FAO GAP WORKING PAPER SERIES 4

# Report of the FAO Internal Workshop on Good Agricultural Practices

Rome, Italy, 27-29 October 2004

FAO GAP WORKING PAPER SERIES 4

# Report of the FAO Internal Workshop on Good Agricultural Practices

Rome, Italy, 27-29 October 2004

Written by
**Anne-Sophie Poisot** with **Siobhán Casey**
FAO Agriculture Department

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2007

Cover photo: FAO/19124/F. Botts

**Copies of FAO publications can be requested from:**

SALES AND MARKETING GROUP
Information Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy

**E-mail:** publications-sales@fao.org
**Fax:** (+39) 06 57053360
**Web site:** http://www.fao.org

# Table of contents

# Acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| CIRAD | International Cooperation Centre of Agricultural Research for Development |
| COAG | Committee on Agriculture |
| COP | Codes of Practice |
| CSO | Civil Society Organization |
| CGIAR | Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| GAP | Good Agriculture Practice |
| GHP | Good Handling Practice |
| GMO | Genetically Modified Organism |
| GMP | Good Manufacturing Practice |
| HACCP | Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point |
| IAEA | International Atomic Energy Agency |
| IFIF | International Feed Industry Federation |
| IDF | International Dairy Federation |
| IFAP | International Federation of Agricultural Producers |
| IGO | Intergovernmental Organizations |
| IPPC | International Plant Protection Convention |
| IPM | Integrated Pest Management |
| ISEAL | International Social Environmental and Accreditation Label |
| MDG | Millennium Development Goals |
| MERCOSUR | Southern Common Market |
| NGO | Non Governmental Organization |
| OECD | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| OIE | International Office of Epizootics |
| PAIA | Priority Area for Interdisciplinary Action |
| PROD | Integrated Production Systems |
| PFL | Post-harvest Food Losses |
| SARD | Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development |
| SPS | Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures |
| TCP | Technical Cooperation Programme |
| WHO | World Health Organization |
| WTO | World Trade Organization |

## FAO Service Acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| AG | Agriculture Department |
| AGA | Animal Production and Health Division |
| AGAD | Office of Director, AGA |
| AGAP | Animal Production Service |

| | |
|---|---|
| AGD | Office of Assistant Director-General, AG |
| AGE | Joint FAO/ IAEA division of Nuclear Technologies in Food and Agriculture |
| AGL | Land and Water Development Division |
| AGLL | Land and Plant Nutrition Management Service |
| AGLW | Water Resources, Development and Management Service |
| AGP | Plant Production and Protection Division |
| AGPC | Crop and Grassland Service |
| AGPP | Plant Protection Service |
| AGS | Agricultural Support Systems Division |
| AGSF | Agricultural Management, Marketing and Finance Service |
| AGST | Agricultural and Food Engineering Technologies Service |
| ES | Economic and Social Department |
| ESA | Agricultural and Development Economics Division |
| ESAE | Agricultural Sector in Economic Development Service |
| ESCB | Basic Foodstuffs Service |
| ESN | Food and Nutrition Division |
| ESNC | Secretariat, Codex Alimentarius Commission |
| ESNS | Food Quality and Standards Service |
| FI | Fisheries Department |
| FIPP | Development Planning Service |
| FO | Forestry Department |
| FONP | Forestry Policy and Institutions Service |
| FOPP | Forest Products Service |
| FORC | Forest Conservation Service |
| FORM | Forest Resources Development Service |
| RLC | Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean |
| RAF | Regional Office for Africa |
| RAP | Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific |
| RNE | Regional Office for the Near East |
| REU/ CEE | Regional Office for Europe and the Central and Eastern European Countries |
| SD | Sustainable Development Department |
| SDA | Rural Development Division |
| TC | Technical Cooperation Department |
| TCDS | Resources and Strategic Partnerships Unit |

# Executive Summary

The concept of Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) has evolved in recent years in the context of a rapidly changing and globalizing food economy and as a result of the concerns and commitments of a wide range of stakeholders regarding food production and security, food safety and quality, and the environmental sustainability of agriculture. Broadly defined, a GAP approach aims at applying available knowledge to addressing environmental, economic and social sustainability dimensions for on-farm production and post-production processes, resulting in safe and quality food and non-food agricultural products. However, the term "GAP" still has different meanings for different stakeholders and is used in a variety of contexts. For example, it is a recognized terminology used in the international regulatory framework as well as in reference to private, voluntary and non-regulatory applications that are developed and applied by governments, civil society organizations and the private sector.

FAO provides an international and neutral platform for intergovernmental, private sector and civil society dialogue on the development of a GAP approach towards concrete implementation of sustainable agriculture and rural development. Under the Priority Area for Interdisciplinary Action on Integrated Production Systems (PROD PAIA), FAO has initiated a process of consultation, internally and externally, to seek understanding and consensus on the principles, indicators and means of supporting GAP. Previous activities have included 2 electronic conferences, a paper to seek guidance and debate during the 17th session of the Committee on Agriculture[1] and a multistakeholder expert consultation on GAP during November 2003 to review, provide guidance and identify strategies for development and implementation of a GAP approach in FAO.

A number of country activities and field projects have been implemented in GAP by different FAO divisions, many units work on and provide assistance on various aspects of GAP but synergies need to be harnessed to provide better coordinated assistance to members.

In this context, an internal FAO workshop on GAP was organized from the 27-29 October 2004, with the objectives to take stock of GAP work in FAO; share experiences, methodologies and approaches on GAP; draw practical lessons from implementation of GAP activities and identify possible synergies for future GAP work in FAO.

As a starting point two background papers were prepared for the workshop, a "GAP Working Concept Document" developed on the basis of previous work in FAO, and a paper related to the "Analysis of existing codes, standards and guidelines outside FAO"[1]. Preceding the workshop, video conferences were held with staff in regional offices for Latin America, Asia, Africa and the Near East, to exchange views, discuss trends and demand for FAO assistance. The growing awareness of GAP and the strong country and regional demand for FAO assistance on GAP was highlighted.

1 Documents available at http://www.fao.org/prods/GAP/gapindex_en.htm

The workshop brought together experts from the Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry and the Economic and Social Departments, who made presentations on the experiences, activities and lessons that can be learned for FAO work on GAP. The breadth of expertise and experience in FAO was evidenced during the workshop, ranging from technical expertise on good practices for crop, livestock and feed, forestry and fisheries, to food safety and quality, value chains, marketing, commercialization and facilitation of multistakeholder agreements on GAP. During working groups and plenary discussions, an analysis of FAOs strengths and weaknesses and its role in assisting member countries was discussed, which lead to the identification of areas where the FAO could most effectively use its comparative advantage in working on GAP at global, regional and country level.

The workshop resulted in a number of key outcomes:

1) Refinement of the GAP concept and methods
2) Identification of a strong country and regional demand for coordinated FAO assistance on GAP
3) Identification of concrete synergies between FAO units which work on different aspects of GAP
4) Identification of specific areas of comparative advantage of FAO on GAP and definition of action areas
5) Key next steps including specific projects outlined.

The key next steps outlined by the workshop included the setting up of task teams under the PROD PAIA/ GAP group to implement actions in each of the key identified areas 1) GAP information 2) Refinement of GAP global principles 3) GAP field activities; a meeting of the PROD PAIA to be convened for this purpose in December 2004. Workshop outcomes will be fed-back to and discussed with Regional office staff and collaborative work on GAP within existing initiatives/ structures will be undertaken where funding is available. Projects were identified for immediate cooperative action in Thailand, Burkina Faso, Latin America region, China, Tanzania-Kenya-Zimbabwe, with other funding opportunities sought from regular programme and extra budgetary resources in the near future.

# 1. Introduction

Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) are becoming an increasingly important issue for many developing countries. Consumers, and hence, the food industry and the development community, are every day more concerned that food – more and more of which comes through processing and supermarket chains - is safe to eat. They also increasingly care that commodities are produced in ways that are in harmony with environment and social values (e.g. minimal needs of farm workers are met or that international agreements on child labour are respected).

While views differ on the breadth and impact of these trends, they have given rise in the past twenty years to a wide array of social, environmental and quality standards, codes of practices and certification programmes in agriculture and the food sector. Governments, especially in developed countries, have established regulations on food safety and quality, voluntary standards on organic agriculture, and sustainability monitoring schemes. A multiplicity of 'GAP' codes, standards and regulations have also been promoted by the food industry and producers organizations as well as governments, NGOs and CSOs, claiming to codify agriculture at farm level.

Attempts by the food industry (large professional organizations, agro-processors, exporters, retailers) to codify, implement and sometimes impose 'GAP' codes of practices on their suppliers (farmers) have raised the question of the extent to which the markets can support sustainable agriculture, how the value-added is distributed in these schemes through the food chain, whether farmers benefit and with what transaction costs, and whether a large proportion of consumers at the end of the chain are willing to pay for sustainable agriculture through such certifications.

The emerging challenge is whether GAP codes and standards can help make agricultural systems more sustainable in a world where food supply chains are increasingly globalized and complex, and pressure on farmers livelihoods is high.

Research and extension services for many decades in developed and developing countries alike, have provided production guidelines to farmers and livestock producers. Objectives include increased productivity, improvement of natural resources use and the generation of higher farmer income. Such recommendations for growers/producers are generally organized following the sequence of activities and choices in the production process.

Over the years, much of the work of FAO units, especially in AGA, AGP, AGL, AGE, FO, FI and some divisions of SD, has been to respond to requests from developing country governments for technical assistance aimed at recommending best practices for crop production, livestock, forestry or aquaculture recommendations. There is high demand from member countries for assistance in particular on horticulture and livestock-based production chains but also on sustainable forest products and fisheries, as countries try to enter global markets (increasingly faced with requiring food safety concerns, and, more recently, environmental and social considerations) and to meet their direct food security needs and improve the income of the rural and peri-uban poor. The concept of Good Agricultural Practices has evolved out of, and expanded on, such production recommendations.

Under the Priority Area for Interdisciplinary Action on Integrated Production Systems (PROD PAIA), FAO has initiated a process of consultation, internally and externally, to seek understanding and consensus on the principles, indicators and means of supporting GAP. Previous activities included two initial electronic conferences, a paper to seek the guidance of FAO's Committee for Agriculture (COAG) in April 2003, and an Expert Consultation on GAP in November 2003. Meanwhile, a number of country activities and field projects have been implemented on GAP by different FAO divisions. Many units in FAO work and provide assistance on various aspects of GAP but synergies need to be strengthened to provide better coordinated assistance to members.

# 2. Workshop objectives and process

As a first step, two background papers were prepared for the workshop – a "GAP Working Concept Document", developed on the basis of previous work in FAO, and a paper related to the "Analysis of existing codes, standards and guidelines outside FAO", available at (http://www.fao.org/prods/GAP/gapindex_en.htm). These documents were essentially designed as starting points for the discussions during the workshop, rather than as formal papers for debate.

In this context, an internal FAO workshop on GAP was organized on 27-29 October 2004. Workshop objectives were to:

- take stock of GAP work in FAO;
- share experiences, methodologies and approaches on GAP;
- draw practical lessons from implementation of GAP activities by FAO; and
- identify possible synergies for future GAP work in FAO.

The workshop provided a forum for exchange, without aiming at reaching a common or prescriptive concept of GAP in FAO. The GAP initiative under the PRODs PAIA is aimed at reinforcing synergies between different divisions to provide better integrated services to FAO's members on GAP-related issues.

The workshop extended over three half-days and consisted of presentations by over 20 different units from AG, ES, FI and FO on GAP projects and areas of expertise relevant to GAP, followed by facilitated dialogue and working groups.

The agenda of the programme workshop may be found in Annex I, and the list and contact details of participants can be found in Annex II.

# 3. Outcome of regional video conference on GAP (25-26 october 2004)

Preceding the workshop, video conferences were organised with staff in regional offices for Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Near East. The objective of this part of the workshop was to exchange views on GAP, discuss trends and demands for FAO assistance regarding GAP in the regions and learn about RO activities in GAP[2]. Outcomes of these discussions were reported at the workshop and used during plenary discussions and specific working groups.

The video conference aimed to give an insight to:

- Views of Regional/Sub regional Staff on GAP concept and approaches.
- Trends and demand for GAP in each region.
- Activities, experiences and methodologies for GAP in the RO.
- Role and comparative advantage of FAO in assisting countries in GAP.
- Views on how FAO (Regional Offices and HQs) could go forward in this area of work.

## 3.1 Awareness

- Increased awareness and growing interest was noted in all regions.
- Level of awareness varied between RO's, the RNE region has 40 Egyptian farms registered with Eurepgap; media attention was highlighted in Thailand; growing interest in RAF (e.g. Sahel countries, Swaziland) because of land degradation, overgrazing, cost of inputs; Environment/ Social/ Food Safety issues wrt commodities (cotton, bananas, dairy, meat) much interest and demand for FAO assistance in RLC regions.
- Some questions were raised on the very general or all-encompassing definition of GAP; how to address all concerns in environment/ land husbandry/ food safety.
- RAF highlighted health-related, food safety concern from both consumer and farmers perspective; RNE enquired about the place of organic farming into GAP.

## 3.2 Activities in each Area

- GAP is being addressed directly or indirectly in the RO's with both horizontal and vertical dimensions (e.g. RAP, GAP is an integral part of projects since addressing sustainable production systems);
- Regional IPM projects ongoing in North Africa;

2 In their recent work on GAP, RLC also conducted an electronic conference on GAP with stakeholders (government, academia, private sector etc.) in Mercosur countries plus Chile during the summer of 2004.

- RLC organised an electronic conference, summer 2004, targeted at MERCOSUR + Chile (with 140 participants from government, private sector etc); resulting in key findings on how GAP are 'transmitted' to the region; which chains should be prioritised, small farmer implementation constraints); regional TCP projects on GAP and GAP for meat in Uruguay (draft form at moment) (Annex 2 for proceedings).
- RAF current activities include PRODs in Burkina Faso, several TCP on conservation agriculture, safe irrigated agriculture, and training manual on farm equipment.

### 3.3 Problems/ Concerns

- The issues of resource poor farmers, constraints in terms of social-cultural, economic, technological were shared by all the regions.
- RNE highlighted the problems of reaching resource poor farmers, RAF highlighted problems both in pesticide use for export and meeting regulations.
- RAP mentioned population pressure on land and other natural resources; diversity in ecosystems, farm size, soil nutrition, issues regarding the best use of natural resource; land degradation; food safety; trade; certification; challenges to trade in less advanced domestic markets and intra-regional trade.
- The problems for implementation in RAPs were three-fold a) Information needs (technical know-how of farmers, actors) b) Financial (sustaining good agricultural practices after initial implementation) c) Institutional challenges.

### 3.4 FAO role

- **Generating and disseminating information** was highlighted as key, by the need for farmer's surveys, inventories, provision of information and tools, dissemination/ exchange of experiences, cost benefit analysis; determining socioeconomic and environmental viability of GAP with small farmers and selected chains.
- **At country level: providing capacity building and policy advice** by capacity building, coordination/ networking, implementation of national and/or regional projects.
- The **multidisciplinary nature of FAO** was highlighted as a comparative advantage, in order to act as an 'honest broker' in public/ private partnerships and providing necessary information and normative tools.
- **FAO has a lot of potential for collaborative work**, awareness raising and advocacy.

In conclusion, this session highlighted the current and growing awareness of GAP in all the regions, the activities that are being carried out in each area and the problems and concerns, especially of small holders, with respect to information needs, financial concerns and institutional challenges. The session highlighted the strong country and regional demand for coordinated FAO assistance on GAP.

# 4. Confirmation of gap concept and approaches

The aim of the workshop was to broadly confirm and refine the concept of GAP proposed at the Expert Consultation, based on guidance provided by COAG in April 2003.

- The GAP approach addresses the **economic**, **environmental** and **social** sustainability of agriculture inclusive of **food safety and quality.** There was a broad agreement and confirmation from FAO participants on the scope of that concept, which is broader than what is to be found in many private sector GAP standards because it seeks to include in a more substantial manner social and environmental sustainability elements; concerns related to nutrition and chronic diseases should also be taken into account in the definition of GAP. Participants generally agreed with the scope of the concept, noting that the challenge is on implementation and that each pillar or dimension will be prioritized depending on the specific context.

- **GAP are different from SARD.** While GAP and SARD use the same three pillars (economic, environmental and social), SARD is a wider concept that embraces not only agriculture production issues on farm (GAP) but also issues of rural infrastructure, rural education and much more. Operationalizing GAP, however, will contribute to SARD.

- **GAP focus on primary production at farm level**, whilst always considering the supply chain and institutional context which create incentives and enabling environments. GAP cover the farm-level part of the chain or continuum which includes, further down, Good Handling Practices (GHP), Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP), HACCP and quality control standards and others. Indeed, an important aspect in identifying practices as GAP is that they should lead to safe and healthy food taking account the food safety and quality standards requirements in a given market context and legal setting. But the focus and contribution of GAP in this process remain at the production level.

- **GAP have to take into account existing voluntary and regulatory** standards such as Codex Alimentarius, the IPPC and OIE and their implication for the definition of good practices. On the other hand, it is not FAO's role to establish an international prescriptive "Super-GAP" or new GAP standards or certification schemes.

- **FAO should work on GAP for specific commodities and for farming systems,** although methodological challenges remain for doing the latter because of the complexity of developing decision support tools for farming systems.

- **FAO should focus on developing a GAP Approach** which is one of sequential decision-making by producers beginning at the very first choices ('what will I grow') to the

end of the on-farm actions - a process of critical decision-making points, to be developed with farmers and other stakeholders, and not prescriptive guidelines. The focus should be on farmers' learning and the development of GAP through multistakeholder processes, working with key drivers of change.

- **FAO should give increased attention to the role of GAP in domestic markets** and its relevance for and impact on small farmers, and not just focus on export opportunities.

The discussions over the three half-days met the workshop objective which was to provide confirmation and refinement of GAP concepts, methods and approaches. It was recognised that is not the aim of the FAO to develop its own standards or have one single definition of an 'FAO Super Gap' but it is important to develop a understanding in-house of the various dimensions of GAP and to work on these common principles together.

# 5. Lessons learnt from FAO GAP-related activities

The objective of this session was to provide the opportunity to FAO staff from different fields of expertise to share experiences and lessons learnt on implementation of GAP and GAP-related activities. Presentations were made from a wide range of divisions, from the Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Economic and Social Departments.

## Setting the Scene: 'Analysis of main GAP programmes, codes and standards outside FAO'

**Andrew Speedy, (AGAP- Animal Production Service)**

There has been a growing number and wide variety of standards, codes and guidelines codifying GAP in recent years. The trend is towards the privatisation of standards and multiplication of non-governmental standards. Broadly, GAP applies knowledge to addressing environmental, economic and social sustainability for on-farm and post-production processes resulting in safe and healthy food and non-food agricultural products (FAO, 2003). However, it is important to understand the scope and purpose of such standards and codes, emerging role of voluntary standards, opportunities and risks for developing country farmers and how they can support GAP objectives.

The paper details providers of GAP, in terms of Governments, Private Sector, NGO's, the Forestry sector, and characterises each GAP programme by their food safety, environmental and social sustainability emphasis. There are many opportunities for small farmers, but also inherent risks, including difficulty in meeting private and export standards, lack of local certification body/ laboratory facilities, limited e.g. Organic, Fair Trade standards markets and farmer compliance with no differentiation or premium received.

There are many issues at stake, from the coverage of sustainability issues in various schemes, who should pay, small holder impact and both positive and negative effects on trade. It will ultimately be a policy choice for governments, based on specific national and local contexts, and this paper attempts to clarify the consequences of varying approaches to better support developing countries.

More information at: http://www.fao.org/prods/gap/database/index.html

## 'GAP for the safety and quality of fresh fruits and vegetables: implementing training projects in Latin America, Thailand, China and elsewhere'

Maya Pineiro (ESNS - Food Quality and Standards Service)

The Food Quality and Standards Service (ESNS) have been integrating GAP into ESNS projects as a key component of the capacity building activities and technical assistance projects implemented at the global, regional and national level.
Key lessons for GAP:

- Identification of hazards, and definition of the measures/ practices for their prevention and control is important for Safety and Quality programmes implementation at the primary level
- Training activities promoting integration and coordination among institutions and public and private sector is the key to success.
- Collaborative work should be on-going to address policies, incentives, support training etc, and links made with ICM (Integrated Crop Management), IPM (Integrated Pest Management) and others.
- Strengthening entrepreneurial skills, awareness raising at local level via producer and farmer organizations are key in GAP implementation.

Website: (http://www.fao.org/es/esn/food/foodandfood_fruits_en.stm)

## 'FAO activities on GAP in the Feed, Milk and Meat Sectors 2003 - 2004'

Andrew Speedy (AGAP- Animal Production Service)

The FAO has been involved in many activities in recent years implementing Codex Alimentarius Codes of Practice (COP) for the feed, milk and meat sectors.
Key lessons for GAP:

- There is considerable interest and participation (Private Sector & Government) in implementing the Codex Codes of practise for feed, milk and meat.
- Implementation of Industry COP is an opportunity to bring together environmental and social aspects of GAP
- FAO has a key role in combining expertise from major stakeholders, sectors and different countries
- Care should be taken to ensure the participation of developing countries.

Website: http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/home/en/home.html

## 'Supporting Good Agricultural Practices to enhance farmers livelihoods in Burkina Faso'

Anne-Sophie Poisot (AGD - Office of Assistant Director-General, AG)

GAP is a multidisciplinary area of work in FAO which is attracting a significant and growing demand for assistance from members. Since 2003, FAO has been facilitating a platform of private and public national stakeholders to support the adoption of GAP in cotton-cereal-livestock systems in Burkina Faso, and to strengthen institutions to implement them.
Key lessons for GAP:

- Perception throughout the chain on **negative effects of current practice**s is a prerequisite (soil fertility, human health, pesticides)
- Recognition of the **differences** between what constitutes "Good" agricultural practices for researchers, for extension services and for farmers
- **Build consensus** on acceptable GAP to all via a platform with key stakeholders
- **Build on the key actors** of change to support transition to GAP (institutional SWOT analysis)
- GAP defined at **optimization with multiple objectives** (tie into the environmental models): economic, environmental, social sustainability, leading to food safety and quality outcomes. This requires farmer empowerment for decision making, farm management training.
- **Better methodologies** needed for 'integrated farming systems GAP' (not just commodity-specific GAP)

Website: http://www.fao.org/prods/GAP/gapindex_en.htm

## 'GAP in horticulture: experiences from Brazil and Western Africa'
## Eric Kueneman and Allison Hodder (AGPC- Crop and Grassland Service)

The Grass and Cropland Service (AGPC) became involved in good agricultural practices with the increasing awareness of consumers and the food industry of food safety, environmental and social concerns, from initial interest in the area in 1995 by private industry.
Key lessons for GAP:

- **Crop management** is essential for GAP via the decisions farmers make on crop selection, preparation of lands, weed management.
- **Production practices** are key to solutions at the farm-level; meaning environmentally sustainable, safe, rational and economically efficient, socially responsible practices.
- Crop production systems can be characterised as a sequence of **critical points** (recognising that each crop has unique characteristics)
- Need for environmental, social and economic **audits** at each critical decision point
- **Concrete experiences** are necessary in horticultural production systems - e.g. Integrated Production and Protection cards

Website: http://www.fao.org/ag/AGP/AGPC/doc/Default.htm

## Concrete experience of GAP approach in horticultural production systems Integrated Production and Protection cards

**Composition of IPP Cards**: Each message is composed of 2 cards:

**CARD 1: Problem:**
A picture which illustrates the current practice as found in the field and/or the problem encountered

**CARD 2: Solution:**
A picture which illustrates the 'better practise' as recommended in accordance with IPP principles. Ideally, both pictures should be taken in the same field or environment.

## 'Activities related to GAP by the FAO/International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Joint Division on Nuclear techniques in Food and Agriculture'

David Bryon (AGE, FAO/ IAEA Joint Division on Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture)

The GAP concept in AGE is to promote sustainability in the food supply chain; build national capacities to diagnose hazards; use analytical capacities to promote safe and effective use of external inputs and promote practices which ensure hazards are kept with within acceptable limits for human health and the environment.
Key lessons for GAP:

- FAO is attempting to create a **level playing field** by providing scientific and technical justification via coordinating and supporting research, providing technical and advisory services, laboratory support and training.
- **Constraints on implementation** include linkages within food supply chains; participation in decision-making, transfer and sharing of information, farmer organization, choice of production systems.
- **Small holders** should be the main beneficiaries of FAO work on GAP

Website: www.iaea.org/programmes/nafa/dx/index.html

## 'The FAO GAP database'

Andrew Speedy (AGAP - Animal Production Service)

The GAP database was compiled from existing FAO databases as well as documents and websites both within and external to the FAO, with a total of 853 records.

- **Records are classified** under food safety, environmental protection, and social equity.
- **Source information** includes guidelines, projects, publications and field activities.
- **Information further broken down** by country, region, farming system, technological and institutional success factors.

Link: (http://www.fao.org/prods/gap/database/index.html)

## 'Lessons for GAP from value-chain analysis'

Nancy Morgan (ESCB- Basic Foodstuffs Service) and Madelon Meijer (ESAE-Agricultural Sector in Economic Development Service)

Within a divisional mandate to identify commodity market trends and issues which influence market participation by developing countries in general, and smallholders in particular, Commodities and Trade division (ESC) and Agriculture and Development Economics Division (ESA) are engaged in value chain analysis. Although there is a distinction between GAP related work and value-chain analysis, GAP activities could be enhanced through the use of this methodology which can facilitate a better understanding of how GAP measures affect the distribution of revenues across the chain.
Key lessons for GAP:

- Value-chain analysis is increasingly **influenced by standards**
- Understanding of how GAP measures affect **distribution of revenues** across chain is crucial.
- Important to demonstrate how **implementation of GAP** by small producers increases economic returns
- Recognise difference between **private and public standards**; who sets them, who benefits; importance of GAP recognised standards.
- A value-chain approach aims for an equitable distribution of benefits; working with the **key stakeholders** all along the chain to improve chain efficiency, with the **target beneficiaries** being small farmers

Website: http://www.fao.org/es/ESC/en/index.html ;http://www.fao.org/es/ESA/en/about.htm

## 'Marketing, agri-business and product quality: Lessons for GAP'
## Doyle Baker (AGSF - Agricultural Management, Marketing and Finance Service)

The Agricultural Support Services (AGS) Division of FAO (comprising of Agricultural Management, Marketing and Finance Service (AGSF); Agricultural and Food Engineering Technologies Service (AGST) assists FAO Members in the development of appropriate policies, strategies and methodologies for agricultural support systems and services as well as technologies for rural development, production and post-production in the agricultural and food sectors.
Key lessons for GAP:

- **Building skills** of farmers is a key component (Farm management and marketing skills)
- Reinforce **Service provision** by farmer advisory and support services
- **Understanding markets**, market access and agri-business linkages enables GAP to be appreciated in the proper perspective.
- **Compliance with standards** is an important issue; mechanisms to allow product **quality and safety information** be feed back to farmers is essential.

Website: http://www.fao.org/ag/ags/index.html

## 'Experiences from aquaculture and eco-labelling in Fisheries'

Rolf Willmann (Fisheries Department, FIPP, Development Planning Service)

The objectives for the Fisheries division within FAO include the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible fisheries and International Plans of Action; development of International Guidelines on ecolabelling and development and adoption of 'Good Aquaculture Practices'.

Lessons learned from normative codes and guidelines specific to Fisheries, developed and negotiated in the framework of FAO:

- In the fisheries sector, FAO is requested by member countries to help **guide** national policy, legislation and practices by setting the standards; this may not necessarily be the case in the agriculture sector
- **Avoid unnecessary barriers** to trade, including boycotts; **tackle through better practices** the **trade-off** between fisheries as **important livelihood source** and **risk of over exploitation** (same issue as in Agriculture)
- **Avoid consumer confusion** and deception caused by misleading and fraudulent labeling practices
- **Provide guidance** to bilateral and multilateral assistance agencies
- **Give attention** to the special requirements and conditions of **developing countries,** in particular small-scale producers/fisherfolks
- Provide a basis for the **development of local-level codes of good practices** adapted to the specific local circumstances and production characteristics
- **Encourage collective action** among **small-scale producers/fisherfolks**

Website: http://www.fao.org/fi/default.asp

## 'Forestry and GAP'

Michelle Gauthier (Forestry Department, FORC, Forest Conservation Service)

The role of the Forestry department as it relates to Good Forestry Practices (GFP) and GAP involves assisting member countries develop good practices in the forestry sector, providing a neutral forum for dialogue and facilitating national and international processes in the development of Codes of Conduct, practices, standards and guidelines.

Many parallels between Good Forestry Practice and GAP as sustainable forests are built on same 3 pillars of economically viable, socially equitable and environmentally friendly practices.

Lessons can be learned:

- from the **development of equitable partnerships**, markets and forest extension in building capacity of small holders and industry to work together;
- Including the understanding of **appropriate contexts** for partnership improvement, guidance, capacity building and governance of such improvements.
- from **parallels in generic guidelines** for assessing management, and certification schemes

Website: http://www.fao.org/forestry/index.jsp

## 'Building environmental models together for making shared decisions'

Florent Maraux (AGLW - Water Resources, Development and Management Service)

The Water Resources, Development and Management Service (AGLW), is involved in building environmental models under conditions of limited water resources to assist shared decision making, where production and environmental functions are not compatible, in order to sustain growth in food production while increasing efficiency. These models could have a role in multistakeholder negotiations:

- **Biophysical models** can be used to **explore scenarios**, estimate long term effects and quantify thresholds - under a variety of weighted criteria scenarios.
- These could **be coupled with socioeconomic models** to share representation between various actors
- FAO could have a **role in building models/ negotiation frameworks** to satisfy contradictory interests of stakeholders.

Website: http://www.fao.org/landandwater/aglw/index.stm

## 'Best Practices in Land Management'

Jose Benites (AGLL- Land and Plant Nutrition Management Service)

Best Management practices are of key importance to GAP and the Land and Plant Nutrition Management Service (AGLL) works with farmers and decision makers towards improving land quality, farming capacity and food security in sustainable land use.

Lessons for capacity building and service delivery:

Government organizations need to serve their farmer clients in more interdisciplinary and participatory ways to adopt GAP

- **Re-orient the methodology** of agriculture and rural development programs to promote and nurture the active participation of farmers and their organizations to accomplish the chain: GAP - productivity-market - food quality
- **Significant research** is needed to facilitate transitions from conventional agriculture to GAP

Lessons for policies:

Restructure inappropriate macroeconomic and agricultural policies

- **Adopt policies** that **promote and enforce productive use** land and water use through GAP protocols and protect the integrity of agricultural families.
- **Adjust legislation** to facilitate the requirements and initiatives of local groups adopting GAP

Best Practices in relation to land management could be negotiated with stakeholders by a series of suggested norms for GAP protocols (see table below).

Website: http://www.fao.org/landandwater/agll/index.stm

## Some LESSONS for GAP work: an example of problem-solution identification

**PROBLEM: Land degradation, soil erosion due to excessive tillage**
Frequent tillage often results in massive erosion, dramatic loss of soil nutrients, soil carbon and rapidly declining yields

**LAND MANAGEMENT SOLUTION via suggested norms for GAP protocols:**

**COMPULSORY** (100 percent of norms accomplished): Enable Farmers to adopt techniques to minimise soil disturbance during seedbed preparation and use integrated weed control practices.

**REQUIRED** (85 percent of norm accomplished): Replace the practices of:
- Conventional Tillage (routine ploughing, tillage of soil)
- Removal/ incorporation of residues (via ploughing, cultivation, burning)
- Crop monoculture (without rotations/ break crops)
- Random in field tracking of field equipment (tractors/ harvesters etc)

**RECOMMENDED:** (Norms implemented although not compulsory) Promote:
- Permanent soil cover and minimum/ no mechanical disturbance of soil
- Zero tillage systems - to ensure sufficient living/ residual biomass to enhance soil & water conservation & control soil erosion

## 'GAP standards in Codex'

Jeronimas Maskeliunas (ESNC, Economic and Social Department, Secretariat, Codex Alimentarius Commission, Joint FAO/ WHO Food Standards Programme)

The Codex Alimentarius Commission was created in 1963 by FAO and WHO to develop food standards, guidelines and related texts such as codes of practice under the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. The main purposes of this Programme involve protecting consumer health and ensuring fair trade practices in food trade, promoting coordination of all food standards work and facilitating international trade.

- Codex shift to **whole food chain perspective**: food safety can best be achieved by considering the whole food chain "farm-to-table" approach and cannot be "inspected in" at the end of the chain;
- **Preventive approach** to food safety, including Good Agricultural, Veterinary, Manufacturing and Hygienic Practices; HACCP

Situation in relation to GAP in Codex:
- Many documents have been elaborated but there is no definition on GAP
- GAP definition in the area of use of pesticides but no guideline document
- Believe there should be very broad definition/principles of GAP

Website: http://www.codexalimentarius.net/web/index_en.jsp

## 'GAP and Phytosanitary Measures, Pesticide Management and Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and the IPPC'

Harry Van der Wulp (AGPP, Plant Protection Service), and Fabienne Grousset, IPPC

The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) is an international treaty to prevent the spread and introduction of pests of plants and plant products; the IPPC secretariat is hosted by FAO.

- **IPPC standards** should be **complied** with in GAP protocols
- Pest and **pesticide management** issues are key to Good Agricultural Practices
- **Pesticide use and residues** are a **major concern** in food safety, public, worker and environmental health.
- Food safety issues related to pesticide risks can only be solved if farmers **change production practices**
- **Integrated pest management** (IPM) programs offer structural solutions

CONCERN about developing protocols:

- **Focusing on protocols** holds the **risk** of falling back on prescriptions that reinforce **reliance on pesticides**; not in line with FAO policy
- Process oriented protocols are difficult at farmer level

FAO comparative advantage:

- **Multisectoral approach** within FAO, demonstrated by the current workshop should be developed
- Develop a Good Collaborative Practice in house, by jointly developing cases at national level to capture synergies.

**The bottom line is to help farmers change their practices**

Website: http://www.fao.org/ag/AGP/AGPP/Default.htm

The breadth of expertise and experience of FAO was evidenced during the workshop, ranging from technical expertise on good practices for crop, livestock and feed, forestry and fisheries, to food safety and quality, value chains, marketing and commercialization and facilitation of multistakeholder agreements on GAP. Much was learnt also from FO, FI and ES departments and units which were not previously much involved in the development of the GAP approach.

Extension services, research and FAO services providing advice to farmers on sound agronomic and animal husbandry, fisheries or forestry practices and sustainable management of natural resources are now looking more closely at whether and how farmers could benefit from these good practices through new market opportunities. Meanwhile, commercialization and supply chain experts are increasingly interested in understanding how GAP standards affect the distributional revenues across the chain, how the implementation of GAP by small producers may increase or decrease economic returns, and who sets and benefits from private versus public standards. FAO units working on institutional development are also interested in contributing approaches to help bridge trade-offs between potentially conflicting objectives related to food security and sustainable agriculture.

Participants considered that the development of a GAP approach in FAO did not attempt to substitute or duplicate on-going work in FAO. It is an action area where synergies should be encouraged among people and programmes in and outside of FAO. It aims at supporting a multisectoral approach to define and provide advice on sustainable agricultural practices, in order to promote GAP which include food safety and quality, environment, economic and social dimensions of sustainability as best locally feasible. The objective is not integration of FAO activities but synergies, identifying win-win situations between divisions to better respond to members' needs. The session generated a momentum for collaborative work in FAO on GAP, including the identification of concrete projects and countries where work will be done in coming weeks or months.

# 6. FAO's role in assisting member countries on GAP

Following presentations by divisions, the workshop participants were split into a number of working groups. As a starting point for discussions, the first two working groups identified the existing and expected demand for FAO assistance; where opportunities for such may arise; the role of the FAO and its comparative advantage in working on GAP.

## 6.1 Existing and expected demand and opportunities for FAO assistance in GAP

The working group identified the demand for FAO assistance, where such assistance could be targeted and the organisation of such. A table highlighting priority areas for targeting actions to FAO needs, as expressed by regional staff during the video conference was also prepared.

### 6.1.1 Trend

FAO headquarters participants and staff from the regional offices participating through the video-conferences reported that there was a significant and rapidly increasing demand for support from FAO on GAP for the production of food and non food agricultural commodities. This demand is expected to increase considerably in the next 10 years or so.

- GAP activities could focus on horizontal farming system areas/ zones and/ or commodities
- GAP activities could be based on similar production systems at regional and sub-regional areas if possible.

### 6.1.2 Opportunities

- Elaboration of the broad-based guidelines to apply GAP for the production of food and other agricultural commodities.
- Utilisation of technical cooperation and other agency programs in the identification, evaluation and promotion of GAP at the request of the member states.
- Formulation of program activities as a catalyst for the development of GAP in member countries

The following table provides an overview of anticipated priorities for FAO support on GAP by region.

## Priorities for Targeting Actions to Regional Needs as expressed by FAO Regional Offices staff during video-conferences

| | RLC | RAF | RAP | RNE | REU/CEE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Regional:** | | | | | |
| **Seminars: awareness raising, clarify concepts, needs assessment**<br>FAO advantage: Raise awareness on GAP-related issues; cost-benefit appraisal of GAP schemes. | X | XXX | XX | XX | X |
| **Feed into Regional Conferences & organisations**<br>FAO advantage: Advocacy and awareness raising in developing countries. | XX | XX | XX | XXX | X |
| **TCPs for strategic support and partnership building**<br>FAO advantage: understanding appropriate contexts; building capacity for improved partnerships. | X | | X | XX | |
| **National:** | | | | | |
| **Multistakeholder meetings**<br>FAO advantage: neutral facilitator to support local stakeholders define GAP in specific contexts. | X | XXX | XX | XX | X |
| **Action Plans and programme formulation**<br>FAO advantage: Provide information tools at country level; involve public and private sector involvement in programme formulation. | XXX | XX | XXX | XXX | XX |
| **TCPs and pilot projects**<br>FAO advantage: provide technical advice on practices; processes; managerial advice on management. | | XX | X | X | XXX |
| **Both Levels:** | | | | | |
| **Engage with on-going private sector and FAOs initiatives**<br>FAO advantage: Work with producer/ along chain on incentives and enabling environments; elucidate strategic choices between commodities, systems. | XXX | X | XX | XXX | XXX |
| **Normative guidelines development**<br>FAO advantage: provide guidance on governance; assist international processes related to criteria and indicators development; codes of conducts and codes of practise. | XX | XXX | XX | X | X |

#### *6.1.2.1 Organisation*

- Support could be given to farmer associations and groups with a view towards improving their participation and decision making in the process at the local level.
- Consolidation and dissemination of information to assist this can be achieved through existing web based systems and publications.
- Possible collaboration with other international governmental and non-governmental organizations to address the three pillars of SARD (social, environmental and economic) as well as food quality and safety.

## 6.2 FAO's roles and comparative advantage in working on GAP

The workshop highlighted FAO's strengths and weaknesses, examples of synergies, and roles of the FAO for on-going work on GAP.

### 6.2.1 FAO strengths identified in responding to countries' requests included:

- FAO information systems and role as neutral information broker;
- Multidisciplinary technical and policy expertise;
- Close collaboration with standard-setting bodies in FAO in order to reflect their considerations in the development of GAP;
- Experience with technical guidelines as basis for developing GAP principles;
- Substantial involvement with farmers' experiential learning approaches
- Experience in facilitation of multistakeholder dialogues;
- Field presence with specific GAP projects and others, FAO country and regional offices.

### 6.2.2 FAO weaknesses identified included:

- Lack of resources (financial and time) leading to dilution of efforts;
- Lack of capacity on social components or insufficient connection of in-house expertise – need to partner with expert organizations in these fields;
- Insufficient mechanisms for outsourcing and collaboration with private sector;
- Weak structural organization and strategic capacity for better interdisciplinary collaboration and lack of synergies between fields of expertise.

### 6.2.3 Examples of successful synergies:

- In-house – Thematically driven synergies e.g. in the Food Safety Area: Fruit and Vegetable (ESA-ESN-AGA-AGP), meat and milk, Conservation Agriculture (AGL-AGST-AGPC-AGAP-TC-SD)
- Strategic alliances with industry and international organisations: examples include AGA work with- International Dairy Federation (IDF), International Feed Industry Federation (IFIF), International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP), Conservation Agriculture Networks; AG work with the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).

### 6.3 In conclusion to the working group discussions, participants recommended that FAO work on GAP at two levels:

1) To meet the needs of rural communities, business, industry and international regulatory frameworks (formulating global principles; providing information resources and awareness raising; advising governments; providing capacity building) to contribute to the achievement the Millennium Development Goals; and

2) To internalize GAP in FAO to fulfill the SARD mandate (strengthening mechanisms and capacities for in-house and outside collaboration; focus technical expertise to support GAP principles; integration into the field programme).

# 7. Identifying the way forward

Leading on from analysis of FAO's strengths and weaknesses and its role in assisting member countries, further discussions in working groups and analysis at plenary identified a number of areas of FAO comparative advantage in working on GAP at the global, regional and country level.

## 7.1 Generate and disseminate information on GAP

### 7.1.2 Information/analysis and dissemination on:

- analytical inventories and comparative studies on existing GAP standards and codes, benefits and costs (financial, social, environmental), challenges, scope, drivers and incentives to adopt them;
- how to apply GAP (management and technical know-how)
- regulatory requirements;
- roles of public and private sectors in developing GAP
- assessment of relevance of GAP for specific situations/categories of producers;
- tools for decision-making on trade-offs in the adoption of GAP.

This has been initiated through the compilation of a GAP meta-database and with studies on GAP within various projects. Further development of this work was encouraged.

## 7.2 Refine GAP basic global principles

- FAO needs clearly defined basic global principles to support country activities and assessment of existing GAP schemes.
- Refinement of the Annex "Good Agricultural Practices for Selected Agricultural Components" to COAG/2003/6 (attached in Annex 1 to the GAP Working Concept Document for the workshop) is a useful starting point as requested by COAG.
- GAP global principles should remain a general, flexible and minimal set, broad because of agro-ecological and commodity differences, driven mainly by the interest of farmers and producers, based on S&T, and focused mainly on generating "public goods".
- They should be based on the wealth of expertise and principles already existing in FAO and not to 'reinvent the wheel'.
- These principles should not create additional obligations for Member states in the framework of trade agreements, should be voluntary in nature and should take account of and be consistent with existing international instruments such as Codex, IPPC and OIE.
- The challenge is on GAP implementation and to ensure that each pillar or dimension is prioritized depending on the specific context.

### 7.2.1 Improvements needed to the Annex to COAG/2003/6 include

- Issues related to non-food agricultural products and integration with trees, forests and fish should be better reflected in the principles.
- Further thinking could be given as to whether GAP global principles should be based on a risk analysis approach e.g. if applied to primary production, it would identify a number of critical points which allow principles to be defined in a simplified manner focusing on outcomes to be achieved.
- GAP principles should also be established on a sound understanding of farming systems and their interactions with larger systems, in the context of the social, economic and environmental priorities, and not only driven by individual components of production systems.
- GAP principles should focus on the "how-to-do" issues and may differentiate among essential (must), important (should) and voluntary (desirable) recommendations.

## 7.3 At regional and country-level: provide capacity building and policy advice

This is expected to be a major focus of FAO activities on GAP.

### 7.3.1 Information and policy advice

#### *7.3.1.1 Recommendations on priority actions included:*

- Provide information tools on country situation, through analytical inventories and comparative studies on GAP schemes, their scope, drivers and the respective incentives to adopt them.
- Support countries to develop policies that 1) mitigate the uncoordinated proliferation of standards on food and agriculture; 2) help farmers cope with and anticipate these developments.
- Contribute technical expertise on locally appropriate practices, taking into account local and indigenous knowledge and capacities.

### 7.3.2 Facilitate local multistakeholder agreements on GAP

It was felt that FAO had a comparative advantage in acting as facilitator to support local stakeholders (government, farmers, markets, research bodies) to define appropriate GAP in a given context for a given commodity or farming system.

- FAO may act as a neutral facilitator helping stakeholders optimize choices and decide how to resolve trade-offs between potentially conflicting objectives and support follow-up of decisions reached ('accountability').
- A number of promising experiences on finding agreement and facilitating equitable partnerships on sustainable practices for a given commodity or farming system were discussed.
- FAO activities could include helping with: building socio-economic models for sharing a representation between different actors; conducting environmental impact assessments;
- Building negotiation frameworks including defining conditions for mutually beneficial partnerships;

- Understanding appropriate contexts for improved partnerships; building capacity and empowerment for improved partnerships; providing guidance on governance;
- Assist international processes related to criteria and indicators development, codes of conducts and codes of practices.

### 7.3.3 Capacity building, in areas including:

- Through partnerships, building skills of farmers to meet existing GAP standards and procurement practices set by retailers and the food industry and non-food agricultural sector.
- Providing technical advice on production practices and processes and managerial advice on farm management and commercialization; facilitating farm-agribusiness linkages and contract negotiations; marketing support by provision of market information
- Reinforcing service provision – farmer advisory and support services (farmer organizations, extension services, other government services, NGOs and CSOs).
- Strengthening food and non-food products control systems organised to facilitate GAP development - including enforcement, inspection facilities, laboratories, research facilities and advisory services.

At country level, the appraisal phase before engaging in GAP work may look at value chain issues in order to determine with countries concerned whether production practices are or not a critical entry point for intervention in a given commodity chain, and what are the range of issues related to GAP.

Workshops at national or regional level may be needed to address these issues, and to raise awareness on GAP-related issues. This should include cost-benefit appraisal of existing GAP schemes and review of private sector and civil society initiatives in areas relevant to GAP.

Strategic choices at country level may include:

1) Commodities vs. combination of commodities (system);
2) Balance between major commodities and minor crop or livestock which constitute diversification opportunities;
3) Work with producers or work along the chain, knowing that production level issues may not necessarily be best addressed by production level interventions alone, but FAO may need to work on incentives and enabling environments.

The choice will not necessarily be either/or of the above areas, but priority emphasis may be given to one or other depending on local relevance.

In conclusion a number of action areas were elucidated, where FAO can best use its comparative advantage in assisting member countries on good agricultural practices. At the global level, the FAO can use its expertise to generate and disseminate information on GAP and in refining basic principles. At the regional and national level the FAO can provide information and policy advice; assist in multistakeholder negotiations and capacity building.

# 8. Conclusion: key outcomes and next steps

The workshop resulted in a number of key outcomes:

## 8.1 Refinement of GAP concept and methods

The workshop met its objective to broadly confirm and refine GAP concepts, methods and approaches. The GAP approach was acknowledged as addressing the economic, environmental and social sustainability of agriculture, including food safety and quality aspects. Confirmed was the fact that GAP are different from SARD, while they use the same three pillars (economic, environmental and social), GAP focus on primary production at farm level while always considering the supply chain and institutional context. It was acknowledged that GAP have to take into account existing voluntary and regulatory standards (Codex Alimentarius, IPPC, OIE) and their implication in definition of good practices. It was agreed that FAO should work on GAP for specific commodities and farming systems, bearing in mind methodological challenges due to the complexity of decision making tools, and focus on an approach of sequential decision-making by producers. Focus should be given by FAO on the role of GAP in domestic markets and impact on small farmers, as well as export opportunities.

It was recognsed that is not the aim of the FAO to develop its own standards or have one single definition of an 'FAO Super Gap' but it is important to develop a understanding in-house of the various dimensions of GAP and to work on these common principles together.

## 8.2 Identification of a strong country and regional demand for coordinated FAO assistance on GAP

The outcome of the regional video conference on GAP, views of staff at headquarters and in regional offices clearly demonstrated the current awareness and growing demand for FAO assistance on GAP for production of food and non-food agricultural commodities, a demand expected to increase considerably in the next 10 years. The identification of this strong country and regional demand highlighted the need for coordinated FAO assistance, using its comparative advantage in the areas of knowledge, stakeholder negotiation and capacity building in responding to member countries requests.

## 8.3 Identification of concrete synergies between FAO units which work on different aspects of GAP

One of the challenges for FAO in the GAP area is to identify concrete synergies in-house of expertise to provide countries with improved, coordinated responses. The workshop

showcased work on-going from a range of divisions, from technical expertise on good practices for crop, livestock and feed, forestry and fisheries, to food safety and quality, value chains, marketing, commercialization and facilitation of multistakeholder agreements on GAP. Much was learned from the FO, FI and ES departments and units not previously much involved in the development of the GAP approach. The workshop identified synergies in FAO activities and concrete projects where work will be carried out in coming weeks and months.

## 8.4 Identification of specific areas of comparative advantage of FAO on GAP and Definition of action areas

The broad ranging discussions during the workshop lead to the identification of action areas where FAO can best use its comparative advantage in assisting member countries. At the global level, FAO can use its expertise to generate and disseminate information on GAP and in refining basic principles. At the regional and national level the FAO can provide information and policy advice; assist in multistakeholder negotiations and agreements on GAP and capacity building at local level.

## 8.5 Key next steps including specific projects outlined

### 8.5.1 Key next steps identified by the workshop included:

- Task teams will be set up under the PROD (Integrated Production Systems) PAIA/GAP group to implement identified actions in each of the key identified areas: 1) GAP information; 2) Refinement of GAP global principles; 3) GAP field activities. A meeting of the PROD PAIA will be convened shortly in December 2004 for this purpose. Units that may be interested to participate include AGAD, AGAP, AGSF, AGPC, AGLL, AGLW, ESAE, ESNS, FORC, FOPP, FONP, FORM and TCDS.
- Workshop outcomes will be fed-back to and discussed with Regional office staff in December 2004; interest of RO staff to be involved in task teams and follow-up activities will be further explored.
- Collaborative work on GAP within existing initiatives/structure will be undertaken where funding is available, focusing on synergies.

### 8.5.2 Country projects identified for immediate cooperative activities are:

- Thailand (GAP for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables, AGD-AGPP with further inputs from ESNS and AGSF) with mission in November 2004. Funding: Extra-budgetary (Norway).
- Burkina Faso (GAP project on cotton-cereal-livestock, AGD-AGSF-AGPC). Funding: Extra-budgetary (Norway).
- Latin America region (case studies on cost/benefit analysis in 3 countries in LAC; ESNS with possible further involvement of AGSF). Funding: to be sought, following on PFL (Post-harvest Food Losses) project.
- China (Fresh fruits and vegetables laboratory facilities and food safety; ESNS-AGPP-AGE). Funding from newly approved TCP and AGE project funds.
- Tanzania-Kenya-Zimbabwe (linking SARD and Best Land Management Practices, AGST, AGP, AGLL, SDA). Funding: Germany

- Other funding opportunities could be sought from extra budgetary resources in the near future.
- Regular Programme resources may be available through AGE's IAEA Coordinated Research Programmes (CRP) and the PRODs PAIA.

# Annex I
# Agenda of the GAP Workshop

## FAO Workshop on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP)

### Purpose
Three half-days for FAO departments to share experiences, methodologies and approaches on GAP, draw lessons from GAP activities in FAO, and identify futureGAP work in FAO

### Participants
FAO staff

### Location
FAO Rome, Ethiopia Room (C285), Philippines Room (C277), Nigerian Room (C215)

### Background Documents
- Resource paper "Good Agricultural Practices, a Working Concept Document"(circulated in advance of the workshop)
- Resource paper "Analysis of existing GAP programmes, codes and standards outside FAO" (circulated in advance of the workshop)
- Outcome and inputs from video conferences with FAO Regional Offices for Latin America, Asia, Africa and the Near East on GAP, held in the days preceding the workshop
- GAP paper presented to the 17th Session of COAG in 2003 "A Framework for Good Agricultural Practices", document COAG/2003/6
- Report on Expert Consultation on GAP, November 2003

## WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

**MORNING 1: 27 October 2004, 9:00-13:00**
**9:00-9:15 Introduction**
Putting in context and setting the scene. What do we want to achieve during the workshop. (Loretta Sonn, AGD)

**9:15-10:30 Session 1 – GAP concept and approaches**
Moderator: Doyle Baker, AGSF
Presentation of resource papers:
- "Analysis of main GAP programmes, codes and standards outside FAO" (Andrew Speedy, AGAP)
- "Good Agricultural Practices, a Working Concept Document" (Anne-Sophie Poisot, AGD)

Plenary observations on key issues and challenges in effectively defining and supporting Good Agricultural Practices

*10:30-11:00 Coffee Break*

**11:00-13:00 Session 2 - Sharing Experiences and Methodologies**
Moderator: Luz Diaz Rios, ESNS

Feedback on video conferences held with RLC, RAP, RAF and RNE in September-October 2004 on GAP activities in the regions (Loretta Sonn, AGD)

Presentations on GAP approaches and activities in FAO:
- Maya Pineiro (ESNS) – "GAP for the safety and quality of fresh fruits and vegetables: implementing training projects in Latin America, Thailand, China and elsewhere"
- Andrew Speedy (AGAP) – "FAO activities on GAP in the Feed, Milk and Meat Sectors 2003-2004"
- Anne-Sophie Poisot (AGD) – "Supporting GAP to enhance farmers livelihoods in cotton-cereal-livestock systems in Burkina Faso"
- Eric Kueneman and Allison Hodder (AGPC) – "GAP in horticulture : experiences from Brazil and Western Africa"
- David Byron (AGE) – "Activities of the Joint FAO/IAEA division on nuclear techniques in food and agriculture related to GAP"
- Andrew Speedy (AGAP) – "The GAP database"

Discussions and comments

**MORNING 2: 28 October 2004, 9:00-13:00**

**9:00-9:15 Introduction and Recap from Morning 1**
Moderator: Eric Kueneman, AGPC

**9:15-10:45 Session 2 (continued) - Sharing Experiences and Methodologies**
Moderator: Eric Kueneman, AGPC

Presentations on areas of work of relevance to GAP in FAO:
- Nancy Morgan (ESCB) and Madelon Meijer (ESAE) – "Lessons for GAP from value-chain analysis"
- Doyle Baker (AGSF) - "Marketing, agri-business and product quality: Lessons for GAP
- Rolf Willmann (FIPP) – "Experiences from aquaculture and eco-labelling in fisheries"
- Michelle Gauthier (FORC), Christine Holding-Anyonge (FONP) and Laura Russo (FOPP)– "Forestry and GAP"
- Florent Maraux (AGLW) – "Building environmental models together for making shared decisions"
- José Benites (AGLL) – "Best practices in Land Management"
- Jeronimas Maskeliunas, Codex Alimentarius (ESNC) – "GAP standards in Codex"

- Harry Van der Wulp (AGPP) – GAP and Phytosanitary Measures (IPPC), Pesticide Management and Integrated Pest Management (IPM)

*10:45-11:00 Coffee Break*

**11:00-13:00 Session 3 – Lessons learned for practical implementation**
Moderator: John Dixon, AGSF

Plenary observations on GAP work in FAO
Working groups:
- Existing and expected demand for FAO assistance on GAP
- Improve policies and incentives for GAP
- FAO's roles and comparative advantage for GAP work
- GAP global principles and local practices

**MORNING 3: 29 October 2004, 9:00-13:00**

**9:00-10:00 Reporting from working groups in Session 3**
Moderator: Thomas Price, TCDS

*10:00-10:15 Coffee Break*

**10:15-11:45 Session 4 – The Way Forward**
Moderator: Thomas Price, TCDS

Working groups discussions on next steps:
- Priority actions at global level: information and GAP global principles
- Priority actions at country and regional level

**11:45-12:45 Reporting from working groups in Session 4 and Consolidation in plenary**

**12:45-13:00 Conclusions**

# Annex II
# Participant list

## Workshop Organizer

**Anne-Sophie POISOT**
Technical Officer
Office of the Assistant Director-General
Agriculture Department
annesophie.poisot@fao.org

## Resource Group

**Doyle BAKER**
Chief
Agricultural Management, Marketing and Finance Service
Agricultural Support Systems Division
Agriculture Department
doyle.baker@fao.org

**David BYRON**
Joint FAO/IAEA Division
Agriculture Department
David.byron@iaea.org

**John DIXON**
Senior Officer
Agricultural Management, Marketing and Finance Service
Agricultural Support Systems Division
Agriculture Department
john.dixon@fao.org

**Michelle GAUTHIER**
Forestry Officer
Forest Conservation Service
Forest Resources Division
Forestry Department
michelle.gauthier@fao.org

**Eric KUENEMAN**
Chief
Crop and Grassland Service
Plant Production and Protection Division
Agriculture Department
eric.kueneman@fao.org

**Katherine LONG**
Joint FAO/IAEA Division
Agriculture Department
Katherine.Long@iaea.org

**Maya PINEIRO**
Nutrition Officer
Food Quality and Standards Service
Food and Nutrition Division
Economic and Social Department
maya.pineiro@fao.org

**Erik PLAISIER**
UNDG Liaison/Programme Officer
Resources and Strategic Partnership Unit
Technical Cooperation Department
erik.plaisier@fao.org

**Luz Berania DIAZ RIOS**
Technical Officer
Food Quality Standards Service
Food and Nutrition Division
Economic and Social Department
luzberania.diazrios@fao.org

**Loretta SONN**
Senior Technical Adviser
Office of the Assistant Director-General
Agriculture Department
loretta.sonn@fao.org

**Andrew SPEEDY**
Senior Officer
Animal Production Service
Animal Production and Health Division
Agriculture Department
andrew.speedy@fao.org

**Thomas PRICE**
NGOs/ CSOs Senior Liaison Officer
Resources and Strategic Partnerships Unit
Technical Cooperation Department
thomas.price@fao.org

## Other Participants

**Astrid AGOSTINI**
Economist
Southern and Eastern Africa Service
Investment Centre
Technical Cooperation Department
astrid.agostini@fao.org

**Marcelino AVILA**
Project Coordinator
Rural Institutions and Participation Service
Rural Development Division
Sustainable Development Department
marcelino.avila@fao.org

**Wilfried BAUDOIN**
Retiree Consultant
Crop and Grassland Service
Plant Production and Protection Division
Agriculture Department
wilfried.baudoin@fao.org

**Jose BENITES**
Technical Officer
Land and Plant Nutrition Management Service
Land and Water Development Division
Agriculture Department
jose.benites@fao.org

**Walter BURGOS LEON**
Technical Officer
Land and Plant Nutrition Management Service
Land and Water Development Division
Agriculture Department
walter.burgosleon@fao.org

**Yoshihide ENDO**
Food Standards Officer
Secretariat, Codex Alimentarius Commission
Food and Nutrition Division
Economic and Social Department
yoshihide.endo@fao.org

**Jean-Marc FAURES**
Senior Officer
Water Resources, Development and Management Service
Land and Water Development Division
Agriculture Department
jeanmarc.faures@fao.org

**Sara FERNANDEZ**
Associate Professional Officer
Water Resources, Development and Management Service
Land and Water Development Division
Agriculture Department
sara.fernandez@fao.org

**Eva GALVEZ-NOGALES**
Marketing Economist
Agricultural Management Marketing and Finance Service
Agricultural Support Systems Division
Agriculture Department
eva.galveznogales@fao.org

**Peter GRIFFEE**
Senior Officer
Crop and Grassland Service
Plant Production and Protection Division
Agriculture Department
peter.griffee@fao.org

**Jan Peter GROENEWOLD**
Consultant
Animal Production Service
Animal Production and Health Division
Agriculture Department
janpeter.groenewold@fao.org

**Leon HERMANS**
Associate Professional Officer
Water Resources, Development and Management Service
Land and Water Development Division
Agriculture Department
leon.hermans@fao.org

**Alison HODDER**
Agriculture Officer
Crop and Grassland Service
Plant Production and Protection Division
Agriculture Department
alison.hodder@fao.org

**Thomas HOFER**
Forestry Officer
Forest Conservation Service
Forest Resources Division
Forestry Department
thomas.hofer@fao.org

**Peter KENMORE**
Senior IPM Officer
Plant Protection Service
Plant Production and Protection Division
Agriculture Department
peter.kenmore@fao.org

**Josef KIENZLE**
Agricultural Engineer
Agriculture and Food Engineering Technologies Service
Agricultural Support Systems Division
Agriculture Department
Josef.Kienzle@fao.org

**Parviz KOOHAFKAN**
Chief
Land and Plant Nutrition Management Service
Land and Water Development Division
Agriculture Department
parviz.koohafkan@fao.org

**Rainer KRELL**
Environmental and Sustainable Development Officer
Sustainable Development Department Group
Regional Office for Europe
rainer.krell@fao.org

**Sang Jae LEE**
Associate Professional Officer
Crop and Grassland Service
Plant Production and Protection Division
Agriculture Department
sangjae.lee@fao.org

**Materne MAETZ**
Senior Agricultural Policy Support Officer
Agricultural Policy Support Service
Policy Assistance Division
Technical Cooperation Department
materne.maetz@fao.org

**Florent MARAUX**
Soil Scientist
Water Resources, Development and Management Service/ CIRAD
Land and Water Development Division
Agriculture Department
florent.maraux@fao.org

**Julian MARTINEZ BELTRAN**
Technical Officer
Water Resources, Development and Management Service
Land and Water Development Division
Agriculture Department
julian.martinezbeltran@fao.org

**Jeronimas MASKELIUNAS**
Food Standard Officer
Secretariat, Codex Alimentarius Commission
Food and Nutrition Division
Economic and Social Department
jeronimas.maskeliunas@fao.org

**Anni McLEOD**
Senior Officer
Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch
Animal Production and Health Division
Agriculture Department
anni.mcleod@fao.org

**Paul MERLIN**
Visiting Scientist
Food Quality and Standards Service
Food and Nutrition Division
Economic and Social Department
paul.merlin@fao.org

**Nancy MORGAN**
Commodity Specialist
Basic Foodstuff Service
Commodities and Trade Division
Economic and Social Department
nancy.morgan@fao.org

**Madelon MEIJER**
Food Security and Poverty Economist,
Agricultural Sector in Economic Development Service
Economic and Social Department
madelon.meijer@fao.org

**Constance NEELY**
Consultant
Land and Plant Nutrition Management Service
Agriculture Department
constance.neely@fao.org

**Melba REANTASO**
Fishery Resources Officer
Inland Water Resources and Aquaculture Service
Fishery Resources Division
Fisheries Department
melba.reantaso@fao.org

**Laura RUSSO**
Forestry Officer
Forest Products Service
Forest Products and Economics Division
Forestry Department
laura.russo@fao.org

**Pilar SANTACOLOMA**
Farm Resource Economist
Agricultural Management, Marketing and Finance Service
Agricultural Support Systems Division
Agriculture Department
pilar.santacoloma@fao.org

**Atsushi SATO**
Associate Professional Officer
Crop and Grassland Service
Plant Production and Protection Division
Agriculture Department
atsuhi.sato@fao.org

**Hitomi SATO**
Associate Professional Officer
Crop and Grassland Service
Plant Production and Protection Division
Agriculture Department
hitomi.sato@fao.org

**Andrew SHEPHERD**
Marketing Economist
Agricultural Management, Marketing and Finance Service
Agricultural Support Systems Division
Agriculture Department
andrew.shepherd@fao.org

**Rohana SUBASINGHE**
Senior Fishery Resources Officer
Inland Water Resources and Aquaculture Service
Fishery Resources Division
Fisheries Department
rohana.subasinghe@fao.org

**Paola TERMINE**
Rural Institution and Rural Workers Officer
Rural Institutions and Participation Service
Rural Development Division
Sustainable Development Department
paola.termine@fao.org

**Tanja VAN DEN BERGEN**
Technical Officer
Land and Plant Nutrition Management
Land and Water Development Division
Agriculture Department
tania.vandenbergen@fao.org

**Harry VAN DER WULP**
Senior Policy Officer
Plant Protection Service
Plant Production and Protection Division
Agriculture Department
harry.vanderwulp@fao.org

**Gavin WALL**
Chief
Agricultural and Food Engineering Technologies Service
Agricultural Support Systems Division
Agriculture Department
gavin.wall@fao.org

**Sven WALTER**
Forestry Officer
Forest Products Service
Forest Products and Economics Division
Forestry Department
sven.walter@fao.org

**Rolf Willmann**
Senior Fishery Planning Officer
Development Planning Service
Fisheries Department
Rolf.Willmann@fao.org

# Annex III
# List of background documents

- Resource paper "Good Agricultural Practices, a Working Concept Document" by Anne-Sophie Poisot, FAO/AGD, with Eric Kueneman, FAO/AGPC and Andrew Speedy, FAO/AGAP
- Resource paper "Analysis of important GAP programmes, codes and standards outside FAO" by Andrew Speedy, FAO/AGAP, with Anne-Sophie Poisot, FAO/AGD
- Outcome and inputs from video conferences with FAO Regional Offices for Latin America, Asia, Africa and the Near East on GAP, held in the days preceding the workshop
- GAP paper presented to the 17th Session of COAG in 2003 "A Framework for Good Agricultural Practices", document COAG/2003/6
- Report of FAO Expert Consultation on GAP, November 2003, Rome

All background documents can be found on the FAO Good Agricultural Practices website at: http://www.fao.org/prods/GAP/gapindex_en.htm

# Report of the FAO Internal Workshop on Good Agricultural Practices

Rome, Italy, 27-29 October 2004

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has being working on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) for many years. The FAO GAP Working Paper Series presents a selection of papers to illustrate this initiative.

The concept of Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) has evolved in recent years in the context of a rapidly changing and globalizing food economy and as a result of the concerns and commitments of a wide range of stakeholders regarding food production and security, food safety and quality, and the environmental sustainability of agriculture. FAO provides a neutral platform for intergovernmental, private sector and civil society dialogue at national, regional and international level on the development of Good Agricultural Practice approaches that can contribute to concrete implementation of sustainable agriculture and rural development.

Many country activities and field projects relating to GAP have been implemented by different FAO divisions since the validation of FAO's GAP approach by the 17th Session of the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) in April 2003. While different divisions provide assistance on specific aspects of GAP (food safety and quality, sustainable crop production and protection, animal production and health, marketing and agribusiness development, and more), it was recognised that synergies could be more efficiently harnessed to provide coordinated support to FAO member countries.

In this context, a workshop on GAP was organized for FAO divisions from 27-29 October 2004, to determine how FAO could best draw upon its various areas of expertise to respond to needs of farmers, government services exporters, and others in developing countries.

This document serves as a summary of the Internal Workshop, including its objectives, summary of presentations, practical lessons learned on implementation, synergies identified and recommendations.