

# **Strategic Review of the Global Food Safety Partnership (GFSP)**

*Food safety (FS) is a global public good related to trade, health, nutrition, food security, and more.*

*The public sector (government) does not produce food - the private sector does.*

Mats Andersson  
Consultant

November 22, 2017

**Strategic Review of  
the Global Food Safety Partnership (GFSP)**

**Table of Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 Background	8
1.2 Objectives of the Report	8
1.3 Structure of the Report	8
<b>2. Evolution of the GFSP (2013 – 2017)</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Launch and Initial Activities 2013-2015	9
2.2 GFSP Strategic Framework 2015-2020 (a summary)	9
2.3 GFSP Operations since 2015	11
<b>3. Recommendations</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1 Strategic Program Scenarios for GFSP (possible pathways going forward)	12
3.1.1 Introduction	12
3.1.2 Scenarios and related GFSP Strategies	13
3.1.3 A Country-Centred Approach	17
3.2 Outreach Program and Mobilization of Funds	21
3.3 Governance and Organization	21
<b>4. Conclusion</b>	<b>24</b>
Annex 1 People interviewed	25
Annex 2 Examples of GFSP Initiatives and Projects to Date	26
Annex 3 Extracts from the Strategic Framework 2015-2020	27
Annex 4 Review of Assumptions, Opportunities, Risks, and Key Requirements from the Strategic Framework 2015-2020	28
Annex 5 SWOT Analysis	29
Annex 6 A Country-Centered, Demand-driven Business Model for GFSP (John Lamb, 2016)	30

## **List of Tables**

Table 1	Summary of Scenario Assessments and Recommendations
---------	---

## **List of Boxes**

Box 1	Strategic Pillars and Associated Objectives
Box 2	Action Plan for a Country-Centered Approach

## **ACRONYMS**

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AfDB	African Development Bank
AIIB	Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank
CFIA	Canadian Food Inspection Agency
EFO	Externally Financed Outputs
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FDA	United States Food and Drug Administration
FSCB	Food Safety Capacity Building
GFSP	Global Food Safety Partnership
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IFI	International Financial Institutions (World Bank, ADB, AfDB, IDB, etc.)
MDTF	Multi-Donor Trust Fund
NDB	New Development Bank
OIE	World Organisation for Animal Health
SDTF	Standards and Trade Development Facility
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WHO	World Health Organization

## Executive Summary

**GFSP realized significant achievements in recent years, but suffered from fragmentation.** Following the formation of a thorough and ambitious Strategic Framework for GFSP in 2015,<sup>1</sup> key achievements have been various successful capacity building (training) engagements in China and Vietnam, and productive stakeholder events in India and Vietnam. While these and many other initiatives may have had good one-off impacts, they appear diffused and with limited sustained broader food safety (FS) systems improvement impact in the client countries,<sup>2</sup> and replication of training modules has been minimal. This project-by-project (short-/ medium-term) orientation has not leveraged GFSP to scale, or enabled a strategic agenda and consistency in the countries; but has rather fragmented the use of limited program resources. Evaluation of project outcomes has been somewhat limited though due to resource constraints.

**GFSP is a unique Public Private Partnership (PPP) platform, but needs to increase its member breadth and resource base.** It is the only broad forum for the private sector for advancement of the food safety in low- and middle-income countries. It has significant ‘convening power’, ability to catalyze capacity building activities, with or without any pooled program funding (e.g. the New Zealand and the Singapore governments recently funded GFSP activities in Vietnam directly), and ability to ‘open doors’ for the private sector. The program has suffered, however, from a limited number of partners (particularly from the private sector), declining funding, and thereby limited program capacity to realize the full value proposition of the PPP platform.

**The governance structure has evolved.** From 2013<sup>3</sup> through 2015 the structure consisted of a small Secretariat, and the partnership members engaging extensively through various Working and Advisory Groups on FS topics, and a Leadership Group as a consolidated body for strategic and other inputs to the Secretariat. This was mainly funded by a grant from the World Bank. In conjunction with the development of the mentioned Strategic Framework in 2015, these groups were dissolved and a Governing Council (GC) was established with the partners (12-14 at the time) as GC members. Since then, essentially all GFSP decisions have been taken by the GC. At its most recent meeting (October 4, 2017), however, the GC decided to streamline the governance structure, and: (a) dissolved itself; (b) gave full decision-making responsibility for the GFSP to the Secretariat (managing the funds in line with World Bank policies and procedures); and (c) instead requested the Secretariat to convene a forum for more strategic engagement with the partners and other stakeholders for the achievement of the GFSP’s mission.<sup>4</sup>

**The financial capacity has declined.** The GFSP strategic framework was launched in 2015 with an expectation of increased funding for the GFSP. This has not materialized. During 2016-2017, the total inflow of funds to GFSP was \$2-3 million dollars. However, significant in-kind and parallel financial contributions were also provided by partners and other stakeholders.<sup>5</sup> The total

---

<sup>1</sup> **The mission of the GFSP** is to enable effective and coordinated food safety capacity building through a robust public-private partnership, aiming to improve public health and economic development outcomes in developing countries.

<sup>2</sup> China and Vietnam have been the primary target countries to date.

<sup>3</sup> GFSP was launched at the end of 2012.

<sup>4</sup> The Bank is accountable for GFSP to each donor, and assumes any liability and risk for the GFSP. The GFSP is not a legal entity. As host for the Secretariat, the Bank signs legally binding Administrative Agreements with each donor. MoUs signed by the GFSP are not legally binding by the partners.

<sup>5</sup> For example, lab training in India funded by Walters, and recent activities in Vietnam funded by New Zealand and Singapore.

GFSP financial resources is at present about \$1 million, of which about 50% is committed to ongoing activities.

**GFSP has a thorough Strategic Framework 2015-2020, but needs to adapt its implementation approach.** Building on the GFSP experience to date, and responding to partner concerns, GFSP will need to sharpen its operational approach.

**Key assumptions have not materialized.** Key assumptions in 2015 were that: (a) the number of partners would increase over time; (b) significant financial resources would still be forthcoming (albeit not with the initial high expectation); and that thereby; (c) GFSP would be able to devote significant time and resources to all three Pillars in the Framework. These assumptions have not materialized, but the program structure provided by the Framework appear still to be very relevant, forming a valuable context for GFSP’s continued activities.

**Three funding Scenarios are outlined in the report.** The Scenarios are: (i) continued limited annual pooled financial resources of about \$1-2 million; (ii) increased financial resources to \$3-5 million; and (iii) significant annual financial resources (at least \$5 million). Within each scenario, optional approaches were assessed based on the Pillars 1-3, taking into consideration that everything cannot be addressed effectively with limited resources. One of the options is recommended for each scenario, as summarized in the table below.

**Summary of Scenario Assessments and Recommendations**

<b>Scenario</b>		<b>Assumed annual finance capacity</b>	<b>Option 1:</b> <i>Focus on Pillar 2</i>	<b>Option 2:</b> <i>Focus on (at least part of) Pillar 1 &amp; 2</i>	<b>Option 3:</b> <i>Focus on (at least part of) Pillar 2 &amp; 3</i>	<b>Option 4:</b> <i>Address all Pillars</i>
<b>1</b>	Continued limited pooled resources	<b>\$ 1-2 m</b>	<b>X</b>			
<b>2</b>	Increased financial resources	<b>\$ 3-5 m</b>		<b>X</b>		
<b>3</b>	Significant financial resources	<b>&gt;\$5.0 m</b>				<b>X</b>

**Apply a Country-Centered Approach.** Within the recommended options above (particularly Scenarios 2 and 3), a strategic country-centered advisory approach is suggested. I.e. concentrating on a few countries with sustained engagements for comprehensive improvement of their FS systems overall (through advisory and capacity building). Dialogues could be anchored in a model framework, i.e. the building blocks for a successful FS system in a country - a *Generic Country FS Framework (GCF)* - a GFSP knowledge product, if not already available in the FS community, outlining ‘what should ideally exist in a country’. The systems impact would need to be more than individual project outcomes or capacity building in a narrow sense (training, study tours, etc.). It would include more advisory service to support advancement of FS policies, regulations, and institutions, and other elements which would enable more and better capacity building in the country. This would be complemented by GFSP identifying projects, to be offered for delivery by

partner and other organizations (and only facilitated by GFSP to the extent needed and requested).<sup>6</sup> To realize this, GFSP would need to: (a) *Develop a GCF* (possibly a basic and an advanced version)<sup>7</sup>; (b) *Seek a committed candidate country client for initial application*. E.g. for mapping, needs assessment, gap identification, etc. (using already available material in the public domain); and (c) *Agree on a Country Action Plan* to move towards the GCF situation. This could include items on: (i) policies and regulations; (ii) institutions and organizational arrangements; (iii) infrastructure (labs, training programs, etc.); and (iv) investment needs (financing); and (d) *Evaluate, Refine, Replicate*.

***The GFSP vision can still be global***, but the number of countries possible to support in this manner will depend on the GFSP and partner resources. GFSP would pass on specific project requests to partners and other organizations for possible take-up. With partner-centered execution of projects, and with the Secretariat focused on coordination and convening of stakeholders in the client countries, limited pooled GFSP financial resources would be needed.

### **Other recommendations**

***Intensified outreach by GFSP and Partners (partner mobilization)*** is necessary to increase the breadth of the partnership and its financial resources, and thereby enhance its impact. A broad outreach campaign could include:

(a) approach (ask) OECD countries (their international cooperation and FS agencies); all IFIs (IDB, ADB, AfDB, IsDB, AIIB, NDB); key multi-national corporations and industry associations; universities; a few large foundations;<sup>8</sup>

(b) hold an international FS Capacity Conference at the World Bank (e.g. as GFSP's first Global FS Forum; see below); and

(c) convene a group of senior executives from multi-national companies for a FS Round-Table on FS capacity building in low and middle-income countries.

**Move to a streamlined, but broader governance model.** The following organizational components are recommended.

**1. *GFSP Strategic Advisory Forum with Program Management by the Secretariat.*** This has already been initiated through the recent GC decision to dissolve itself, and replace the GC with a forum for more strategic engagement with the partners and other stakeholders for the achievement of the GFSP's mission. Two bodies are envisaged which would complement each other.

***Global FS Forum.*** A broad (annual or bi-annual) public-private sector Advisory Forum, including some multi-national corporations; FS regulators in some OECD countries; IFIs; WHO; FAO; STDF; GFSI; etc.; and a few FS agencies from developing countries. I.e. a forum with representatives of the broad international 'FS community'; convened by the GFSP Secretariat or the World Bank. It would focus on: (i) coordination of efforts in developing countries; (ii) topics

---

<sup>6</sup> This approach may have some similarities with the initial intentions of the GFSP focusing on China, Vietnam, and Indonesia. The approach also resembles the concept suggested for GFSP by John Lamb (consultant) in 2016, "*Moving Toward a Country-Centered, Demand-driven Business Model*".

<sup>7</sup> The GCF could provide context for a basic FS Index, and position FS related to food security, nutrition, etc.

<sup>8</sup> Material, albeit brief, should indicate specific example activities in various countries or regions, where funding would be expected to have good impact (e.g. related to aflatoxin in Africa; aquaculture in Asia).

of common interest (e.g. how to facilitate dialogue between the industry and regulatory agencies; how to leverage resources for FS; etc.); and (iii) advice GFSP on the role that this ‘FS Community’ would want GFSP to play.

***GFSP Funders Forum.*** An Advisory Forum with the GFSP partners who are providing annual contributions to the GFSP on a continuous basis (as funding or as annual in-kind contributions). The forum could meet on ‘as needed’ basis, but at least annually, taking advice from the Global FS Forum into account. Its main role would be to: (a) decide on the strategic directions of GFSP, and oversee, refine and enhance these, as required; and (b) contribute to the continuous improvement of the GCF. The individual partner organizations should also, to the extent possible: (a) respond to project ideas and proposals generated by GFSP or obtained by GFSP as requests from countries; (b) participate in the GFSP outreach program through their networks (to drive GFSP growth); (c) provide expertise for GFSP convening events; and (d) enhance linkages of the GCF to their own projects/initiatives in developing countries.

**2. *A few Partner-driven Working Groups*** could also be considered, capitalizing on the experience and strengths of the partners for thought-leadership on selective topics of common interest. Due to the limited number of partners at present, two working groups appear sufficient. To maintain the PPP emphasis, the groups should be composed of a mix of public and private sector partners. The working group approach (if proved effective) can progress in stages. Details are provided in the report.

**GFSP has important roles to play.** There is increased interest in low and middle-income countries to improve their food safety systems, and there is a demand for international technical assistance and capacity building support. In this context, there is also an increasing need for public-private interactions for knowledge exchange and coordinated efforts. The public sector in OECD countries are interested in improved FS systems in the developing countries from both a trade and public health perspective; and from the private sector lens, strengthened FS systems will secure their supply chains, and support their brand protection. GFSP is the only broad forum for the public and private sectors to help advance the food safety in the developing countries. It has significant convening power, ability to catalyze capacity building activities (with or without any pooled program funding), and an ability to ‘open doors’ for the private sector. With an increased breadth of partners, GFSP can help selective countries improve the building blocks of their overall FS systems; with the partners and other organizations executing specific advisory and capacity building projects, and the Secretariat focusing on coordination of international efforts, convening country stakeholders, and sharing information with the international network of FS actors (public sector, private sector, academia, foundations).

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 Background**

The mission of the Global Food Safety Partnership (GFSP) is to enable effective and coordinated food safety capacity building through a robust public-private partnership aiming to improve public health and economic development outcomes. The GFSP was launched in December 2012 by the World Bank together with various public and private partners. A Strategic Framework 2015-2020 was produced in 2015 with an updated vision and strategic goals for the Partnership. The Strategic Framework encompasses activities and measurable indicators for outputs, to track progress towards accomplishment of the GFSP mission. It was understood that these activities and indicators may be refined over the course of implementation of the Strategic Framework. GFSP now sought an independent strategic review of the program and its governance arrangements going forward.

### **1.2 Objectives of the Report**

The objective of this report is to: (a) assess whether the GFSP organizational structure is aligned with its strategy; (b) review the GFSP's performance since the strategy revisit 2015; and (c) make recommendations on possible pathways for GFSP going forward.

### **1.3 Structure of the Report**

Following this introduction, the report provides a summary of the evolution of the GFSP since its launch at the end of 2012, with emphasis on the GFSP Strategic Framework 2015-2020 and recent developments. This is followed by strategic recommendations based on a set of program scenarios under different funding levels, with options assessed for the partnership (with their advantages and disadvantages). Suggestions are then made on outreach activities and organizational arrangements for GFSP to consider. A list of people interviewed is found in Annex 1, and supporting materials are provided in other Annexes.

## 2. Evolution of the GFSP (2013 – 2017)

This section summarizes the activities of GFSP to date, and the content of the Strategic Framework 2015-2020 developed in mid-2015.

### 2.1 Launch and Initial Activities 2013-2015

**The Global Food Safety Partnership (GFSP) was created in December 2012** by the World Bank together with various public and private partners, as a public-private initiative to support global cooperation for food safety capacity building, and to promote and better coordinate such capacity building efforts in low- and middle-income countries. In short, a **Platform** to convene food safety capacity building actors globally to support and foster local and targeted partnerships.

**Governance and Finance.** From 2013 through 2015 the governance/organizational structure consisted of a small Secretariat, with the partnership members engaging through four Working Groups on various FS topics, two Advisory Groups, a Coordination Committee, and a Leadership Group as a consolidated body for strategic and other inputs to the Secretariat. Extensive activities and participation in these groups was mainly financed by a \$1.2 million grant from the World Bank’s Development Grant Facility (DGF). Substantial funding was also provided for program activities by the other partners during 2012 – 2014; in total about \$3.1 million to the GFSP Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) and through externally financed outputs (EFOs). Significant in-kind contributions of partners were also provided.

**Program Activities.** GFSP held an annual conference in each of the years 2013 and 2014, with broad participation of international stakeholders in the food safety sector. Supported project initiatives included a needs assessment and supplier training in Zambia, curriculum reviews, and chemical risk assessment training, just to mention a few (a list is found in [Annex 2](#)).

### 2.2 GFSP Strategic Framework 2015-2020 (a summary)

**In June 2015, a Strategy Retreat was held** with the extended GFSP stakeholder community, which developed a vision for the future and an updated strategy of GFSP for the period 2015-2020. The participants reached common ground on foundational perspectives,<sup>9</sup> including that:

*“GFSP offers a unique platform for discussions between public, private and academic partners and relevant international organisations, on food safety issues and in particular on food safety capacity building; ... and for public and private sector partners to more deeply engage with international organisations with oversight responsibility for food safety i.e., FAO, WHO, and for some aspects, OIE.*

*As well as providing a platform for global coordination and as a convener of the global dialogue, GFSP also offers opportunities to lead, influence and steer food safety capacity building locally, regionally and globally in a manner that prevents duplication and leverages existing resources and competencies amongst partners;*

---

<sup>9</sup> “Key Outcomes. Strategy Retreat, June 4 - 5 2015. Towards GFSP Strategy 2015-2020”

*The GFSP is a platform for constructive conversation, across borders and boundaries, and has the potential to become the uniting mechanism that helps break through barriers and institutional silos in a way that will identify and facilitate action on opportunities for collaboration and synergies.”*

**In October 2015, a “Strategic Framework 2015-2020” (the Framework) was produced** based on the Strategy Retreat, with the purpose to advance the mission of the GFSP during the period 2015-2020 by defining an updated vision and strategic goals for the Partnership. It was understood, that the Framework might be further refined over the course of its implementation. Key elements from the Framework are found in [Annex 3](#). The framework recognizes that:

*“food safety capacity development is a costly endeavor requiring investments by public and private partners, who often operate in silos and lack opportunities for collaboration. These partners recognize the need for a platform where international organizations, food regulators, private sector producers, processors and retailers, technical service providers, leading academic institutions and other stakeholders can convene to influence the development and implementation of collaborative approaches to address food safety capacity building needs.”*

**Three Strategic Pillars.** According to the Framework, through 2020 the GFSP would be guided by three strategic Pillars (of equal importance) plus a foundational pillar to support its internal governance and operations. It was recognized that *“activities under Pillar 1 focusing on priority setting and steering FSCB will likely not be as resource intensive as initiatives under Pillar 3, which focuses on execution.”* The Pillars with their associated objectives are in [Box 1](#).

### **Box 1: Strategic Pillars and Associated Objectives**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Strategic Pillar 1:</u></b> <b>Analyze, Capture and Report on Priorities, Tools and Effectiveness of Food Safety Capacity Building</b></p> <p><b>Objective 1.1:</b> Analyze food safety capacity development needs, priorities and methodologies <b>Objective 1.2:</b> Develop and implement food safety capacity building knowledge dissemination</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Strategic Pillar 2:</u></b> <b>Effective Convening and Coordination</b></p> <p><b>Objective 2.1:</b> Steer the development and implementation of food safety capacity building initiatives towards consensus priorities set by public-private partners</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Strategic Pillar 3:</u></b> <b>Enable Effective Execution of Food Safety Capacity Building Initiatives:</b></p> <p><b>Objective 3.1:</b> Develop and implement practical and effective processes to enable execution of coordinated food safety capacity building initiatives <b>Objective 3.2:</b> Execute ‘proof of concept’ projects according to GFSP’s operational model</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Foundational Pillar:</u></b> <b>Enact Effective Governance and Operations</b></p> <p><b>Objective 4.1:</b> Develop and implement a governance structure that supports GFSP’s operations <b>Objective 4.2:</b> Invest in GFSP secretariat functions to enable GFSP’s sustainable leadership in steering food safety capacity building globally</p>
---

## 2.3 GFSP Operations since 2015

**The governance structure has evolved.** In conjunction with the development of the Strategic Framework in mid-2015, the Advisory Groups and the Leadership Group were dissolved, and instead a Governing Council (GC) was established with all partners (12 at the time) as GC members. Since then, essentially all GFSP decisions have been taken by the GC. At its most recent meeting (October 4, 2017), however, the GC decided to streamline the governance structure, and: (a) dissolved itself; (b) gave full decision-making responsibility for the GFSP back to the Secretariat (managing the funds in line with World Bank policies and procedures); and (c) instead requested the Secretariat to convene a forum for more strategic engagement with the partners and other stakeholders for the achievement of the GFSP's mission.<sup>10</sup>

**The financial capacity has declined.** The GFSP strategic framework was launched in 2015 with an expectation of greater funding for the GFSP, but this has not materialized. During 2016-2017, the total inflow of funds to GFSP was \$2-3 million dollars. However, significant in-kind and parallel financial contributions were also provided by partners and other stakeholders.<sup>11</sup> The total GFSP financial resources is at present about \$1 million, of which about 50% is committed to ongoing activities.

**The number of project activities has increased.** China, Vietnam, and Indonesia were defined by the Governing Council as primary GFSP target countries following the development of the Framework in 2015. Key achievements in these countries have been various successful training programs (Pillar 3) in China (lab training and supplier training) and in Vietnam (on aquaculture). Productive stakeholder events were held in India and Vietnam (Pillar 2). An Africa Mapping study is ongoing, identifying current and planned FS activities by international actors in this region (to be finalized early 2018). A list of key GFSP activities to date is included as [Annex 2](#).

**But the scalability has not materialized due to the funding constraints.** While these and many other initiatives appear to have had good one-off impacts, they appear somewhat diffused and with limited sustained broader FS systems improvement impact in the client countries. Replication of training modules has been minimal to date. This project-by-project (short-/ medium-term) orientation under the resource constraints, has not leveraged GFSP to scale, or enabled a broader strategic agenda in client countries, but rather been perceived by partners and others as fragmentation to some extent of the program resources. Evaluation of project outcomes has been somewhat limited, however, due to the resource constraints. While limited investments in FS have been made in some World Bank-funded projects over the years, it is only recently that the Bank has received requests from countries for funding of FS-centered projects; particularly from China and dialogues at an early stage in Vietnam). This reflects increased prospects for scale up in low- and middle-income countries. Experience gained through GFSP has informed these projects.

---

<sup>10</sup> The GFSP will revert to the accountability of the Bank to each donor. The World Bank assumes liability and risk for the GFSP. The GFSP is not a legal entity. The Bank signs legally binding Administrative Agreements with each donor. MoUs signed by the GFSP are not legally binding by the partners.

<sup>11</sup> For example, lab training in India funded by Walters, and recent Vietnam activities funded by New Zealand and Singapore.

A brief review of the Assumptions, Opportunities, Risks, and Key Requirements that were outlined in the Framework is included in [Annex 4](#), in terms of the extent these occurred, were seized, materialized, and were met respectively.

### 3. Recommendations

This section provides strategic recommendations based on a set of program scenarios under different funding levels, with options assessed for GFSP going forward (with their advantages and disadvantages). This is followed by suggestions on outreach activities and organizational arrangements for GFSP to consider.

#### 3.1 Strategic Program Scenarios for GFSP (possible pathways going forward)

##### 3.1.1 Introduction

**Key assumptions have not materialized.** A key assumption at the launch of the GFSP was that significant financial resources would be forthcoming (in the order of \$45 million). Key assumptions in mid-2015, at the time of the development of the Strategic Framework 2015-2020, were that:

- (a) The number of partners would increase over time;
- (b) Significant financial resources would still be forthcoming (albeit not with the initial high expectation); and that thereby
- (c) GFSP would be able to devote significant time and resources to all three Pillars.

None of these assumptions have materialized. Rather, the number of partners (particularly funding partners) and the financial resources have declined somewhat, and GFSP has had to spread themselves quite thin across the three Pillars, with most of the funds in the MDTF (the joint GFSP funds) needed to maintain a limited Secretariat and carry out Pillar 2 type activities (convening and coordinating). Most project activities (Pillar 3) have been funded through EFOs, and with in-kind contributions and parallel donor funding.

**But the Strategic Framework 2015-2020 is still valid.** The program structure and guidance provided by the Framework from 2015 appear still to be very relevant, forming a valuable context for GFSP's continued activities. The considered options below within three funding Scenarios, are therefore based on the three Pillars, taking into consideration that everything cannot be addressed immediately. GFSP needs to build on the existing strong elements of the platform (see SWOT analysis in [Annex 5](#)) and articulate a sharper focus for the future, to respond to the interests of the existing partner, and to prospective new partners.

**GFSP is a unique Public Private Partnership (PPP) platform, but needs to increase its member breadth and resource base.** GFSP has important roles to play. It is the only broad forum for the private sector for advancement of the food safety in low- and middle-income countries, particularly regarding legal and regulatory matters, and a country's capacity in terms of its FS infrastructure (laboratories, training providers, inspections, etc.). GFSP has significant 'convening power', ability to catalyze capacity building activities, with or without any joint program funding (e.g. the New Zealand and the Singapore governments recently funded GFSP sponsored activities

in Vietnam as ‘parallel financing’), and ability to ‘open doors’ for the private sector. However, as mentioned above, the program has suffered from a limited number of partners (particularly from the private sector), declining funding, and thereby limited program capacity to realize (demonstrate) the full value proposition of the PPP platform.

### 3.1.2 Scenarios and Related GFSP Strategies

**The scope and depth of GFSP activities depends to a large extent on the financial capacity of the partnership** as a shared platform for FS activities. Therefore, three resource Scenarios for the GFSP operations during the coming years are reviewed below: (i) continued limited annual pooled financial resources of about \$1-2 million; (ii) increased financial resources to \$3-5 million; and (iii) significant annual financial resources (at least \$5 million). A few optional strategic approaches with reference to the Pillars 1-3 are outlined within each scenario, with a few anticipated advantages (+) and disadvantages (-).<sup>12</sup> One of the options is recommended for each scenario. A summary is found in Table 1. This is intended as input to the anticipated strategic discussions among the current GFSP partners.

**Table 1. Summary of Scenario Assessments and Recommendations**

Scenario		Assumed annual finance capacity	<u>Option 1:</u> <i>Focus on Pillar 2</i>	<u>Option 2:</u> <i>Focus on (at least part of) Pillar 1 &amp; 2</i>	<u>Option 3:</u> <i>Focus on (at least part of) Pillar 2 &amp; 3</i>	<u>Option 4:</u> <i>Address all Pillars</i>
1	Continued limited financial resources	\$ 1-2 m	X			
2	Increased financial resources	\$ 3-5 m		X		
3	Significant financial resources	>\$5.0 m				X

#### **Scenario 1. Continued limited financial resources (\$1-2 million per year).**

This represents a ‘Steady State’ situation as during the recent two years. While a ‘business-as-usual’ approach is certainly possible, it would carry significant weaknesses and risks as indicated above (see also the SWOT analysis included as Annex 5). A narrower mission (scope) could be considered however. For example: (a) focus on one specific topic, in one or more regions; e.g. aflatoxins or aquaculture; and/or (b) exclude directly trade (market access) type FS activities (instead pass such prospective activities to STDF). Such an approach would likely lower the attraction of GFSP among prospective partners through (governments, firms, academia).<sup>13</sup>

Options considered for joint GFSP activities and the Secretariat are instead as follows, anchored in the three Pillars of the GFSP Strategic Framework.

<sup>12</sup> **The Foundational Pillar:** *Enact Effective Governance and Operations*, supporting the internal GFSP governance and operations, is commented upon separately under section 3.3 Governance and Organization.

<sup>13</sup> Two other options would be to: (a) merge GFSP with the IFC FS Advisory (the legal and regulatory group). However, they have incompatible missions/objectives, and the GFSP’s PPP platform concept might create some conflicts from IFC perspective; or (b) fold GFSP into the World Bank as a traditional, subject-based MDTF for FS, available to the World Bank staff to access (i.e. apply for) as grant support for stand-alone studies, advisory, or Bank-funded investment projects. However, this would lose the PPP dimension, and most likely further reduce financial contributions from the private sector.

*Options 1.1: Concentrate on one of the Pillars*

- + Strong focus of Secretariat activities
- Narrow engagement (and limited re. Pillar 3) by the Secretariat with client countries

*Option 1.2: Aim to cover parts of both Pillar 1 and 2*

- + Outcomes of Pillar 1 activities might strengthen some Pillar 2 activities (convening events)
- Pillar 1 tends to be resource intensive, leaving little capacity for Pillar 2

*Option 1.3: Aim to cover parts of both Pillar 2 and 3*

- + Ability by the Secretariat to follow-up on some issues identified and requests received at convening events (i.e. respond to client expectations to some degree)
- Pillar 3 tends to be very resource intensive, leaving little capacity for Pillar 2

*Option 1.4: Use joint GFSP funds (MDTF) across all three Pillars where some impact can be expected (i.e. opportunistically)*

- + Experiences would be gained by the partners and the Secretariat from all Pillars 1-3. (Resources would likely only be sufficient for meaningful activities in one country though)
- Fragmentation regarding impact (although limited number of initiatives due to financial constraints)
- Risk of duplicating activities by the partners or other international entities (unless resource consuming mapping exist, or would first be done by GFSP in the country)

**Recommendation: *Option 1.1*** Concentrate GFSP Secretariat efforts on Pillar 2 (Convening and coordination), adding value to own activities by the GFSP partners; with the partners (or others) executing any GFSP sponsored projects (Pillar 3) with their own funds; either through EFOs or directly on their own (benefitting from the GFSP name, as needed). Rely on Pillar 1 type outcomes (needs assessment, analytical work; etc.) done by others (e.g. the World Bank and other IFIs; EU; CFSI; STDF; Partners; etc.). Concentrating on Pillar 2 would have low risk of ‘competing’ with activities by others (e.g. their analytical work, or projects).

**Scenario 2. Increased financial resources (\$3-5 million per year).**

This represents a scenario with a meaningful increase in resources. Options for joint GFSP activities and the Secretariat are as follows.

*Options 2.1: Concentrate on one of the Pillars*

- + Strong focus of Secretariat activities.
- + If concentration on Pillar 2, this provides a significant leverage potential also from Outreach perspective (i.e. mobilization of more partners and funding)
- + If concentration on Pillar 2 in selective (a few) countries, it has potential for broad, strong FS systems impact in those countries
  - If concentrating on Pillar 1 or 2: narrow engagement by Secretariat with client countries
  - If concentrating on Pillar 3 (responding to requests from countries), risk of fragmentation

*Option 2.2: Aim to cover both Pillar 1 and 2*

- + Outcome of Pillar 1 activities might strengthen some Pillar 2 activities (synergy)

- + Ability for the Secretariat to respond to some requests for particularly needs assessment (if not already done by others) in a country or region and/or review an issue in a country or region; further analyse /document and share good practices and case studies; etc.)
- Risk of limited follow-up (take-up of projects; Pillar 3) by partners and others of the outcome of needs assessments (Pillar 1) and stakeholder events (Pillar 2).

*Option 2.3: Aim to cover parts of both Pillar 2 and 3*

- + Ability to follow-up with fully or partly GFSP funded projects (Pillar 3) in response to issues identified and requests received at convening events (i.e. ensure responsiveness to client expectations to some degree)
- No resources for needs assessments (if required) to ensure reasonable priority of requested projects (unless this would be requested as an initial Pillar 3 project)
- Pillar 3 could be very resource intensive for the Secretariat, leaving little capacity for Pillar 2 and carrying a risk of raising expectations at Pillar 2 events which would be difficult to meet

*Option 2.4: Use joint GFSP funds (MDTF) across all three Pillars where reasonable impacts can be expected (i.e. opportunistically)*

- + Experiences would be gained by the partners and the Secretariat from all Pillars (but resources would likely only be sufficient for meaningful Pillar 1-3 activities in 2 or 3 countries.)
- Risk of fragmentation regarding impact, and limited number of initiatives due to financial constraints.
- Risk of duplicating activities done by the partners or other international entities (unless mapping – Pillar 1 - be done first in the client countries by GFSP)

**Recommendation: Option 2.2**

Focus GFSP Secretariat efforts on a combination of Pillar 1 (needs assessments and other analysis) and Pillar 2 (convening and coordinating) in a few countries with high needs and strong commitment to comprehensive FS systems improvements. I.e. a country-centred approach for sustained engagement by GFSP in a few countries. See Section 3.1.3 below for details on this recommendation. GFSP would pass on identified / requested and prioritized projects to the GFSP partners and others for take-up consideration (implementation). GFSP would continue its Pillar 2 role of coordinating and convening stakeholders in the countries, as required. GFSP pooled funds would only be funding a portion of a project in exceptional cases; e.g. in case of significant learning value or if it would be a pre-requisite for leveraging funds from a non-GFSP partner organization. The suggested option would have low risk of creating a ‘competing’ situation with a GFSP partner’s own initiatives in a country (e.g. their analytical work, or projects).

**Scenario 3. Significant financial resources (e.g. >\$5 million/year)**

This represents a scenario with very significant increase in resources. Options for joint GFSP activities and the Secretariat are as follows.

*Options 3.1: Concentrate on one of the Pillars*

- + Strong focus of Secretariat activities
- Narrow engagement by the Secretariat with client countries
- If concentrating on Pillar 1, likely more needs assessments generating more project proposals than partners and other international donors would have capacity to address.

- If concentration on Pillar 2, this amount of funds may be hard to use effectively.
- If concentrating on Pillar 3 (responding to requests from countries), risk of fragmentation.

*Option 3.2: Cover Pillar 1 and Pillar 2*

- + Outcome of Pillar 1 activities might strengthen some Pillar 2 activities (synergy)
- + Ability for the Secretariat to respond to many requests for particularly needs assessment in countries or regions (and/or review issues; analyse/document good practices or cases; etc.)
- Risk of limited follow-up /take-up of projects (Pillar 3) by partners and others, from convening events and outcomes of needs assessments (Pillar 1)

*Option 3.3: Cover Pillar 2 and significant volume of Pillar 3*

- + Ability to follow-up with fully or partly funded projects by GFSP (Pillar 3) in response to issues identified and requests received at convening events (i.e. ensure responsiveness to client requests)
- No resources for needs assessments to ensure reasonable priority of requested projects (unless this would be requested as an initial Pillar 3 project)

*Option 3.4: Use pooled GFSP funds (MDTF) across all three Pillars where reasonable impacts can be expected*

- + Resources would allow meaningful synergies across the Pillars, with valuable experiences gained by the partners and the Secretariat.
- + The resources would likely be sufficient for either:
  - (a) a sustained engagement in at least a few countries, with a set of thorough activities (needs assessments, stakeholder events, and projects) for their FS systems improvements;
  - or
  - (b) activities in many countries, in response to requests (ideally starting with needs assessment, if not already exist).
- + This level of funding would allow GFSP to create new features within the three Pillars, as appropriate. For example, seek applications for grant funding for Pillar 1 and Pillar 3 type activities from both international and local country or regional actors; **if** the GFSP Partners would support such an approach for some of the pooled GFSP funds.  
(Note: Some MDTFs at the World Bank primarily function as such grant facilities. Some MDTF, however, are available for World Bank staff only, based on application.)
- Would likely require multi-year commitments by funding partners to ensure that the GFSP Secretariat work and commitments to client countries are not disrupted.
- May need some up-front work to determine the most effective allocation among the Pillars to prevent risk of fragmentation regarding impacts.
- Risk of a perception of duplicating own activities by partners or other international entities (unless needs assessment and mapping exist (Pillar 1), be done first in GFSP client countries).

**Recommendation: Option 1.4**

The noted funding volume for Scenario 3 should be sufficient to address all three Pillars in selective countries, as envisaged in the Strategic Framework. The mentioned country-centred approach mentioned in Scenario 2 above (and further elaborated on in Section 3.1.3 below) for sustained engagements by GFSP in a few countries, could be considered for Scenario 3 as well.

GFSP might be able to use some funds for approved project requests (based on an application process) from client countries, in case the GFSP partners and other organizations would not have interest or capacity at the time to respond to certain requests on their own. (i.e. applications should first be circulated to prospective donors and firms to consider). I.e. in some situations, the GFSP MDTF could fund complete project implementations. Needs assessments and mapping of current actors in a country (Pillar 1 tasks, unless already exist) should prevent ‘competing’ situations with other organizations’ own analytical work, events, or projects in a country. Such a demand-driven GFSP component would need to be managed carefully though, to prevent raising expectations which might not be possible to meet due to insufficient GFSP funds (credibility issue).

### 3.1.3 A Country-Centered Approach

Within the recommended options above (particularly Scenarios 2 and 3), the following strategic country-centered FS advisory approach could be considered by GFSP.

***Concentrating on a few countries.*** Embark on a sustained engagement with selective (initially only a couple) countries for comprehensive improvements of their FS systems overall (through advisory and capacity building). This would entail:

- Advisory service to client countries, anchored in a model framework, i.e. the building blocks for a successful FS system in a country.
- Convening, technical assistance, and project identification roles of GFSP (Pillar 1 and 2).
- Project implementations by partners and others themselves.

Dialogues on the country’s needs and priorities would be based on the model framework – a Generic Country FS Framework (GCF) - a GFSP knowledge product, if not already available in the FS community, outlining ‘*what should ideally exist in a country*’.<sup>14</sup>

***A FS Systems Approach.*** The value addition for such systems impact would need to be more than individual project outcomes or capacity building in a narrow sense (training, study tours, etc.). It would include more advisory service to support advancement of FS policies, regulations, and institutions in the countries, and other elements which would enable more and better capacity building in the country. This would be complemented by GFSP identifying projects, to be offered for delivery by the partners and others (and only facilitated by GFSP to the extent needed and requested).

This approach may have some similarities to the initial intentions of the GFSP focusing on China, Vietnam, and Indonesia. The rationale for focusing on these countries was to demonstrate ‘proof of concept’. Various activities have taken place in China, with good results; some in Vietnam; but only limited ones in Indonesia, due to turnover of country contact points. The approach also resembles the concept suggested for GFSP by John Lamb (consultant) in 2016, “*Moving Toward a Country-Centered, Demand-driven Business Model*” (see Annex 6).

---

<sup>14</sup> Building on: (a) GFSP’s engagements and activities to date, (b) anticipated country commitments; and (c) particular country interests by GFSP partners. The initial countries, for example, could be: (i) Vietnam (of interest to many partners; (ii) India (of keen interest to the private sector); and (iii) one country in Africa. Related to the Scenarios 1 - 3 above, probably concentration would be necessary to evolve from one, to two, to three countries for the respective Scenario.

***The approach would address many objectives.*** The approach would maintain a strong PPP focus, leverage GFSP’s convening power, prevent project fragmentation, while still ensuring impacts-on-the-ground through execution of high-value projects for overall systems improvements in selective countries (concentration). It would build on GFSP’s Strategic Framework 2015-2020 and its experience to date, moving to more sustained engagements with selective countries for the advancement of their FS systems. The model framework (the GCF) would represent a knowledge product (Pillar 1); the convening emphasis is Pillar 2; and systematic project identification (Pillar 3) would provide a “support function” to the GFSP partners and others.<sup>15</sup> GFSP would complement own projects by the partners (and others) in the country, particularly through the convening activities. Government partners would be expected to particularly support trade and public health impacts of local FS systems improvements; while private multi-national corporations would also benefit from the creation of a level playing field, and improvement of stronger local supply chains in the country over time.

***A continuous improvement and expansion process.*** To realize this, GFSP would need to:

(a) *Develop a Generic Country Framework (GCF)* – articulate what the building blocks are for success, possibly with two levels of ambition (a basic and an advanced system) - with active partner engagement and input;<sup>16</sup>

(b) *Seek a committed candidate country client for initial application.* E.g. for mapping, needs assessment, gap identification, etc. (using already available material in the public domain); and

(c) *Agree on a Country Action Plan* to move towards the GCF situation. This could include items on: (i) policies and regulations; (ii) institutions and organizational arrangements; (iii) infrastructure (labs, training programs, etc.); (iv) investment needs (financing); and

(d) *Evaluate, Refine, Replicate.* The performance of the PPP platform should be measured by its support (through advisory and capacity building) of the achievement of the overall FS system in and by the client countries. (It should not be measured by the number of projects carried out or their individual outcomes.)

**Limited joint GFSP financial resources would be needed** with the Partner-centered execution of projects and with the Secretariat focused on coordination and convening of stakeholders in the client countries. The approach would initially need to be fully applied in at least one country for ‘proof of concept’. It could, for example, build on the activities to date in Vietnam, and/or be applied in one country in Africa following the completion of the ongoing Africa Mapping activity.

***GFSP vision can still be global,*** but the number of countries possible to support in this manner will depend on the pooled GFSP financial resources. Otherwise efforts will be diffused, and outcomes suffer. This is a sustained approach longer term, country-by-country, while passing on specific project requests to partners and other organizations for possible take-up. See [Box 2](#) for details.

---

<sup>15</sup> To the private as well as the public sector, although government agencies tend to have their own local offices or contact points in countries via embassies etc. to identify their FS interventions.

<sup>16</sup> The GCF could provide context for a basic FS Index, and position FS related to food security, nutrition, etc.

***The roles of the Partners and Secretariat.*** Supporting selective countries to move the building blocks of their overall FS systems closer to the Generic Country Framework (GCF), the roles of the Partners and Secretariat respectively would be as follows.

*Roles of Partners.* In short: (a) contribute to the continuous improvement and enhancement of the Generic Country Framework (GCF); and (b) to the extent possible, respond to project proposals generated by the Secretariat or obtained by them as requests from countries (i.e. execute projects; by own staff and/or contracted resources). For example, country needs assessments; advisory activities; specific capacity building projects; etc. The individual partners have also important roles to play in GFSP outreach program, by creating awareness of GFSP through their networks (to drive GFSP growth); provide expertise for GFSP convening events; and enhance linkages of the GCF to their own projects/initiatives (triggered by GFSP TA and events, or otherwise).

*Roles of the Secretariat.* In addition to maintaining productive dialogues with the main government FS agency/ies in a client country: (a) highlight coordination needs among international entities (and facilitate these to the extent possible); (b) convene stakeholders in the client country to help advance their overall FS systems toward the GCF; and (c) receive advisory and capacity building requests from countries, passing these on to the Partner organizations for review and consideration.

Indicative proportions of time to be spent by the GFSP Secretariat in the respective Scenario applying the described country-centered approach (for discussion purpose only).

	Approximately in 2016-2017 (??)	Scenario 1 (low funding)	Scenario 2 (medium)	Scenario 3 (high)
Pillar 1	20%	10%	20%	30%
Pillar 2	30%	80%	70%	50%
Pillar 3	50%	10%	10%	20%

## Box 2. Action Plan for a Country-Centered Approach

**Step 1.** *Develop a Generic Country Framework* (“what should a country ideally have?”) with active partner engagement and input. A Pillar 1 activity, for which the Africa Mapping may help (and possibly also the FS Economic Analysis work being done by the World Bank. The FS GCF could potentially be viewed as GFSP’s *Signature Product*, to continuously be enhanced and refined. The Generic Country Framework (GCF) can be used as somewhat of a benchmark. It would be important for the GCF to:

- . function as ‘ideal situation’ or ‘benchmark’ (possibly both a basic and an advanced version)
- . not be too complicated (to develop and apply in a country)
- . be enhanced in stages over time (i.e. incremental versions)
- . be applied successfully in at least one country

**Step 2.** *Seek a committed candidate country client for initial application.* E.g. mapping, needs assessment, gap identification, etc. and agree on a *Country Action Plan* to move towards the GCF situation. E.g. with items on: (i) policies and regulations; (ii) institutions and organizational arrangements; (iii) capacity building infrastructure (labs, etc.); (iv) investment needs (financing)

**Step 3.** *Evaluate, Refine, Replicate.* A continuous improvement process of the approach.

### By Pillar:

**Pillar 1. Analytical and dissemination work** (as much as possible within resource constraints)

- . First, develop a Generic Country Framework (GCF)
- . Then focus on items supporting this GCF and related strategic directions .... within resource constraints. I.e. analysis on specific priority topics in the priority countries only.

**Pillar 2. Convening and coordination** (Main GFSP foci guided by the GCF.)

- . Needs to:
  - (a) have specific (measurable) outcome objectives for each event, and generate a greed follow-on activities (i.e. “who will do what”);
  - (b) address substantive FS matters; and
  - (c) have the ‘right’ people to attend.
- . Leverage events to support Pillar 1 where possible
- . Convening particularly in countries where support is provided based on the GCF (i.e. countries where needs are high and strong commitment exist).

**Pillar 3. Project execution**

- . Mainly to be executed by the Partners or others (e.g. STDF, FAO, etc.) themselves; with low-cost GFSP facilitation support, as needed and upon request from either the beneficiaries or from the providers; e.g. when a partner sees an added value of direct GFSP involvement.
- . If necessary, GFSP sponsoring a project financially only in those countries where the GCF has been introduced (and the project is executed within the holistic systems framework, the GCF.)

## 3.2 Outreach Program and Mobilization of Funds

***Intensified outreach by GFSP and Partners (partner mobilization)*** is necessary to increase the breadth of the partnership and its financial resources, and thereby enhance its impact. An outreach campaign could, for example, include:

- (a) Approach (ask) OECD countries (the international cooperation and FS agencies); all IFIs (IDB, ADB, AfDB, IsDB, AIIB, NDB); key multi-national corporations and industry associations; universities; a few large foundations;
- (b) World Bank holding *an international (1-2 days) FS Capacity Conference* at the World Bank for knowledge exchange, idea generation, etc., with top-notch speakers (including a few from developing countries), and invite firms, universities, and OECD country agencies/embassies. Individual follow-ups.  
Note: Could be considered the first “GFSP Global Forum” suggested in section 3.3 below.
- (c) Convene a group of senior executives from multi-national companies (CEOs or VPs responsible for FS in the respective company) for *a half-day FS Round-Table* on FS capacity building in low and middle-income countries. GFSP would seek their views on the priority needs in the developing world, in terms of regulations, supply chain strengthening, local FS infrastructure, etc. The public sector GFSP partners would be invited to participate. Such ‘round-tables’ could be held regionally or in a country as well, with key corporations and public-sector organizations in the region or country.

The outreach campaign would need a brief folder with basic information; the one-pagers; and ideally, to gain traction, an example “demand matrix” (key support needs by country),<sup>17</sup> drawing from available knowledge. I.e. concrete examples of advisory and capacity building initiatives that might be attractive for international agencies or multi-national firms to support (either directly or through GFSP as facilitator or co-sponsor).

## 3.3 GFSP Governance and Organization

**The governance structure has evolved.** From 2013 through 2015 the structure consisted of a Secretariat, and the partnership members engaging extensively through four Working Groups on various FS topics, two Advisory Groups, a Coordination Committee, and a Leadership Group as a consolidated body for strategic and other inputs to the Secretariat. This was mainly funded by a grant from the World Bank. In conjunction with the development of the mentioned Strategic Framework in 2015, these groups were dissolved and a Governing Council (GC) was established with all partners (12-14 at the time) as GC members. Since then, essentially all GFSP decisions have been taken by the GC. At its recent meeting (October 4, 2017), however, the GC decided to streamline the governance structure, and: (a) dissolved itself; (b) gave full decision-making

---

<sup>17</sup> *Example of elements in a “demand matrix” by country or region (examples of productive use of additional donor funds):*

Re. Topics: (i) priority need for international technical assistance in India; (ii) model FS regulations in low and middle-income countries; (iii) follow-on activities in selective country/ies to the ongoing Africa Mapping exercise; (iv) approaches for FS improvements related to “wet markets” in developing countries; (v) first version of a country FS index,

Re. Geography: (i) global or region FS studies; (ii) analytical work in donor-priority countries (GFSP as facilitator, drawing on its network of experts.)

responsibility for the GFSP to the Secretariat (managing the funds in line with World Bank policies and procedures);<sup>18</sup> and (c) requested the Secretariat to convene a forum for more strategic engagement with the partners and other stakeholders for the achievement of the GFSP's mission.<sup>19</sup>

**Moving to a new, streamlined, but broader governance model.** Building on experience from the governance arrangements to date, a set of organizational components going forward are proposed below. They would all complement each other to strengthen the partnership, and contribute to both further thought leadership on FS, to strategy development, and to GFSP funding mobilization. The Secretariat would mainly have a convening and coordinating role across this organizational framework, but also maintain a flow of information to all partners about people met; FS situations in countries visited; and opportunities identified during its activities.

**1. *GFSP Strategic Advisory Forum with Program Management by the Secretariat.*** This has already been initiated through the recent GC decision to dissolve itself, and replace the GC with a forum for more strategic engagement with the partners and other stakeholders for the achievement of the GFSP's mission. Two bodies are envisaged which would complement each other, as follows:

***Global FS Forum.*** A broad (annual or bi-annual) public-private sector Advisory Forum, including some multi-national corporations; FS regulators in some OECD countries; IFIs beyond the World Bank (i.e. ADB, AfDB, IDB, etc.); WHO; STDF; GFSI; etc.; and a few FS agencies from the developing countries. I.e. a forum with representatives of the broad international 'FS community'. These annual forums convened by the GFSP Secretariat would focus on: (i) coordination of efforts among the participating organizations in developing countries; (ii) discussions on critical topics of common interest (e.g. how to leverage resources for FS in low- and middle-income countries; how to facilitate dialogue between the industry and regulatory agencies; etc.); and (iii) advice GFSP on the role that this 'FS Community' would want GFSP to play.

***GFSB Funders Forum.*** An Advisory Forum with the GFSP partners who are providing annual contributions to the GFSP (i.e. on a continuous basis) through the MDTF/ EFOs / special accounts, or as in-kind contributions annually (as the World Bank as a partner has provided since the start). The main role of the participants in this Forum would be to: (a) decide on the strategic directions of GFSP and thereby broadly the use of the GFSP funds in the MDTF; and (b) oversee GFSP from a perspective of adherence to the agreed directions, and refine or enhance these, as required. This forum could meet on 'as needed' basis, but at least annually, taking advice from the Global FS Forum into account.

**2. *A few Partner-driven Working Groups*** could be considered, capitalizing on the experience and strengths of the current partners for thought-leadership. Due to the limited number of partners at present, two working groups appear sufficient. To maintain the PPP emphasis, they should be composed of a mix of public and private sector partners. Partner groupings<sup>20</sup> and subjects to

---

<sup>18</sup> Currently, the human resources in GFSP Secretariat are: (i) program manager (full-time WB staff); (ii) FS specialist (half-time WB staff); (iii) research analyst (part-time consultant); program assistant (part-time WB staff); and (iv) communications officer (very limited time of a consultant).

<sup>19</sup> As host for the Secretariat, the World Bank is accountable for the GFSP to each donor, and assumes any liability and risk for the GFSP. The GFSP is not a legal entity. The Bank signs legally binding Administrative Agreements with each donor. MoUs signed by the GFSP are not legally binding by the partners.

<sup>20</sup> As an example: Group 1. Waters, UNIDO, FDA, FAO, the Netherlands; Group 2. Mars, FIA, CFIA, USAID, WB.

address, would be decided jointly (e.g. at the first Funders Forum). The working groups could invite non-partners as well to the discussions (e.g. on Skype or similar). The working group approach (if proved effective) can progress in stages, for example with adjusted partner compositions, as appropriate, and new subjects. Each working group should have: (i) defined objective(s); and (ii) a time-line (e.g. 3-4 to completion for each Stage).

Potential subjects (*examples for discussion purpose only*):

Stage A:	Group 1:	Development of GFSP strategic directions, as preparatory work for discussion in the Funders Forum (building on the Strategic Framework 2015-2020)
	Group 2:	<u>How to</u> get country regulators to engage with multi-national companies to learn from the existing FS schemes in these companies (e.g. Cargill, Nestle, etc.)
Stage B:	Group 1:	New partner mobilization (follow-on to Group 1 in Stage A)
	Group 2:	Review of the Africa Mapping output, and development of follow-on activities for GFSP and partners.

A working group would capture partner insights and views, and the partnership overall would benefit from some continuous valuable analytical engagement of the partners (obviously important that the subjects are of strong interest to the group members). It would likely need to be self-financing by the working group members, i.e. not by the MDTF, due to the current GFSP resource shortage.

## **Other Governance and Organizational Considerations**

***Seconding staff to the Secretariat.*** For some multi-donor trust fund (MDTF) secretariats hosted at the Bank, the donors sometimes find it useful to second one of their staff to work in the secretariat for a certain time (e.g. from a couple of months to a year, as in-kind contribution). Some of the GFSP partner organizations may wish to consider this, for example as a developmental assignment for their staff to work on analytical FS matters at the GFSP Secretariat in Washington, DC. Beyond working on partnership matters, seconded staff could benefit from becoming familiar with how the World Bank operates in the agriculture sector; in its advisory and analytical work, as well as in its lending. Once GFSP would have established strong engagement with a couple of client countries, the FS agencies in these countries could in principles consider the same.

***Reflection on the Partnership and Teamwork.*** The GFSP partnership represents a platform (focal point) for collaboration among partners with common interests; an organizational form for the public and private entities to jointly strive for improved food safety in low- and middle-income countries. On one hand, this means that each partner represents their organization in the partnership; but equally important, if not more, is that the discussions among partners in GFSP meetings and events, are undertaken with “GFSP hats” on; i.e. more as a GFSP team than as a collection of representatives.<sup>21</sup> However, this does not mean that everything related to the GFSP need to be done jointly; only those tasks or activities that benefit significantly from different views of the partners; for example, strategic directions (as the partners recently decided to focus on).

---

<sup>21</sup> Important factors to achieve effective teamwork is often considered to be: (a) a common objective; (b) trust among the members (earned over time); and (c) that different (even opposing) views are viewed as a strength to arrive at the best solutions.

Tasks or activities which are quite discrete and related to specific partner competencies or interest can be most effectively carried out by individual partners (team members) accordingly. This would be reflected in the Secretariat mostly concentrating on convening and coordination; and the individual partners concentrating on project executions.

#### 4. Conclusion

**The need for food safety improvements is high, and interests coincide.** There is clearly: (a) an increased interest in low and middle-income countries to improve their food safety systems; (b) continued need for international technical assistance and capacity building support; and (c) a need for public-private interactions for knowledge exchange and coordinated efforts. The public sector in OECD countries are interested in improved FS systems in the developing countries from both a trade and public health perspective; and in coherent approaches to the international cooperation regarding FS support. From the private sector's lens, strengthened FS systems in developing countries will secure their supply chains, and support their 'brand protection'. Academia values material from evidence-based project outcomes.

**GFSP has an important role to play.** It is the only broad forum for the public and private sectors to help advance the food safety in low- and middle-income countries. It has significant 'convening power', ability to catalyze capacity building activities (with or without any pooled program funding), and an ability to 'open doors' for the private sector. The program has suffered, however, from a limited number of partners (particularly from the private sector), declining funding, and thereby limited program capacity to realize and demonstrate the full value proposition of the PPP platform.

**This report outlines possible pathways going forward.** These depend to a large extent of the breadth of partners and the available resources for joint activities by the partners. However, within its global vision, GFSP can always, albeit at different levels of ambition, support selective countries on a longer-term, sustained basis, to help improve the building blocks of their overall FS systems; with the Partners and other organizations executing specific advisory and capacity building projects, and with the Secretariat focusing on coordination of international efforts (particularly in selective countries), convening stakeholders there and internationally, and sharing information with the international network of actors involved in the FS subject (public sector, private sector, academia, foundations).

People interviewed

**GFSP Secretariat**

Lystra Antoine  
Valentina Paskalova  
Tingting Wang  
Bess Winston  
Tam Thi Do

**The World Bank**

Juergen Voegelé  
Martien van Nieuwkoop  
Nathan Belete  
Steve Jaffee  
Amy Evans  
George Mokaya, Trust Funds Department

**Partners**

Mary Lou Valdez and Julie Moss (FDA)  
Paul Mayers (CFIA)  
Kelley Cormier (USAID)  
Paul Young (Waters)  
Al Bardaneh (UNIDO)

**Other stakeholders**

Sonia Bradley, Consultant  
Melvin Spreij and [Marlynne Hopper](#), STDF  
Brian Bedard, GMA Science and Education Foundation

## Examples of GFSP Initiatives and Projects to Date

### *Early projects (2013-2015)*

#### Pillar 1

- . Global Food Safety Curricula Initiative
- . Food Safety Capacity Building Needs Assessment in Zambia
- . Extensive networking and thought processes through Advisory/Expert Working Groups leading up to development of the Strategic Framework 2015-2020

#### Pillar 2 Annual GFSP Conferences 2012-2014 (Paris, Singapore, Cape Town)

#### Pillar 3

- . Development of GFSP Chemical Risk Assessment Module
- . Development of GFSP Module on Aquaculture Food Safety Training of Trainers in East Asia
- . Supplier training in Zambia
- . Dairy Food Safety Initiative in East Africa
- . Global Food Safety Partnership Online Discovery Platform

#### Pillar 4

- . Development of website, newsletters, Strategic Framework (2015-2020)

### *Recent projects (2016 – 2017):*

#### Pillar 1

- . Food Safety Capacity Building Needs Assessment in China

#### Pillar 2

- . Singapore and India: High-level Dialogue on Building Trust and Capacity for Safe Food in Asia
- . Vietnam: Convening of country stakeholders

#### Pillar 3

- . Pilot Laboratory Capacity Building Pilot in China and Vietnam
- . China: Supplier training program
- . Vietnam/SE Asia: Aquaculture training

#### Pillar 4

- . Recruitment of GFSP Program Manager
- . Independent Strategic Review (this study)

### *Ongoing projects (November 2017)*

#### Pillar 1

- . African Food Safety Capacity Building - Mapping Current Efforts and Convening Stakeholders to Improve Country-Led Strategies (to be completed early 2018)
- . Initial discussions on the feasibility of and approach for a 'FS Index'

#### Pillar 3

- . Supporting a government laboratory in India
- . Vietnam/SE Asia: Aquaculture training (continuation of earlier training events)
- . Singapore supporting training on lab testing, study tour (to be initiated shortly)

### Extracts from the Strategic Framework 2015-2020

**Food safety capacity building** encompasses building competencies, knowledge and infrastructure to support enhanced food safety outcomes. It includes the development of technical, scientific and regulatory capacity of government organizations entrusted with training, outreach, oversight, auditing and enforcement of food safety law and regulations in low- and middle-income countries. It also includes upgrades to food industry value chains and their management systems that ensure the production of safe food and to support compliance with food safety laws and regulations.

#### **MISSION OF THE GLOBAL FOOD SAFETY PARTNERSHIP**

The mission of the GFSP is to enable effective and coordinated food safety capacity building through a robust public-private partnership, aiming to improve public health and economic development outcomes in developing countries.

#### **ULTIMATE OUTCOME: IMPROVED GLOBAL FOOD SAFETY SYSTEMS**

Improved public health, increased trade, reduced rural poverty, and increased economic development.

#### **STRATEGIC VISION STATEMENT FOR 2020.**

By 2020, the GFSP aims to be a major public-private enabler, catalyst and knowledge-sharing hub for food safety capacity building initiatives in low- and middle-income countries.

**The GFSP value added.** In short, the GFSP is in the business of catalyzing and mobilizing resources to more effectively enable the execution of food safety capacity building (FSCB) in developing and middle-income countries, to improve the efficacy of initiatives and to amplify their impacts, thereby contributing to improved public health, food security, consumer confidence, trade and economic development. This is to be achieved through synthesizing and sharing FSCB knowledge and by bringing a higher level of coordination and synergy among on-going or new initiatives.

**The role of the GFSP.** The GFSP will act as a robust **Platform** to foster public-private food safety capacity building partnerships that deliver measurable improvements in food safety capacity in developing and middle-income countries. The GFSP will act following two core functions: 1) to set the course of food safety capacity building; and 2) to mobilize resources.

The **Global Platform** would facilitate the identification and prioritization of needs, bring its convening power to bear to mobilize resources to respond to such needs, and analyze and disseminate information on the effectiveness of best practices in capacity building. The GFSP would also help in coordinating **local** or regional food safety capacity building **partnerships, when asked and when certain criteria are fulfilled**, subject to available resources.

#### **GFSP PRINCIPLES AND CORE VALUES**

- Collaboration amongst the broad community of food safety partners and stakeholders to foster inclusiveness and facilitate consensus building
- Transparency in decision making and operation
- Accountability on the use of available resources and for achieving impact

## Review of Assumptions, Opportunities, Risks, and Key Requirements from the Framework

<b>Assumptions:</b>	<b>The degree occurred to date</b>
- Scaled-up private- and public-sector training expected as output of GFSP, delivered on a large scale	Very limited scale-up due to resource constraints.
- GFSP aims to maximize the impacts of targeted interventions by others through bringing together private and public partners and leveraging their collective resources.	Yes, to the extent possible under the resource constraints.
- No need for significant GFSP investments in capacity building needs analyses where the food manufacturers may already have identified gaps and addressed them.	OK. E.g. the needs analyses in China was done upon request from the food manufacturing sector.
- GFSP's coordination and convening activities should aim to leverage existing food safety meetings (not rely on newly created forums or events).	While own country-level events have been held, these appear not to have duplicated, but rather complementing other meetings.
- GFSP should facilitate knowledge sharing between public and private sector interests.	Yes, through events. Limited within the GFSP due to few partners.
<b>Opportunities:</b>	<b>The degree seized to date</b>
- GFSP should focus its efforts on enabling amplification of already existing FS efforts, such as effective execution of larger scale training, building on existing sector investments ... and by undertaking capacity building programs under its leadership more efficiently and effectively than outside the partnership.	Very limited due to resource constraints.  (hard to assess)
- There may be added opportunities to leverage new FS investments by the GFSP to support public health and economic / human development goals, as a catalyst and coordinator of such efforts.	Yes, to the extent possible under the resource constraints.
<b>Risks:</b>	<b>The degree materialized to date</b>
- GFSP partners are not able to align their priorities in a manner that support coordinated action.	While this does not appear to have been an issue, few joint projects among partners have been carried out.
- GFSP "bureaucracy" inhibits effective implementation of food safety capacity building.	The applied GC model may have been perceived as such to some extent, but has now been addressed.
- Delivering training and other capacity development activities from within GFSP being costlier than delivering the same programs without GFSP's intervention.	No. The GFSP Secretariat has tailored its role in each case.
- The Partnership fails to deliver improved food safety capacity enhancements.	No. While the volume has been limited due to resource constraints, executed programs sponsored or supported by GFSP appear to have been successful.
<b>Key requirements:</b>	<b>The degree met to date</b>
The importance of buy-in and commitment of the partners is emphasized to ensure that the <b>key requirements</b> are met.	
- The Secretariat is to be funded in a sustainable fashion (through a trust fund), at a level commensurate with the new expectations of delivery (the new model)	Not achieved to the extent required to meet the aspirations from 2015.
- The Secretariat is adequately staffed and equipped with the relevant expertise to enable the new operational model, where it plays an expert analytical role, analyzing needs, priorities, best practices of FS capacity building, beyond its coordination and convening role.	Not achieved to the extent required to meet the aspirations of 2015.
- GFSP is able to attract additional and maintain existing partners and donors to ensure sustainable funding of the GFSP Secretariat and promote investments in food safety capacity building.	Existing partners at mid-2015 essentially maintained, but no additional partners have joined.
- An agreed-upon governance structure is implemented (based on a GFSP Charter), with Governing Council (GC) acting as the decision making and steering body for GFSP.	Met
- FS oversight organizations (i.e., FAO and WHO) will provide leadership and support to the GFSP.	Very limited (e.g. WHO not a partner and only marginally engaged during 2016; more at present.)

## SWOT Analysis

### *Strengths*

- . PPP platform (unique), albeit somewhat limited at present. GFSP is essentially the only broad forum for the private sector regarding FS matters.
- . ‘Convening power’, leveraging the World Bank name
- . Ability to ‘open doors’ for the private sector
- . Thorough Strategic Framework 2015-2020 (albeit more ambitious than what realized to date)
- . Ability to catalyze activities without providing any GFSP funding (e.g. New Zealand funding a Vietnam program)
- . Basic infrastructure established (partner forum, MDTF, EFOs, MRAs (a special account for an initiative), the Secretariat with World Bank as host, website, newsletter, ...)

### *Weaknesses*

- . Few partners (particularly from private sector)
- . Limited funding (and thereby limited program capacity & FS human resources in the Secretariat); low volume of activity undermining recognition as significant FS body
- . Fragmentation of activities. Somewhat diffused project activities, albeit each one valuable on their own (limited replication to date).
- . Limited realization (demonstration) of the PPP platform potential and value-proposition.

### *Opportunities*

- . Continue to seize the PPP platform potential
- . Be recognized as the prime body for conveying and supporting a Strategic Country Framework for low and middle-income countries.
- . Be the prime global FS CB convener for low and middle-income countries
- . Leverage. Facilitate FS capacity building with no (or only limited) own funding
- . Explore relationships with food security, trade facilitation, nutrition programs, and other agriculture development subjects (at the World Bank and elsewhere).

### *Threats*

- . Incompatible priority objectives of partners; limited commitments to the partnership;
- . Other FS bodies competing for funding from the same donors, and for engagement by the private sector/associations (e.g. STDF, GFSI, FDA, FAO, IFIs, etc.)

**A Country-Centered, Demand-driven Business Model for GFSP (John Lamb, Nov. 2016)**

Suggestion: That GFSP move toward a more **country-centered, demand-driven, and participatory business model** by following the process below in a methodical manner.

1. Rather than defining programs based first on the four main themes (i.e., curriculum development, supply chain management, global/regional needs assessment, and regulatory capacity building), then looking for contexts in which to apply those programs, **treat possible partner countries (whether developing or emerging) as the first filter.**
2. Once a country has expressed interest in partnering with GFSP (whether on its own initiative or in response to marketing effort by the Secretariat), **arrange a rapid appraisal visit to the country to prequalify the prospect** by (a) exploring its own perceptions of its capacity building needs, (b) examining relevant work already done or in process, (c) meeting potential cooperating public and academic institutions as well as donors active in the country, (d) preselecting plausible subsectors and industries as well as potential cooperating lead firms and associations within them, and then (e) jointly sketching out a needs assessment based on key informant interviews.
3. Based on the recon visit, as well as later desk analysis and remote communications, **flesh out a zero-draft food safety upgrading action plan**, which would emphasize capacity-building while also highlighting complementary investment needs (such as lab infrastructure, policy or regulatory reform, organizational arrangements, financing).
4. Discuss the resulting draft plan with previously identified potential partners (public, private and knowledge) active in the country, make modifications as appropriate, and then **move the document toward a joint Draft Action Plan.**
5. Using the convening powers of the GFSP, which derive partly from its links with the WB, partly from its own charter, and partly from its promise of access to external technical and financial support, bring together all interested and qualified actors (organizational) from national government, international agencies, civil society, centers of excellence, and private industry, in an effort to **create a consensus Final Action Plan** that would establish joint priorities, allocate responsibilities, attract resources, and help ensure a coordinated public-private approach to food safety upgrading for each country.
6. Use the Final Action Plan to **draw up a Country Food Safety Upgrading Compact**, between cognizant public entities, interested private players (whether firm or association), interested donors, and other key players.
7. Based on each Compact, **oversee, participate, or just monitor execution.**
8. As more country action plans emerge, and as they move toward the stage of becoming a compact, use the resulting content to **shape the evolving GFSP global supply response, broadening, enriching and/or deepening capacity** within the Secretariat itself, with/from member private firms and academic centers of excellence, and from the international food safety community of practice.
9. As GFSP capacity expands in an organic, demand-driven, and country-led manner, **begin creating a menu of programs, tools, capabilities**, on which successive cooperating countries can choose from as they develop their own action plans.
10. As Compacts are implemented, also take care to document lessons learned, successes and failures, useful resources, experts, institutions, and so in, to **form the basis for a global food safety knowledge and action platform.**