen, Senior Food Safety & Nutrition Officer), the STDF Working Group (Mr. Sidney Suma, Biosecurity Adviser, GOS-UNDP-GEF) and Mars (Ms. Smilja Lambert, Cocoa Sustainability Research Manager for Asia Pacific Region, Mars Global Chocolate) were also represented.

WORKSHOP SUMMARY DAY 1 (27 November 2013)*

Following the introductions and welcome speeches the afternoon's programme of presentations began. The country partner representatives, from Malaysia and Indonesia, gave their addresses in the afternoon (a change from original programme order).

Dr Lee Choon Hui (Director General, **MCB**) informed the group that cocoa is 4th on the list of Malaysia's National Commodity Policy (which has a large emphasis on increasing smallholder production). Research and development are going well but there are bottlenecks in usage at ground level. Production in country is presently at the lowest point in many years but is expected to begin to rise in the coming years. Dr. Lee also stressed that if Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) are properly applied, meeting other set requirements such as MRLs will be easier for the farmers. Growers should monitor the use of pesticides and generally only use them when necessary. If they follow the correct GAP measures and if farmers are well informed, they can move forward and not be misled by counterfeit chemical products. "When you apply GAP you hardly need to use any pesticides when your plants are mature enough for cocoa harvest". When preparing for certification, issues such as record keeping needs to be addressed, as this will also be necessary for the regulatory authorities. Dr. Lee described MCB's work programme, which displayed a good agreement with what the project intends to do, from training and surveying/monitoring of yields and incomes, to web communication and knowledge sharing. Their experience will be invaluable in the project activities in Malaysia, for example, with farmer selection "it's a waste to approach farmers that aren't interested"- MCB know many potential participants that they can target for involvement.

Dr Soetanto Abdoellah (Member of Scientific Board and formerly Deputy Director for Research, **ICCRI**) introduced the situation in Indonesia, characterized by an increase in total cocoa area during the 2000-2012 period, with smallholders accounting for most of the increase. There are fewer big estates than in the past (in fact, only 2-3 companies are now growing cocoa). Production is down since 2009/2010 but grindings are significantly increasing. Issues affecting production include the fungal disease vascular streak dieback (VSD), insect pests cocoa pod borer (CPB) and mirids, soil fertility degradation, soil pH, ageing tree stock. He emphasized that a large number of farmers in Indonesia use chemicals. ICCRI has some well-developed training materials, which were passed to the project manager (Soetikno).

During the discussion about cocoa bean fermentation in Indonesia, Julie Flood (CABI Global Director for Commodities) asked if there is any movement towards fermentation as most Indonesian production involves wet unfermented beans. The answer was that most companies still accept unfermented beans and there is no price incentive to make it worthwhile

for a farmer's effort to ferment his beans (it's an efficient supply chain so farmers get a good price for unfermented beans; 80% of the world price).

Dr. Eremas Tade (Director of Productivity Improvement Program & Caretaker Officer, **PNG CCI**) informed the group that although PNG only contributes 2% to world production, cocoa production is the main source of income for 150,000 households. Half of PNG cocoa goes to Malaysia and 90% of PNG cocoa attains "fine flavour" status. Chemical usage in PNG is minimal due to the high cost of agrochemicals, with some used for CPB control. IPM and GAP have been recently promoted through extension services (CABI's CPB project amongst others). This was originally concentrated in East New Britain province but is now spreading to other provinces. The "model farmer" principle is used; the leader has 25 farmers who learn best practices from him. New planting materials are also being promoted; there are 14 new clones being in trial of which 4 are tolerant to CPB. Cadmium levels are a concern in PNG, and were investigated in a survey. Most samples have so far shown Cadmium (Cd) levels to be below proposed EU maximum levels.

Laurent Pipitone (Director of Economics and Statistics Division, ICCO) described the SPS legislation issues that have led to the projects inception, two examples being 2005 EU limits (pesticide MRLs) being imposed and how countries are acting to the on-going EU review on maximum levels of Cd for cocoa. It is clear that "we need a meeting of minds and constant dialogue to sharing knowledge" and ICCO acts as a platform for a unified approach to the issue. It is important to identify the problems in the supply chain in a rapid and transparent way, communicate these issues to the authorities and solve them quickly. Laurent and **Moisés Gómez-Miranda** (Project Officer, ICCO) shared some information about the on-going STDF-co-funded project in Africa. Taking place in five West African countries, EDES COLEACP are the biggest partner, others include CropLife. The project aimed to strengthen their lab facilities, raise awareness, train extension services and other stakeholders. One major output of the project was addressing the problem of illegal/counterfeit pesticides. Other concerns include costs of pesticides (trade off/ cost-benefit analysis needed) and in Ghana the main concern was access to markets in Japan (Ghana being their biggest supplier). The project has not reached all objectives due to a late start in some countries but ambitious programmes have been developed and activities continue. The final workshop will be in December 2013.

Some **outputs** of the Africa Project could be of direct benefit to the present project: EDES developed 21 training modules, and there has been a 3rd edition of the manual 'Pesticide use in cocoa' developed in association with the project; a draft of which was given to each workshop participant. A self-assessment system was described whereby all operators in the supply chain are to be identified to improve visibility, traceability and implement effective control systems and a set of different control methods (guidelines) are developed and voluntary implemented by all operators. In addition, a web site was developed for the Africa project and, following a recommendation by ICCO members, is due to be expanded to include all cocoa SPS matters. This platform could be either used for the Asia project or, at least, both web sites should be linked.

Lessons learned include the value of private sector involvement (as in the present project). Other issues were getting participating countries fully and actively involved. For the web presence, caution was needed not to put too much content on the site and to try to make it sustainable and needs driven. All aspects of the work needs to be focussed by working closely with in-country partners. Since the present project is only a two year work programme, we need to be realistic in what can be achieved and measured.

There followed some discussion of the possibility of **measuring residue levels** in cocoa samples obtained through the project. This is feasible in Malaysia since MCB can make their

lab facilities available. For Indonesia, Smilja suggested the project might make use of data from a recent project by Mars/ICCRI. However, there is no budget available for this so allocation would have to be made, or it would be included as a co-finance contribution. Sidney reminded the group that if we are to make any changes to the project, we need to inform the STDF working group.

Smilja Lambert (**Mars**) gave a presentation prepared by herself and Martin Gilmour (who was unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments) on the constraints, needs and opportunities in the region. This region has strong development potential but they have significant problems such as cocoa pod borer. Grindings are increasing in the region but production is not keeping pace (and is actually going down in some of the biggest producing countries). Production and consumption trend statistics showed the need to increase production. The region is seen as key to supplying for the growing demand for cocoa products in China and India (with the rise of the middleclass). Globally, Mars estimates a demand of approximately 5 million tonnes of cocoa beans by 2020. Cocoa yields can increase through the use of best practices, but quality and safety are critical. Key issues follow closely those highlighted by the Project document; pesticides, PAHs, OTAs, heavy metals. Also, low pH is a concern as it can induce uptake of e.g. zinc, cadmium (Cadmium limits will be a factor for production by 2018). Regarding pest management, CPB control is most effective though sleeving of pods (used in combination with the right insecticide plus GAP). This technology is applicable to smallholders although currently few farmers apply it due to the high labour cost. Work is on-going on more novel approaches for CPB control, such as semiochemicals and host plant resistance/tolerance.

Ms Shashi Sareen (FAO) presented 'Capacity Building on Food Safety in Asia Pacific Region – Challenges and Way Forward'. The challenges to food safety include globalization, spread of contamination, and the trade-off between food safety and food security. Also, regulations can be out-dated, they can be complex due to multiagency coordination and there needs to be linkage and traceability between primary production and processing. Unreported cases are another issue as is the problem of sharing of equipment/labs for food and non-food. FAO looks at policies and legislation on food safety, codex standards, inspections, certification, emergency management and recall systems. Shashi mentioned projects in the region that might lend lessons to this work, such as one in Nepal where four value chains are being assessed for opportunities to strengthen.

Shashi maintained that having good GAP in place for the purpose of attaining export was also useful for improving the situation at the local level. e.g. the India fishery sector. There was a need to improve infrastructure to reach EU markets, and as a "knock on effect" some benefits stayed in-country. However, sometimes, non-compliant material might then go to local markets as a consequence of high quality foodstuffs being exported, as happens with aflatoxin-contaminated nuts in Africa. During the discussions, we mentioned compliance with various standards, but Shashi reminds us that although buyer requirements are important, for the purpose of this project national/international barriers to trade should be the concern. Codex regulations are in place for this, and some countries base their standards on them (while other are stricter).

This is followed by discussion on **awareness of regulations**. Often the issue of awareness only become apparent when requirements change and yet this also highlights the problem of lack of information available for *existing* regulations. Also, withdrawals of regulations are often not reported. Laurent told the group that ICCO tries to monitor regulations and gives information to its member countries. However, language can of course be a barrier too for importing and exporting countries.

Certification was a topic that arose several times during the workshop. For example, Mars has a commitment towards 100% certified cocoa sourcing by 2020. Smilja said that farmers must understand why these issues are important for sustainability. Quality is their first rule, so Mars are keen on initiatives that promote quality. In PNG, farmers have a choice of certification; if they are well informed then they can choose what they want to go for. However, we are told that certification can give a questionable return for the farmer. Dr. Lee said that most of the premium goes to the certifying organization, not the farmer. Certification is not a priority for the project, but some inclusion could be made in the training activities; training material could in part come from such schemes. The project's main aim will be to enhance core level knowledge, so farmers will be enabled to make a choice.

WORKSHOP SUMMARY DAY 2 (28 November 2013)*

In day two of the workshop, the details of project activities were discussed, with the aim of making all parties aware of what the intended actions are, who is responsible, and the timing of this.

The **baseline surveys** of information were described by Dr. Soetikno. There is a need to collect relevant information related to GAP/SPS/cocoa bean safety for each of the three targets for training activities. It will take the form of a questionnaire measuring aspects of (for farmer group/co-op leaders): farmers information, farm size, agronomic practices employed, production data, income, pest management practices, awareness on residues and regulations, methods of drying and storage, awareness on bean quality and safety. For agrodealers, much of the same basic information will be captured, along with information relating to e.g. license status, sourcing of pesticides, types stocked and sold, types administered for use on cocoa, awareness of different classes and usage and training on pesticide applicator training (PAT). Traders and processors will be more involved at the postharvest level (drying and storage methods, pesticide use during storage, awareness of different classes and usage, training on PAT, awareness of bean quality and food safety).

The questions/methods will be finalised by month 6, and the survey carried out in year 1 during TOMFs and TOFs (when master facilitators carry out the survey with their facilitator trainees). At the end of project it will be repeated using the same groups and it will be expanded using the surveys at farmer level. It was recommended that National Implementing Organizations (NIOs) conduct the surveys again 1-2 years after the project to follow up and evaluate the longer term impacts of the work. It will be possible to learn from existing reports/questionnaires/materials for the project for example, analyses carried out by partner organizations. Dr Ramle bin Kasin (Director of Transfer of Technology Division, MCB) expressed concern that we should use a level of adaptation to tailor the measurements and methods to the different project participants. MCB will review the questionnaires once drafted by CABI. The NIOs need to ensure that the same respondents are used before and after for TOF and these indicators to be quantified (this will be done during development of the surveys and detailed training plans)

Development of **training materials** was then introduced by Dr. Soetikno; the project will prepare a large module for TOMF (10 days) so that the Master Facilitators (MFs) will be knowledgeable in all three aspects of the training.

Material will be sourced from the Malaysian standards, ICCO's best practices material (and recently revised manual) given out at the meeting plus the Africa project training materials, plus materials from CABI, various other books and manuals, some produced very recently, e.g. Swisscontact prepared a draft manual, with after consultation (on GAP, postharvest, and certification). Dr. Soetikno had already acquired some information and further materials were collected from MCB and ICCRI during the workshop. The curriculum will contain the following components:

1. Establishment of cocoa farm
2. Cocoa farm maintenance and crop husbandry
3. Cocoa crop protection
4. Cocoa harvest and post-harvest on farm processing and storage

Agrodealer-targeted content will be more difficult to acquire. Dr. Soetanto suggested content on where best to store liquid products. There are no manuals relevant for the project- all material is too specific for certain chemicals, and made by industry for the sale of agrochemicals. Agrodealer specific ideas include pesticide classification, PAT (application techniques), personal protective equipment (PPE), effects on natural enemies, cocoa specific chemical application, storage, biological pesticide promotion. Component 4 (material for postharvest) would include specifics on e.g. harvest time, pod splitting, OTA problems due to tools wounding the pods.

In the coming weeks, the curriculum will be prepared and circulated for feedback. Then the manuals will be developed for the TOMF training.

Smilja reminded the group that we should highlight to trainees the idea of toxicity levels from various agrochemicals. There is also a need to adhere to proven knowledge, not promote or pass on trial and error (e.g. care is needed when talking about biopesticides). The project should recommend only well understood and effective, proven control methods.

At the level of training of facilitators, training of each group should overlap eg. farmers should learn much of the information that agrodealers are taught. Key messages need to be presented to each trainee groups but with overlap and consistency between the trainings of each target group. During the project, agrodealer (and other) training will be complemented with publicity materials such as leaflets and brochures.

Mr Jeremy Ngim (**CABI** scientist) gave more details on what will be taught in the training components of the project. As described by Dr. Soetikno, training components will be guided by regulations and material from e.g. ASEAN GAP, global GAP, MCB standards, the ICCO pesticides manual, Indonesia/PNG requirements/standards. There should be harmonization of standards but exporting and market access could include differences based on target countries for export. Combining the standards information and ensuring they are harmonized for the producer will form a framework for the training and training materials. Sidney confirmed that regulatory standards will be an initial part of GAP training. Jeremy demonstrated how combining the standards information and harmonising them for the producer will form the framework for the training materials and the training courses. He went through the components of the courses.

TOMF training will contain detailed information, including negative consequences of some chemicals (some more toxic than others). Content will include types of hazards- chemical, biological, physical, e.g. worker safety, residue analysis, mention of certification, self-assessment checklist (self-audit is coming whether we like it or not), IPM cultural control etc., purchases from licensed suppliers only, specific methods like disposal, methods to prevent leaking and contamination. The importance of due diligence, documentation and recording (very few farmers actually keep records). There is a comprehensive list of topics, and who will be taught which aspects. This will be completed and sent to partners for comment.

Some other points raised: The possibility of including another project associate was discussed- **Croplife** are active in the region and could be a valuable source of information on pesticide training in particular, as they have been in the ICCO project in Africa. Dr. Soetanto suggested including mention of **early warning systems** in the IPM components of training. Sidney told the group that methyl bromide will be banned from 2015. An alternative is being

sought but at present, it's still allowed. Laurent said that authorities are looking at use of jute bags (and other sources of possible contamination) as mineral oil was found in chocolate in Germany. Dr Lee commented this is an issue of where the **jute bags** are stored (near oil). So the bags are contaminated but not necessarily on farm although bags are often old and re-used. Nonetheless, these bags have been the best mode of transport for beans for many years. We need to be aware of these aspects too as part of the wider information provision in the project.

Mr. Chan Fook Wing (**CABI** scientist) described the knowledge sharing aspects of the project that involve web content and publicity materials. The objective of the website/knowledge exchange platform is the exchange of information between project partners and raise awareness and publicity of the project to the wider community. Examples of existing sites managed by CABI and partners were given, from which experience will be valuable in site setup and maintenance. User feedback will be used to make a site map for the site, what will go on it and how you navigate it. If a site has forums and discussion/question boards they can be valuable but we should remember that communication tools are often not used properly. NIOs will use the platform for sharing of best practices and lessons learned during the project. The site will host marketing materials, multimedia videos which will be systematically organized into groups, libraries etc., and properly captioned. Raising awareness can also be done via maintaining media contacts, conducting press events if necessary. Training materials can sometimes be dual purpose- for public awareness as well. Alternative media will be included- links to social networks may be useful (there is a need to be more concise with content for these. We can look at similar sites, eg.. STDF VN website.

Laurent shared the results of the SPS African experience and indicated that the Africa SPS site was set up "from scratch" and new developments are uploaded periodically. Newsletters are good- they draw users to the site. Fook Wing agreed that analytics show that there can be low usage of a site, but an email or newsletter can increase hit rate.

If we're are going to use a systems approach, we will need to feed messages to farmers regularly to keep them informed E.g. if a non-compliance issue arises, we want to communicate it quickly between partners. Project countries will define the value of the site. STDF will also be able to link documents to the site.

Discussion on the sustainability of the website (after the project ends) was opened, during the Steering Committee meeting. Fook Wing prefers to host it on a commercial Internet Service Provider for full control and the security of backups. Migration could be considered in the longer term.

Mr Lum Weng Kiong (**CABI** financial officer) gave an outline of the available budget for the project and described the project finances and reporting requirements. As well as the detailed budget in the Project Document, the data can be summarised by partner and cost type, and this summarised form will be the basis for reporting from country partners back to CABI and ICCO. The types of proof of expenditure were given, and the need to provide these and keep records of expenses. The importance of accounting and book-keeping was impressed on the group, and separate book keeping accounts should be established for co-finance from MCB and ICCRI (to hold their cash contribution). CABI will provide breakdown for each partner within 3 weeks of the meeting. There will be a request for a contact point (preferably the financial manager/accountant) in each country. Disbursement of funds was made clear. Reporting on STDF funds will be done every quarter, but costs from co-finance (cash and in-kind) will be required on a six monthly basis.

Moisés Gómez-Miranda described the expected roles and responsibilities of the NIOs. NIOs are local institutions recognized for their expertise in the cocoa sector and they are responsible

for the implementation of the day-to-day project activities as established in the work programme. This includes bringing together other cocoa stakeholders, eg finding the right stakeholders in each country to be involved in the work; the project relies on the NIOs for this.

Also, NIOs are encouraged to organize national meetings with MoA, government institutions etc. and national committees were recommended by Moises- a national steering committee would be ideal so that countries take ownership. NIO team should include a finance officer approved by the NIO directors and relevant names should be sent to Mr. Lum (CABI).

NIOs are responsible for ensuring counterpart contributions from governments, and they should bear in mind the budgeting periods of their government. The 6-monthly report is quite straight-forward but important. It comprises progress and results, status on outputs and activities, financial review. Financial reporting is required at country level; proof of expenditure etc. and very strict evidence is needed on how money is spent in relation to the budget. CABI will then compile this information with the assistance of ICCO.

Sharing of experience from problems encountered before by ICCO; Moises reminded the group that it is very important to identify the right stakeholders. Also that timely planning of project implementation and reporting are crucial. The workplan and programme should be planned ahead of time (for example, for availability of counterpart contributions). ICCO encourages the NIOs to get the funds ready for when they are needed. STDF requires reporting on the counterpart contributions.

Phil Swarbrick (CABI Project Development Officer) gave an introduction to the subject of Monitoring and Evaluation, informing the group of the importance of this both for accounting to the donor what has been done and achieved, but also for our own internal learning. Not only should we do what we said we would do, but we should evaluate whether they were the right things to do, and whether our interventions made any difference to the beneficiaries. There was discussion of indicators, which led into a follow-on session (see below). Some of the methods that we will use to monitor the progress of the project and measure/evaluate the achievement of objectives were mentioned (eg change in knowledge of participants between before and after project interventions, awareness of issues, measures of production, collection, processing, compliance of batches/shipments etc., interviews, questionnaires, surveys, case studies ('most significant change' stories and tracer studies), means of reporting and dissemination). Finally, there was mention of the need for projects and indicators to be gender responsive. For example, considering involvement of trainers/participants of both sexes, plus taking into consideration the engagement of youth/elderly groups, recording information on education level, marital status, and consideration of household responsibilities in the timing of events so as to promote inclusivity (e.g. holding training events on days/at times that are accommodating to child care, religious events).

DISCUSSION ON INDICATORS OF THE PROJECT

In order to better define the project's indicators, it was highlighted that they need to be more 'SMART'. Making indicators and milestones more quantitative and qualitative is important for the project to set targets that can be recorded against. There was discussion on how to improve the logframe indicators. Initially, at the activity level targets and milestones can be easily transferred in from the numbers present in the budget spreadsheet. At the results and specific objective (equivalent to outcome/purpose) level, we need to consider indicators that reflect project success in enabling market access and raising awareness. Indicators at the results level must lead into the purpose level. Specific objective/purpose should contribute to the overall objective/goal/impact level.

Dr. Lee commented that Malaysian production levels are low and Malaysia does not export many cocoa beans- they are retained at the local/national level, so it is important to have indicators that show outcomes of the project at the local level (e.g. grinders).

It is difficult to quantify the direct effects of the project as the cocoa value chain is long. However, we should first sample bean quality and then later in the project. This is to be done on a relatively local scale. Measures of volumes will have to be country specific, possibly down to the local level, as farmers reached by the project via the facilitators trained will be interspersed with others (not project trained). Thus the only way to measure increase in quality/quantity is at the local level. It will be very difficult to measure at the export level; can we discuss with SPS or the STDF secretariat to access data on shipments? In PNG, Agmark is the main exporter so we should work closely with them if project activities in the country are to be expanded. We will need access to data on rejected shipment and Smilja had examples of this data for Cargill/EU. We may be able to access this.

Uptake of information is more immediate and so is achievable. This can used to demonstrate impact in the project. Any questionnaire designed must be able to demonstrate change in behaviour. Can we learn from the Africa project here? As such, indicators have been reformulated, and are presented in Annex 4 as a revised, detailed logframe for review by project partners and representatives of the Working Group.

Following this, **development of a detailed workplan** began, in which the attached chart was expanded to detail the activities to be done for each. The chart summarises activities to be completed during the coming six months (Annex 5).

PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE

At the end of day 1 the first meeting of the Project Steering Committee was held. Most matters had being discussed openly during the main meeting sessions so the meeting was fairly brief. Committee participants are one representative from each implementing country (Drs. Lee, Soetanto, Tade), the regional coordinator (Dr Soetikno), plus Mr. Pipitone, Mr. Suma and Ms Sareen. Several inception meeting attendees also sat in and contributed.

Soetikno chaired the meeting. Three project steering meetings will be held in total, with the second one during training in Indonesia (mid-term meeting) and the third, at project close in late 2015. For on-going communication between committee members in the interim period, an email list will be compiled.

The project start date was clarified and explained: the contract was signed in late September, with the official project start date 1st November. The project activities for the next six months were outlined: training materials gathering, questionnaire development and circulation of each to the partners for feedback. It is best to initially aim at a general training document then get additional inputs from cocoa stakeholders and adapt it for local conditions. Training materials will be validated by Malaysian experts. TOMF selection criteria are to be drawn up and it was decided that coutries will submit a list of participants/facilitators who will be trained (Shashi told us that in Vietnam, farmer selection was made from different groups but were trained in all aspects- a reminder that training should cover a wide range of relevant topics). Shashi suggested exchange visits between different countries or different farmer groups in country or the national coordinator could provide a link and ensure consistency in training messages. Sidney reminded us of the importance of inputs from all three countries and it is very important to articulate the partner's contributions in reporting. Further inclusion of PNG needs to be developed. Trainers' ability is important for selection criteria but their background and membership is important. Are they part of the national system, for example? It is important to keep the skill in place by choosing to train the owner of the agrodealer business to ensure continuity. It was envisaged that trainers in others institutions who are already providing training to cocoa farmers would be included as trainers and facilitators. Smilja will check

internally if trainers from the Mars Cocoa Development Centers (CDCs) could participate. This would ensure wider dissemination of SPS issues. The web site will be established shortly with linkages to ICCO's SPS project site, or and ASEAN Cocoa Club pesticide website? This would improve sustainability. The content can be migrated after the project lifecycle. Shashi will send a link to the Vietnam project website. We can also use experiences from FAO work, and training materials.

A discussion followed that PNG is not actually in SEA. PNG were not originally part of the developing project, but it was decided that expanding the project's reach would be beneficial to all. No firm decision was made on whether to rename the project. The abbreviated name (CocoaSafe) is being used. Sidney said that the activities are mostly for Indonesia and Malaysia, but should we wish to request more support to expand into PNG then we would have to go to the working group. There might be an amendment opportunity. We might need co-finance in place first. Work in Vietnam could also be included if further funding was obtained.

CLOSING SESSION

During the closing session Dr Soetikno provided a summary of the main topics discussed during the workshop. Dr Soetikno stressed the need for NIOs to fully engage with authorities and stakeholders in the participating countries to ensure the successful implementation of the project. It was highlighted that the information resources submitted during the workshop to produce the training manuals was a very good start; however, each NIO was requested to find additional information (if available) to include in the training manuals. It was also recommended to encourage authorities from PNG to submit information and try to source funds to actively participate in the TOMF. Finally, Dr Soetikno highlighted the importance of keeping the momentum built during the workshop by maintaining constant communication between the PIA, the NIO and the PSC members.

ACTION POINTS

<u>CABI</u>

1. Inception meeting report (with inputs from ICCO)
2. Including detailed workplan for months 1-6
3. Updated logframe with improved indicators
4. Curriculum development
5. Provide budget breakdown to country partners
6. Contact FAO (Shashi) to obtain farmers selection criteria used by FAO in the Vietnam project. Also request link for Vietnam project website as example for the 'CocoaSafe' project website.

<u>In country partners</u>

1. Review and contribution to inception meeting report, review of revised logframe indicators
2. Establishing the National Project Steering Committee
3. Breakdown of budget by 6 months as requested by Mr. Lum
4. Exchange of accounting/finance details e.g. project code
5. Settling finances relating to the workshop
6. NIO to appoint the financial contact person in each participating country and establish contact with Mr. Lum.
7. NIO (with assistance from CABI and ICCO) to contact private initiatives (MARS, Swisscontact, eg) to obtain any information resources and establish partnerships for the project.

*All presentations from the Project Inception Workshop will be made available on the web- site as soon as its up and running.

Annex 1: Participants at the workshop, in order of position in the group photograph. Front row left to right, followed by back row left to right.

Participant	Designation	Organization
Front row (L-R)		
Mr Sidney Suma	Biosecurity Adviser	GOS-UNDP-GEF
Dr Soetanto Abdoellah	Member of Scientific Board	ICCRI
Mr Laurent Pipitone	Director of Economics and Statistics Division	ICCO
Dr Julie Flood	Global Director of Commodities	CABI UK
Dr Lee Choon Hui	Director General	MCB
Dr Loke Wai Hong	Regional Director	CABI SEA
Dr Eremas Tade	Director of Productivity Improvement Program & Caretaker Officer	PNG CCIL
Dr Smilja Lambert	Cocoa Sustainability Research Manager (Asia Pacific Region)	Mars Global Chocolate
Back row (L-R)		
Dr Philip Swarbrick	Project Development Officer	CABI UK
Dr Jayne Crozier	Plant Pathologist	CABI UK
Dr Soetikno S. Sastroutomo	Senior Scientist	CABI SEA
Mr Haya Ramba	Director of Biology	MCB
Mr Jeremy Ngim	Scientist	CABI SEA
Mr Moisés Gómez-Miranda	Project Officer	ICCO
Dr Ramle bin Kasin	Director of Transfer of Technology Division	MCB
Ms Shashi Sareen	Senior Food Safety & Nutrition Officer	FAO
Dr Sabariah Samsudin	Director of Chemistry & Technology Division	MCB
Mr Lum Weng Kiong	Financial Officer	CABI SEA
Ms Khing Su Li (not pictured)	Scientist	CABI SEA
Mr Chan Fook Wing (not pic)	IT Specialist	CABI SEA

Annex 2: Photographs from the workshop

Group photograph

Dr Lee Choon Hui , Director General, MCB

Dr Soetanto Abdoellah, Member of Scientific Board, ICCRI

Dr Eremas Tade, Director of Productivity Improvement Program & Caretaker Officer, PNG CCIL

Mr Sidney Suma, Biosecurity Adviser, GOS-UNDP-GEF

Dr Smilja Lambert, Cocoa Sustainability Research Manager (Asia Pacific Region), Mars Global Chocolate and Dr Soetikno S. Sastroutomo, Senior Scientist & Project Manager, CABI SEA

Ms Shashi Sareen, Senior Food Safety & Nutrition Officer, FAO

Mr Laurent Pipitone, Director of Economics and Statistics Division, ICCO

Dr Julie Flood, Global Director of Commodities, CABI UK

Dr Lee Choon Hui , Director General, MCB

Mr Jeremy Ngim, Scientist, CABI SEA

Dr Loke Wai Hong, Regional Director, CABI SEA

Annex 3: Workshop Programme

STDF-CABI-ICCO PROJECT:
"CocoaSafe": Capacity Building and Knowledge Sharing in SPS in Cocoa in Southeast Asia (STDF/PG/381)

PROJECT INCEPTION WORKSHOP
Boulevard Hotel, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
27-28 November 2013

PROGRAMME

Wednesday, 27 November 2013			
Time	**Presentation**	**Subject / Topic**	**Presenter / PIC**
8.30 – 9.00 am		Arrival of Participants and Registration	
Session 1	**Opening**		
		MC: Khing Su Li	
9.00 – 9.30 am		Welcome Address by CABI SEA	Dr. Loke Wai Hong (Regional Director)
		Address by ICCO	Laurent Pipitone (Director of Economics and Statistics Division)
		Opening Address by the Malaysian Cocoa Board (MCB) *[postponed to 2.00 pm]*	Dr. Lee Choon Hui (Director General)

		Self-introduction (CABI, partners and other delegates)	
Session 2	**Background of the Project**		
		Chairperson: Loke Wai Hong	
9.30 – 10.00 am	Presentation 1	Brief Objectives and Activities of the Project	Dr. Jayne Crozier (CABI UK)
10.00 – 10.15 am		Q & A	
10.15 – 10.30 am		Coffee / Tea Break	
Session 3	**Lesson learned from related projects in the region and beyond**		
		Chairperson: Julie Flood	
10.30 – 11.00 am	Presentation 2	SPS Capacity Building in Africa	Laurent Pipitone / Moises Gomez-Miranda (ICCO)
11.00 – 11.30 pm	Presentation 3	SPS Capacity building, needs and opportunities in the region	Dr. Smilja Lambert (Mars)
11.30 – 11.45 pm		Q & A	
11.45 – 12.15 pm	Presentation 4	Capacity Building on Food Safety in the Asia Pacific: Challenges and the Way Forward	Shashi Sareen (FAO Asia Pacific)
12.15 – 12.45 pm		Facilitated discussion on lessons learned and further potential opportunities in the region	
12.45 – 2.00 pm		Lunch	
2.00 – 2.30 pm		Opening Address by the Malaysian Cocoa Board (MCB)	Dr. Lee Choon Hui (Director General)

Session 4	**Background Situation in the Participating Countries**		
		Chairperson: Loke Wai Hong	
2.30 – 3.00 pm	Presentation 5	Malaysia	Dr. Lee Choon Hui (MCB)
3.00 – 3.30 pm	Presentation 6	Indonesia	Dr. Soetanto Abdullah / Dr. Misnawi (ICCRI)
3.30 – 3.45 pm		Group photograph, followed by Coffee / Tea Break	
3.45 – 4.15 pm	Presentation 7	Papua New Guinea (PNG)	Dr. Eremas Tade (PNG CCIL)
4.15 – 4.30 pm		Q & A	
4.30 – 5.00 pm		Project Steering Committee Meeting	
5.00 pm		End of Day 1	

Thursday, 28 November 2013			
Time	**Presentation**	**Subject / Topic**	**Presenter / PIC**
Session 5	**Activities of the Project**		
		Chairperson: Jayne Crozier	
8.30 – 8.50 am	Presentation 8	Baseline Surveys	Dr. Soetikno S.S. (CABI SEA)
8.50 – 9.30 am	Presentation 9	Development of Training Materials	Dr. Soetikno S.S. (CABI SEA)
9.30 – 10.00 am	Presentation 10	Training Components	Jeremy Ngim (CABI SEA)
10.00 – 10.20 am		Coffee / Tea Break	
10.20 – 10.50 am	Presentation 11	1) Knowledge Exchange Platform and Website	Chan Fook Wing (CABI SEA)

		2) Publicity / Public Awareness	
10.50 – 11.30 am		Q & A	
Session 6	**Budget and Allocations**		
		Chairperson: Philip Swarbrick	
11.30 – 11.50 am	Presentation 12	Available budget for each activity and each country	Lum Weng Kiong (CABI SEA)
11. 50 – 12.10 pm	Presentation 13	Roles, responsibilities and expected work from the National Implementing Organizations (NIO)	Moises Gomez-Miranda (Project Officer, ICCO)
12.10 – 1.00 pm		Group discussion on the implementation and practicalities of project management	
1.00 – 2.00 pm		Lunch	
Session 7	**Monitoring & Evaluation of the Project**		
		Chairperson: Soetikno S.S.	
2.00 – 2.40 pm	Presentation 14	What is monitoring and evaluation, and why is it important for the Project?	Dr. Philip Swarbrick (CABI UK)
2.40 – 3.10 pm		Q & A	
3.10 – 3.30 pm		Coffee / Tea Break	
Session 8	**Closing Session**		
		Chairperson: Philip Swarbrick	
3.30 – 4.30 pm		Summary of the workshop, next steps and action plans	Dr. Soetikno S.S. (CABI SEA)

		Closing Speech	Laurent Pipitone (ICCO)
		Closing Address	Dr. Loke Wai Hong (Regional Director)

Annex 4: Revised Project Workplan

	Project description	**Measurable indicators**	**Sources of verification**	**Assumptions and risks**
Overall objectives (goals)	*What are the broader development objectives (goals) to which the project contributes?* To produce and trade cocoa that meets food safety and international SPS standards.	*How are overall objectives to be measured (quantity, quality and time*)? Reduction of rejections of imports of cocoa produced in Indonesia, Malaysia and PNG by consuming countries New markets accessed for cocoa from Indonesia, Malaysia and PNG	*What are the sources of information (and methods to collect and report it) for these indicators?* Statistics from importing countries showing sourcing from project countries. Source, number and reason of rejected cocoa produce consignments; Data on exports from government authorities (SPS authorities, trade and economic ministries, etc), including percentage of cocoa exports that complies with international regulations.	*What are the external factors and conditions necessary to sustain overall objectives in the long run*? Importing countries propose food sanitary regulations based on standardized and realistic measuring methods Importing countries introduce international food safety standards based on scientific and verifiable foundations
Immediate objectives (purpose)	*What are the immediate and specific development objectives at the end of the project*?	*How are objectives to be measured (quantity, quality and tim*e)?	*What are the sources of information (and methods to collect and report it) for these indicators*?	*What are the external factors and conditions necessary to achieve objectives? Which risks should be taken into consideration?*

	Food safety and SPS practices along the cocoa supply chain in Indonesia, Malaysia and PNG are improved. Increased awareness of SPS issues among supply chain stakeholders through innovative knowledge dissemination.	1. Amount of beans/cocoa that complies with international SPS standards of food safety 2. Increased awareness amongst project stakeholders of SPS and GAP issues from knowledge sharing 3. Increase in wider stakeholders' knowledge and understanding regarding the effect of the use of harmful substances in cocoa production (and presence of contaminants)	1. Sales of cocoa beans by producers, agro-dealer sales figures, export volume from project participants (Number of rejected batches *in project areas:* issues flagged up by failure to meet standards at national and provincial levels). Collect by surveying project participants and report in project reporting. As compared to baseline information (from public and private sector; using existing data collected) 2. Surveys of project stakeholders regarding awareness of issues and knowledge platform use , reported in project documentation 3. Website/publicity usage presented in end of project reporting	Government policy related to cocoa production does not change during or immediately after the project period *Risks* Security risks or political situations may change during the project period. This is thought to be unlikely as the project countries are well known and project work will be implemented by local partners with whom we have good working relations.

Expected results	*What are the tangible products and services delivered by the project to achieve its purpose*?	*How are results to be measured (quantity, quality and time)?*	*What are the sources of information (and methods to collect and report it) for these indicators*?	*What external factors and conditions outside project control must be met to obtain the expected results on schedule*?
	1. Improved capacity of SPS and GAP knowledge amongst project stakeholders Output 1.1. Training modules and curricula on GAP/ SPS/safety produced Output 1.2. master facilitators capable of training stakeholders as facilitators Outputs1.3., 1.4., 1.5., 1.6 Trainers and stakeholders at key intervention points in the value chain trained in best practices for GAP/SPS/safety in cocoa production Output 1.7. Impact survey of training participants	1. Laboratory analysis of pesticide residues, OTA, etc. from SPS and health authorities demonstrating compliance with international SPS standards pre and post project. 80% of facilitators trained are successful in evaluation on GAP, including integrated pest management (IPM), safe use of pesticides and international SPS regulations. 2. Number and type of users accessing the website, periodical exchange of information among participating countries.	1. Training reports, survey carried out during TOT sessions. Evaluation of impact survey following training activities. Measures of increased quality captured. e.g. through case studies, most significant change. 2. Usage metrics for platform: number of users, number of documents uploaded, number of comments/shares, number of queries/answers, feedback from users.	Cooperation of authorities with project activities and permission to carry out project interventions Relevant stakeholders can access the network (use of a low bandwidth alternative would encourage this) Group participants' inherent attitude towards the project: they must be convinced that it is worthwhile and be keen to become and stay involved
	2. Effective knowledge sharing and flow between organizations, project stakeholders, regional and international SPS authorities, and beyond, in Indonesia, Malaysia and Papua New Guinea	3. Comparison of project achievements with initial indicators	List of producer groups, number of meetings held, meeting minutes, reporting from project staff, attendance of SPS	Security issues in the project countries. Where any concerns are present, locations targeted by project interventions will consider security risks

	Output 2.1., 2.2. A website/knowledge exchange platform for SPS/GAP/food safety information sharing Output 2.3. Lessons from project activities shared via platform Output 2.4, 2.5. Output 2.7. PNG partners/stakeholders knowledge enhanced via access to platform 3. Project coordinated and evaluated in an effective manner, with immediate objectives evaluated and indication of progress towards overall objective		authorities and officials to international fora Reports of implementation of knowledge acquired through content or interactions on the platform Project website online and available, with links to and from other sites e.g. ICCO, CABI, ICCRI, MCB & PNG-CCI, ASEAN Cocoa Club. Website usage metrics Online surveys of SPS awareness 3. Project reports and impact evaluations	International external factors that could affect the results of the project, e.g. relative favour of oil palm over cocoa
And Activities	*What are the key activities to be carried out, and in what sequence, to produce expected results*? <u>Enhancing capacity for improving quality of cocoa and meet SPS standards</u>	*What are the work programme targets (milestones)? What are the means and costs required to implement these activities (provide summary for each)?* 1.1. curricula produced/compiled in English by month X:	*What are the sources of information to measure progress in implementation*? 1. Training reports, feedback questionnaires available via knowledge exchange platform, surveys	*What external factors and conditions outside project control must be met to implement the planned activities on schedule?* Financing from all sources is made available on a timely

	1.1 Development of locally adapted curricula for training of trainers, tailored for key intervention points in the value chain 1.2 Train agricultural officers (research and extension staff) as master facilitators (TOMF) in the context of GAP, SPS, safety and quality. 1.3. Training of facilitators: local extension staff 1.4. Training of facilitators: farm group/cooperative leaders 1.5. Training of agro-dealers as sources of knowledge for farmers in appropriate pesticide use 1.6. Training of facilitators in best practices postharvest: traders and processors 1.7. Training in best practice postharvest 1.8. Baseline/Impact survey: carry out surveys of impact of the activities <u>Facilitating knowledge sharing between project stakeholders</u> 2.1. Analysis of project stakeholders' user accessibility/requirements	Manual for TOMF to enable them to train facilitators developed by month 3, 50 copies of training manuals made by month 6 (each country-Indonesia/Malaysia) 1.2. 2 training courses run by end of month 8 40 master facilitators (agricultural extension staff) trained 1.3. 5 training courses run by end month 18 (Indonesia). 1.3. 4 training courses run by end month 18 (Malaysia). 1.4. 5 training courses run by end month 18 (Indonesia). 1.4. 4 training courses run by end month 18 (Malaysia). 1.2. 2 training courses run by end month 18 (Indonesia). 1.5. 2 training courses run by end month 18 (Malaysia).	and reports, evaluation report. 2. Report of user requirements, feedback questionnaires. Website usage metrics, articles, publications and presentations. Regular monitoring of knowledge exchange platform usage data. 3. Monitoring documentation, as presented in six-monthly and end of project reports Reports and publicity from inception and end of project workshops.	basis in line with proposed activities. Acquisition of additional financing of training of facilitators from actors such as provincial governments can be made. Training venues and facilities are available. Stakeholder involvement and participant compliance are active throughout. Successful and timely development of materials, adequate publishing and dissemination resources.

	2. 2. Design of website/knowledge exchange platform on website, content uploading 2.3. Maintenance and monitoring of knowledge exchange platform, encouraging interactions and sharing of lesson learned 2.4. Best practices and lessons learned from training activities shared via the knowledge platform (see component 3) 2.5. Production of printed materials 2.6. Production of multimedia content 2.7 Needs analysis and awareness raising in PNG <u>Coordination and evaluation</u> 3.1. Project co-ordination 3.2. Project inception workshop 3.3. Regional workshop at end of project	1.6. 3 training courses run by end month 18 (Indonesia). 1.7. Local training o 20 participants in Indonesia 1.8. Surveys of all participants during training events. Surveys in 5 provinces of Indonesia, 3 provinces of Malaysia following project interventions (month 22). 2. Website/knowledge exchange platform to be online by month 4. Will initially contain # documents with up to date information on SPS and GAP issues/advice. Best practice and lessons learned added on a regular basis (content added/pushed to users *<u>monthly</u>*). Website updated with links to articles fortnightly. 500 manuals Malaysia 200 posters Malaysia 500 manuals Indonesia 200 posters Indonesia		

		2 (in 2 languages) videos collated, edited and produced 500 manuals to PNG counterparts 200 posters to PNG counterparts 3.1. Project being coordinated as intended with six monthly reports 3.2. initiation meeting held 3.3. Regional workshop in month 23 and final report produced , Evaluation carried out in month 22		

Annex 5: Revised Project Logframe

Activity		Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov-Jan	Feb-Apr	May-July	Aug-Oct
Enhanced capacity of relevant stakeholders to improve quality of cocoa and meet SPS standards																	
Activity 1.1	Development of locally adapted curricula for training of trainers																
	• Collate existing relevant training materials																
	• Draft curriculum and content of training manuals for TOMF																
	• Feedback from partners																
	• Develop manual																
	• Feedback from partners																
	• Develop TOF training materials Malaysia																
	• Develop TOF training materials Indonesia																
Activity 1.2	Train agricultural officers (research and extension staff) as master facilitators (Training of Master Facilitators; TOMF)																
	• Define MF selection criteria																
	• Confirm dates, venue and participants of TOMF																
	• Training plans and logistics Malaysia																
	• Training plans and logistics Indonesia																
	Training in Malaysia																
	Training in Indonesia																
Activity 1.3	Training of facilitators: farm group/cooperative leaders (Indonesia)																
	• Define farm group/cooperative leaders selection criteria																
	• Confirm dates, venue and participants of TOF																
	• Training plans and logistics																

Activity 1.3	Training of facilitators: farm group/cooperative leaders (Malaysia)																	
	• Define farm group/cooperative leaders selection criteria																	
	• Confirm dates, venue and participants of TOF																	
	• Training plans and logistics																	
Activity 1.4	Training of facilitators: local extension staff (Indonesia)																	
	• Define local extension staff selection criteria																	
	• Confirm dates, venue and participants of TOF																	
	• Training plans and logistics																	
Activity 1.4	Training of facilitators: local extension staff (Malaysia)																	
	• Define local extension staff selection criteria																	
	• Confirm dates, venue and participants of TOF																	
	• Training plans and logistics																	
Activity 1.5	Training of facilitators: agro-dealers (Indonesia)																	
	• Define agro-dealers selection criteria																	
	• Confirm dates, venue and participants of TOF																	
	• Training plans and logistics																	
Activity 1.5	Training of facilitators: agro-dealers (Malaysia)																	
	• Define agro-dealers selection criteria																	
	• Confirm dates, venue and participants of TOF																	
	• Training plans and logistics																	
Activity 1.6	Training of facilitators: storage/processing (Indonesia)																	
	• Define collectors/processors selection criteria																	
	• Confirm dates, venue and participants of TOF																	
	• Training plans and logistics																	
Activity 1.6	Training in best practices postharvest: traders and processors (Indonesia)																	
	• Define traders/processors selection criteria																	
	• Confirm dates, venue and participants																	
	• Training plans and logistics																	
Activity 1.7	Training in best practices storage and processing: traders and processors (for Indonesia using Malaysian experts)																	

Activity 1.8	Baseline surveys																
	• **Design of questionnaire/survey**																
	• **Feedback and refine questionnaire**																
	• **Carry out survey, during TOMF**																
	• Survey analysis																
	• Surveys/data collection during TOFs																
	• Carry out follow up survey																
	• Survey analysis																
Website/Knowledge Exchange Platform and Awareness Raising																	
Activity 2.1	**Analysis of website user accessibility/requirements**																
	Consideration of suggestions from partners and access of users																
Activity 2.2	Design, creation of website/knowledge exchange platform																
	Choice of platform to use																
Activity 2.3	Updating, maintenance and monitoring of website/knowledge exchange platform																
Activity 2.4	Best practices and lessons learned from training activities shared via the knowledge platform																
Activity 2.5	Production of printed materials for dissemination																
Activity 2.6	Production of multimedia videos for distribution and online																
Activity 2.7	Awareness-raising in PNG through website and availability/distribution of publicity materials, needs assessment study in PNG																
	Awareness needs analysis mission to PNG																
	Baseline surveys using Questionnaire developed in Activity 1.7.																
	Feedback and refine Questionnaire																
	Carry out survey																
	Survey analysis																
Coordination, management and Evaluation of the project																	
Activity 3.1	Project co-ordination																

	Regional Coordination • Establish Project Steering/Advisory Committee																	
	National Coordination • Establish Project Steering/Advisory Committee																	
Activity 3.2	Project inception workshop																	
	Inception workshop report																	
	Project mid-term workshop																	
Activity 3.3	Regional workshop at end of project																	

Key: Main responsibility for activity is colour coded such that:
Yellow represents several/all partners, Purple represents activities in Indonesia, Red Malaysia, Blue PNG, Green represents activities carried out by the PEA.