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Summary
Because of fast-growing demand, export markets can absorb high value added products and offer high returns; for many developing countries export market development is thus a key requirement for rural income generation and rural growth.

Although developing countries face increasingly strict sanitary and phytosanitary standards in their export markets, they can maintain and improve market access – and improve domestic food safety and agricultural productivity – by adopting a strategic approach to food safety, agricultural health and trade. High-income countries should increase development flows to help developing countries build the capacity to plan and execute the necessary strategies.

The first proposal in this paper is to make two existing sets of guidelines widely available to interested parties, in particular through the World Bank and the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). The first covers the broad process of problem assessment, strategy development and action plan formulation; the second set deals with institutional analysis and training of staff of the official sanitary control services.

The second proposal is that interested countries and donors should speed up the ongoing development of guidelines, computer software tools and training material to help countries quantify the importance and impact of food safety issues. The focus here is on a ‘multipurpose agricultural data analysis and modelization system’.

The third proposal is to carry out a case study to help demonstrate that a number of animal health issues related to food safety should be treated as relating to ‘global public goods’ and thus require intervention on a global scale. Possible candidates are foot and mouth disease and highly pathogenic avian influenza.
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Issues and opportunities

What is food safety?
The basic definition of food safety is: ‘what makes your food safe to consume’. But a few issues make such a definition over-simplistic:

– safety cannot be absolute, so ‘safe’ should be replaced by ‘safe enough’. The concept of safety should then be replaced by the concept of ‘acceptable level of risk’;

– the level of risk depends on the way food is used: the same foodstuff can be perfectly safe if properly cooked but dangerous if consumed in raw form. The marketing of raw milk may be safe in a village in India where people traditionally boil their milk several times a day, and dangerous in a different context;

– safety and quality are distinct but closely related. For the economist, food safety is a public good, meaning that related costs and benefits cannot be captured by the mechanisms of the market, whereas food quality is a...
private good (though some amount of regulation is nevertheless needed, e.g. labelling). Quality management systems also help address safety issues;

– in a broader sense, safety also means safety with regard to animal (and plant) health. Food safety is thus closely linked to agricultural health. This is why the implications of food safety for international trade are governed in part by the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement) under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade rules supervised by the World Trade Organization.

**Why is food safety becoming more important?**

Food safety is important in two different domains: domestic consumption and access to export markets.

Demand for livestock products (as well as fruits and vegetables) is growing fast, particularly in developing countries. This growth helps to trigger change. Changes in consumption patterns create new hazards that can produce new food safety risks. In many large cities, for example, a growing number of people get their lunch from street vendors instead of at home. Changes in food processing and distribution systems, such as the development of supermarkets that are replacing traditional neighbourhood markets, also produce new types of risks. Food poisoning incidents spread to larger numbers of people, and trigger growing consumer concern about food safety. Improving food safety thus becomes an important element of better public health and food security.

Because of fast-growing demand, export markets can absorb high value added products and offer high returns, and for many developing countries export market development is a key requirement for rural income generation and rural growth. At the same time new risks and hazards are being identified, and the global burden of disease is growing, as exemplified by the recent major crises of foot and mouth disease (FMD) and bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and the current concerns with avian influenza. There is also growing consumer concern about food safety in importing countries, and as a result technical trade barriers are of increasing importance.

**The Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures: what is it and what are the implications?**

The SPS Agreement sets out a number of ‘ground rules’ about trade measures to protect the health of humans, animals or plant life, while aiming to ensure that such measures will not create unfair barriers to trade (10). There are seven of these ground rules, which relate to:

– transparency
– equivalence (recognition of different systems)
– the need for measures to be science-based and applied only to the extent necessary (using risk assessment to determine the ‘appropriate level of protection’)
– regionalisation
– the desirability of harmonisation
– the role of national sovereignty
– an established mechanism for dispute resolution.

In general terms the agreement can be said to have triggered regulatory reform and prompted action to open markets. However, there are concerns that it unduly favours advanced countries, which gain market access while less developed countries lack sufficient capacity to meet requirements for animal health and other safety and quality measures. Small, low-income countries might be particularly disadvantaged under the agreement, as they have limited public capacity, underdeveloped food systems, and higher costs per capita in regulating and monitoring food safety.

In addition, countries have differing ways of ‘framing’ problems, and large differences exist even among countries that are similar in other respects. As a result, there are still fundamental disagreements over the role of science versus the importance of consumer choice, as shown by ongoing controversies over genetically modified organisms, the beef hormone dispute, or issues related to the environment, labour regimes or animal welfare.

**Recognising the problem**

In spite of the growing importance of food safety, it is given low priority by a number of countries – and often also at the donor level. Too little attention is given to safety concerns, or to the impact of problems related to food safety and the linkages with development policies.

As a result, more often than not there is no comprehensive strategy at the national level, nobody is clearly in charge, and the issues receive attention only when there is a crisis. The situation is similar at donor level. Because food safety issues often cut across sector lines, nobody is in a position to take the lead.

From the perspective of development policy, trade raises more attention and can be used as the entry point. On the other hand, public opinion in developed countries will only focus on the issue of food safety when there is a crisis that threatens public health, as clearly illustrated by the current avian influenza crisis.
First conclusion

The first conclusion one can draw from the above is that countries need to quantify the importance and impact of food safety issues with regard to:

- the cost of limitations to access to external markets
- the cost of the absence of quality
- the importance and priority of food safety with regard to public health
- the need to go beyond risk assessment, to assess relative importance as compared to other issues
- the economic implications for incomes of the SPS Agreement and in particular the impact on the rural poor.

Institutional capacity issues

Much of the policy discussion about trade and standards in developing countries centres on finding ways to help those countries to participate in international standard-setting bodies (the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex), the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) and the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)), or otherwise influence the level and nature of the standards themselves. There have also been some suggestions that the SPS Agreement itself should be re-examined, again with greater involvement from developing countries.

Risks and hazards differ from one country to the next. Typical issues that arise, and for which too many of the less-developed countries (LDCs) lack capacity to argue their views, include:

- debate over new risks (even though established risk sources may be more important to LDC trade)
- whether different standards and systems are equivalent
- whether regulations concerning hazard analysis critical control points are equivalent
- whether equivalent domestic regulation is necessary.

However, new findings from the World Bank’s research programme on SPS standards (4) suggest that focusing on ‘the rules of the game’ represents only a partial solution, at best, and that the challenges and opportunities posed by standards can be better addressed by strengthening public and private capacities to manage food safety and agricultural health risks effectively.

In particular, the promotion of public/private partnerships is particularly important to help overcome the capacity gap.

Second conclusion

Developing countries need to analyse their institutional set-up and capacity, and in particular:

a) clarify the roles of actors:
   - public and private sector roles in the export trade
   - the roles of government, consumers and civil society in domestic issues
b) identify the needs that could be better addressed through regional cooperation
c) identify needs for research, surveillance systems, monitoring of food systems, epidemiological monitoring and capacity building in risk assessment.

Policy implications

The general trend towards more intensive livestock production very often translates into increased concentration and vertical integration of input supply, production and processing. Altogether, this represents a very serious threat to small-scale producers.

Obviously, productivity gains from improved control of plant and animal disease may benefit the rural poor. At the same time, however, a strategy that sets higher standards
might have damaging impacts on poorer producers. Controls set by the SPS, if not designed with small producers in mind, are likely to favour large-scale production units, further aggravating the threat.

The problems are particularly difficult in areas of market failure, and specific support needs to be provided in regulation, surveillance of diseases, training, extension and research.

Producer organisations can be crucial in moving the public agenda. Producers can make public services (research, extension, credit) more responsive to clients, but they need specific support to become effective.

**Third conclusion**

Developing countries need to identify and implement policies to enhance sustainable income opportunities for small farmers, in particular resource-poor livestock keepers, in order to mitigate potential negative impacts that measures for animal/plant health and food safety might have on the poor.

**Overall conclusions**

In order for developing countries to benefit more fully from the opportunities offered by international markets, they need to address food safety issues and comply with the provisions of the SPS Agreement.

There is a consensus that implementation of measures related to animal (and plant) health and food safety needs to be based on farm-to-table science-based (risk assessment) holistic approaches.

Developing countries faced with rising SPS standards in their export markets need to maintain and improve market access, position industries for long-term competitiveness, improve domestic food safety and agricultural productivity. Recent research work carried out by the World Bank (4) indicates that LDCs can achieve these goals by: 'adopting a strategic approach to food safety, agricultural health, and trade. For those countries and suppliers who are well prepared, rising standards represent an opportunity, for those who are poorly prepared, they pose safety and market access risks. High-income countries should increase development flows to help developing countries build the capacity to plan and execute the necessary strategies.'

This translates in particular into the need for such countries to:

- formulate specific strategies, programmes and policies designed in particular to mitigate the problems of the poor
- assess the countries' institutional capacity to cope with SPS requirements
- quantify the importance and impact of food safety issues
- increase the legitimacy of international standards by more participation in the standard-setting process, in particular through resource sharing and regional cooperation.

**Proposals**

**General**

Of the four points listed in the overall conclusion of the previous section, the last one (on international standard setting) is dealt with in other parts of this Review (1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11), so this article will limit its proposals to the other three topics.

Regarding the first two points – strategy and policy formulation and institutional capacity – one of the limitations often faced by LDCs is that they do not know how to develop these aspects. The World Bank has sponsored the production of tool kits or sets of guidelines to help countries build capacity in those two areas (2, 9).

The first set, entitled 'Guidelines for food safety, SPS and trade', covers the broad process of problem assessment, strategy development and action plan formulation. The second set, entitled 'Formation des personnels des services officiels de contrôle sanitaire des pays en développement' (available only in French) deals with training for staff of the official sanitary control services, and for that purpose includes guidelines for their institutional analysis.

The two sets of guidelines are described in the two following sections. The first proposal of this article (as mentioned in the introduction) is to make such guidelines widely available to interested parties, in particular through the World Bank and the OIE, this will entail getting them translated into more languages (the two sets of guidelines should be made available at least in English, French and Spanish). Members of the international development community are also invited, in line with their commitments under the SPS Agreement, to offer technical assistance to the countries willing to undertake such comprehensive reviews.

In the same way that many LDCs face problems in strategy and policy formulation and institutional capacity, a similar capacity gap exists regarding the need to quantify the importance and impact of food safety issues. This is particularly the case in sub-Saharan Africa, and has been recognised as a priority issue by the African Livestock Programme (ALive), the recently established partnership
for livestock development, poverty reduction and sustainable growth in sub-Saharan Africa. One of the constraints identified by ALive is that most countries lack the capacity to analyse the livestock sector, and in particular its poverty dimensions, formulate strategies, and propose programmes for international and national funding. To address this constraint, ALive has included in its work programme a project to provide the countries with a number of interrelated tools (a tool kit), including guidelines, computer software, and the corresponding training modules. This has resulted, alongside other proposed activities, in the specification of a software tool called the ‘multipurpose agricultural data analysis and modelization system’ (DAMS), which could be used to develop quantitative analyses of food safety issues.

The second proposal of this paper is that interested countries and donors should speed up the development process. Donors and technical agencies such as the OIE should also help an initial group of countries develop their own sector analysis capacity, in order to test and improve upon the various tools that are currently available. The focus here will be on the main software proposal, and the key features of DAMS are presented in a later section (the ALive toolkit).

The third proposal – outlined in the fourth and last section – is to carry out a case study (using a tool such as DAMS) to help demonstrate that, where food safety is concerned, a number of animal health issues should be treated as issues relating to ‘global public goods’. This implies that the costs and benefits of such issues are global in scope, and are not captured by the operation of market forces, but on the contrary require global intervention on a global scale. Well-known examples are FMD or highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI).

**Guidelines for food safety and trade in the context of the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures**

The case has been made in the first part of this paper that countries need to formulate specific strategies and programmes in order to deal properly with food safety issues in relation with the SPS Agreement and trade, and in particular to develop policies to mitigate the problems of poverty.

The international agriculture and health institutes (the World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, Codex, IPPC, OIE), the World Bank, and some key traders in the global market such as the European Union and United States of America (USA) have published various guidelines to help policy-makers cope with food safety issues. Most publications tend to focus on the collection of data and analytical work for the analysis of problems, and some also discuss the possible elements of interventions; few, however, give help with the difficult step of linking data to the development of policy. In 2002, in order to bridge this gap, the World Bank commissioned a team from the University of Wageningen, the Netherlands, to prepare guidelines to help countries formulate and implement such strategies. The outcome (9) is presented here.

The solution to the lack of methodological support in this matter (i.e. how to link analytical data to policy development) lies in taking a participatory approach to policy-making. While in this approach the analytical work remains of enormous importance, it is merely the input into the interaction of policy-makers with the stakeholders affected by the policy. The guidelines aim to support this pivotal interaction by providing guidance about both analysis and consultation for policy evaluation ex ante (i.e. at the earliest stage of policy-making) at a national level. The challenge was to bring to the surface mechanisms of evaluation that help in such situations. In this way, these guidelines contribute to a more rational and less emotional policy process. Further added value comes from the fact that these guidelines were designed to address specifically the problems that may occur in developing countries.

The Wageningen document thus offers a set of guidelines and decision-support tools for developing policies on food safety in low-income and middle-income countries. Targeted users are officials in key positions in national governments, and outside consultants. Aims are to give food authorities insights into the basic policy dilemmas, to identify shortcomings and priorities, and to provide guidance about the design of interventions. These guidelines go beyond the mere description of policy issues in the field of food safety, and suggest practical options. The user is to be supported in the activities of setting the objectives for food safety policy, assessing the food safety situation and identifying priority problems to be addressed, and developing a policy strategy and an action plan for implementation. The guidelines cover the policy-making process from the earliest stages to the final go/no-go decision on the proposed action plan.

The first part of the document, setting out the guidelines, presents a process in seven steps, going from the initial activities to the preparation of an action plan, as shown in Figure 1.

Developing food safety policy is not the work of a single official, nor is it a desk exercise only. As food safety touches on the policy fields of public health, agriculture/fisheries, and trade/commerce, a cooperative effort between government officials is needed to develop sound policies. Moreover, policies need support from stakeholders in food control: consumers, producers, retailers, traders and the like. The management of the various stakes in food safety
issues poses substantial coordination challenges to the process of policy development.

The Wageningen document focuses on the need for the process to be participatory, emphasising stakeholder consultation supported by analytical work. See the left-hand side of the figure for the analytical input into the process; the right-hand side shows the operational side in terms of interactive activities and consultations (Fig. 1).

The second part of the document is a resource book for food safety policy. Its first section includes a discussion of the objectives that policy-makers in the domain of food safety may define. Subsequently some options are presented to support the development of a policy strategy. The third section suggests a range of measures and actions to achieve progress towards the objectives of food safety policy. This part concludes with a summary section aimed at decision support.

The document is partly based on field research in South Africa in 2002 and 2003. The last part of the document presents the case of contaminated groundnut as an example of how to match food policy to markets. Although this is not an animal product, the discussion should be of interest to the readers of the OIE Review as an illustrative account of real-life experience.

Guidelines on training for official sanitary control services

Recognising the key importance of the official control and certification services in the implementation of any food safety improvement programme, and the need to provide assistance to developing countries that lack institutional capacity, the World Bank commissioned a second piece of work in 2002 to complement the one described above, focusing on training for such services.

The work was undertaken by a consortium of French organisations, including the livestock department of the Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement, the National School of Veterinary Services, the Training Institute (INFOMA) and the Quality and Plant Protection Sub-Directorate of the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Engineers-for-Development Network. So far the guidelines are available in French only.

The guidelines are based in part on fieldwork carried out by the team in Senegal, South Africa and Vietnam. They cover three areas.

The first part presents a broad array of reference material, mostly in the form of pointers to websites where

---

**Fig. 1**
Food safety strategy formulation process
Source: Wageningen report (9)
detailed information can be found. It is organised in three sections:

– the world market for food products

– sanitary and phytosanitary requirements, by geographical area

– international, regional or national support organisations.

The second part presents guidelines for the institutional analysis of official services dealing with food safety and official control and certification. The guidelines also cover food safety management by private companies and companies providing control or certification on behalf of governments, as well as the use of support structures providing services such as laboratories, risk assessment or research.

The guidelines are organised around a series of templates designed to help the user put together the relevant information concerning:

– an overview of the agriculture and food situation in the country, including a brief description of the main issues and objectives relating to the improvement of food safety

– a detailed picture of the government services in charge of control and certification, in terms of statutes, missions, administrative and judicial power, and human resources and their management

– an inventory and analysis of the organisations dealing with laboratory services, risk assessment, research and university training, and of private organisations dealing with control on behalf of governments

– a review of the food companies, by sector, in terms of implementation of risk control plans or good practice processes

– an assessment of the missions and effectiveness of public/private sector coordination mechanisms.

Finally, the guidelines will help analyse the situation regarding the production of the information and arguments that will be required to convince stakeholders that the policy is worthwhile, namely the system of surveys and other surveillance systems (occurrence and epidemiology of disease incidents), including the way incidents are analysed and how the results of such analysis are used.

The third part presents guidelines on designing and developing training systems. One outcome of the institutional analysis is to identify the training needs of the various stakeholders in order to improve the sanitary condition of a given sector or product line. Then the guidelines help in drafting training specifications that can be used when requesting training suppliers to submit proposals, help appraise such proposals, and finally propose monitoring and evaluation tools.

Although the guidelines are geared towards the identification of training needs, they provide valuable guidance for the detailed analysis of a country’s institutional set-up, and as such complement very well the broader guidelines presented in the previous section.

The ALive toolkit: a set of tools for quantitative analysis

ALive is planning to provide countries with a number of interrelated tools (a tool kit), including guidelines, computer software, and the corresponding training modules. The need for modelization of the livestock sector is acknowledged by the methodological guidelines being developed under ALive for the analysis of a country’s livestock sector.

A DAMS is thus proposed (7). The objective is to develop a system that can not only undertake sector analysis of poverty reduction strategies but can also be used as a decision tool for testing policy scenarios, for sector monitoring, and for regional and project level analysis. In particular it could be used for modelling in economic terms the impact of animal diseases and of programmes designed to control them better.

The core model would represent a livestock system, defined as a herd (or flock or any other grouping) of a size corresponding to a typical production unit, and specified by suitable animal production parameters. Production systems are represented by production-unit/farm models defined as a linear combination of livestock systems and other activities (e.g. crop cultivation, non-farm activities). A region, a development programme or the entire livestock sector of a country is then represented as a linear combination of production units.

It is proposed that the system, at least in its initial version, would be based on simple deterministic cost–benefit analysis models; in other words, the user is responsible for determining the value of the parameters (e.g. milk production per lactation of a cow, yield of a crop), and the software merely compiles the data to produce results.

The DAMS approach aims to be a synthesis between the manipulation of non-typed variables and the detailed structuring of data found in other software. The idea is to structure the data in order to allow for maximum pre-definition of calculations and output tables, as well as to provide for mechanisms that would let the user specify additional calculations and define the format of customised reports (tables). The number of data types is kept relatively
limited by combining generic and specific data structures in order to provide maximum power and flexibility. The DAMS would offer two specialised data structures to handle livestock models (herd and feed) plus two primary generic data structures (data object types), called commodity and plan, which are meant to be general enough to accommodate most basic analysis situations. At the lowest level, plans can be thought of as representing activities as a combination of herds, feed and commodities produced or consumed. These activities can in turn be combined linearly into higher-level plans. For example, one can define a farm model as a plan comprising herd and crop plans, and a given sector, region or project as a plan composed of farm plans. The plan is thus the structure that represents a particular model. Calculations will be performed and reports produced for a given plan. In addition, DAMS would offer additional generic data structures to handle investments and credit, to schedule the different components of a plan, to calculate sub-totals and explore alternative scenarios, and would also offer mechanisms to specify user-defined calculations and to produce summary tables and user-defined reports.

Figure 2 presents a very simple example of the way data can be structured to define crop budgets, farm models and the entire study area.

If for example one wants to use the system to model the impact of FMD in a country where the disease is endemic, the steps would be as follows:

a) first identify all stakeholders, and in particular identify representative production or farm models, ideally by drawing on recent surveys and national statistics that indicate the typology of production systems;

b) each model would eventually be represented in DAMS, and for each model a weighting parameter would be estimated, so that the weighted sum of the models would give total values (e.g. herd size, milk production) for the study area;

c) each model corresponds to a projection into the future of what is likely to happen in a ‘normal’ situation in the absence of specific events or programmes;

d) an FMD outbreak would be simulated by modifying the parameters of a herd model to represent the impact of the disease on mortality or fertility; the weighting parameters of such modified models would be derived from available epidemiological data on the frequency of outbreaks. The dynamic nature of the herd models would be a major improvement over traditional ‘static’ models, as it would show that perturbations in the herd caused by the outbreak extend well beyond the year of the event;

e) a second set of models would represent what would happen if a better control programme were put in place. A higher vaccination coverage could be expected to result in a lower frequency of outbreaks, as well as in less severe impacts at the level of individual outbreaks (lower mortality and less loss of fertility);

f) the difference between the cost and benefit flows corresponding to the two sets of projections would give an estimate of the returns from the control programme.

Overall, the proposed system should be able to deal with the following:

- herd model (static or demographic) and feed balance
- other activities model (e.g. crops, support services)
- production system/farm/enterprise model/product line analysis/regional or national level analysis
- financing, debt service, cash flow and other financial analysis
- poverty indicators
- financial versus economic pricing
– variability, vulnerability/resilience of production systems
– ‘what-if’ scenarios
– investment return analysis (present value, internal rate of return).

Obviously the availability of the right tool is of no use if sufficient data is not available, so countries might also need to improve their statistical systems and strengthen their capacity to carry out surveys and analyse survey data. Guidelines and computer software would also be required for that purpose, but the inventory of what is already available is beyond the scope of this paper.

More information on the ALive initiative, including the draft specifications of DAMS, can be found at their website (www.alive-online.org).

**Case study on food-safety-related disease control as a global public good**

In order to go beyond what can be achieved by the kind of analysis presented in the above section, one should look at the rationale for viewing the control of food-safety-related disease as a global public good. This could be considered through one or more case studies that would look at the rationale, technical feasibility and economic justification of global or regional programmes to control specific diseases that draw their main justification from a decrease in the risks of new crises in Europe, the USA or worldwide. Possible candidates could be a global programme for the elimination of FMD, or the control of HPAI in countries where it is endemic or pandemic.

Let us take the case of FMD as an example. The initial process is not that different from the one at national level. It would involve assessing:

– what is currently known of the epidemiology of the disease
– whether it is possible to achieve consensus on the technical approach (i.e. vaccination versus culling)
– whether it is realistic to expect that the probability of success of a control programme can be reasonably estimated
– whether the impact on livestock productivity at national level would be a sufficient incentive for affected countries to undertake the programme, even assuming they get financing and technical assistance from outside, or whether something more would be needed (as a comparison, the interest of the rich world in protecting biodiversity in developing countries has translated into the establishment of the Global Environment Facility)
– what approach would be used to quantify benefits at the global level.

The donor community, possibly with the OIE taking the lead, should establish a working group of carefully selected experts and ask them, as a first step, to carry out a theoretical analysis of the kind outlined above, using readily available information. If the outcome is convincing enough, it would provide the rationale and justification for mobilising more resources and launching whatever activities would be required to move from theory to reality and prepare fully fledged feasibility studies.
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Résumé
En raison de l’augmentation rapide de la demande, les marchés d’exportation peuvent absorber des produits à fortes valeur ajoutée et rentabilité ; pour de nombreux pays en développement, augmenter les exportations est donc un moyen essentiel de générer des revenus pour le secteur rural et d’y favoriser la croissance.
Bien que les marchés d’exportation imposent aux pays en développement des normes sanitaires et phytosanitaires de plus en plus rigoureuses, ceux-ci peuvent conserver et améliorer leur accès à ces marchés (et améliorer en même temps l’ inocuité des aliments vendus localement et la productivité du secteur agroalimentaire) en adoptant une approche stratégique intégrant à la fois la sécurité sanitaire des aliments, la qualité sanitaire des productions agricoles et le commerce. Les pays à revenu élevé devraient intensifier l’aide au développement afin d’aider les pays en développement à renforcer leurs capacités de planification et de mise en œuvre des stratégies nécessaires.
La première proposition avancée par l’auteur consiste à diffuser parmi les parties prenantes deux séries de lignes directrices déjà existantes, en particulier par l’intermédiaire de la Banque mondiale et de l’Organisation mondiale de la santé animale (OIE). La première série de lignes directrices concerne les processus d’évaluation des problèmes, d’élaboration de stratégies et de formulation de plans d’action. La deuxième série concerne l’analyse institutionnelle et la formation du personnel des services officiels de police sanitaire.
En second lieu, l’auteur propose que les pays intéressés et les organisations donatrices progressent dans l’élaboration de lignes directrices, d’outils progiciels et de matériel didactique afin d’aider les pays à quantifier l’ampleur et l’impact des questions liées à la sécurité sanitaire des aliments. L’ emphase est mise sur un « système pluri-fonctionnel d’analyse des données agricoles et de modélisation ».
La troisième proposition consiste à réaliser une étude de cas visant à démontrer qu’il conviendrait d’aborder certaines questions zoosanitaires liées à la sécurité sanitaire des aliments en les rattachant à la notion de « bien public international », ce qui suppose d’admettre qu’elles requièrent une intervention à l’échelle mondiale. Deux problèmes pourraient d’ores et déjà relever de cette approche, à savoir la fièvre aphteuse et l’influenza aviaire hautement pathogène.
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Medidas sanitarias y fitosanitarias e inocuidad de los alimentos: desafíos y oportunidades para los países en desarrollo
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Resumen
Habida cuenta del rápido crecimiento de la demanda, los mercados de exportación pueden absorber productos de gran valor añadido y ofrecer un elevado rendimiento. Para muchos países en desarrollo, ampliar los mercados de exportación es pues un requisito clave para lograr que el medio rural genere ingresos y entre en la senda del crecimiento.
Aunque los mercados de exportación imponen reglas sanitarias y fitosanitarias cada vez más estrictas a los países en desarrollo, éstos pueden mantener y mejorar su acceso a esos mercados (y a la vez mejorar la inocuidad de los alimentos y la productividad agrícola en su propio territorio) trabajando estratégicamente sobre las cuestiones de la inocuidad, la sanidad agropecuaria y el comercio. Los países de elevado nivel de renta deben incrementar sus actividades de asistencia para ayudar a que los países en desarrollo adquieran la capacidad de planificar y aplicar las estrategias necesarias.
La primera propuesta que el autor formula consiste en dar amplia difusión a los dos conjuntos de directrices existentes, en particular a través del Banco Mundial y la Organización Mundial de Sanidad Animal (OIE), para hacerlos llegar a todas las partes interesadas. El primer conjunto se refiere al proceso general de evaluar problemas, concebir estrategias y formular planes de acción; el segundo trata del análisis de instituciones y la formación del personal de los servicios oficiales de control sanitario.
La segunda propuesta es que los países y donantes interesados incrementen el ritmo actual de producción de directrices, aplicaciones y programas informáticos y material didáctico para ayudar a los países a valorar cuantitativamente la importancia y las repercusiones de los problemas de inocuidad. A este respecto, el autor pone el acento en un ‘sistema polivalente de análisis de datos y elaboración de modelos agrícolas’.
La tercera propuesta consiste en realizar un estudio de caso que ayude a demostrar que hay una serie de problemas zoosanitarios ligados a la inocuidad de los alimentos que conviene considerar temas de ‘interés público mundial’, merecedores por lo tanto de una intervención a escala planetaria (dos enfermedades en las que podría centrarse el estudio son la fiebre aftosa y la influenza aviar altamente patógena).
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