



PAGE 4: B.1) YOUR CASE STORY: TITLE AND DESCRIPTION

Q1: TITLE OF CASE STORY

Pacific Horticultural and Agricultural Market Access (PHAMA) Program – Phase One

Q2: CASE STORY ABSTRACT

PHAMA provides a structured, strategic approach for assisting Pacific Island countries (PICs) to gain access to key markets for selected high-value primary products. While PHAMA focuses on high value primary products, particularly agricultural and horticultural (plant and animal, fresh and processed), it can also assist fish and forest products.

PHAMA's overall goal is to strengthen economic livelihoods and contribute to economic growth. Implemented in Samoa, Tonga, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Fiji, it helps these countries meet the regulatory requirements - such as quarantine and food safety standards - of trading partners. It helps overcome key market access constraints to Pacific exports of agricultural and horticultural products.

PHAMA was originally designed as an eight-year program, to be implemented in two phases. This was in recognition of the long lead times required to address regulatory issues and create successful pathways for Pacific agricultural products. Phase One ended in June 2013 and phase Two is currently in operation.

Q3: LONG DESCRIPTION OF THE CASE STORY

Despite most PICS being primarily agricultural-based economies, export performance of non-commodity primary products and high-value products has been poor. In contrast, developing countries globally have benefited from a revolution in the trade of high-value agricultural and horticultural products over the past 20-30 years.

PHAMA was designed to address the following key constraints:

- Need for prioritisation. Australian and New Zealand regulatory authorities have indicated that market access requests have been poorly prioritised and communicated. PHAMA provides a coherent process for the private sector and government to collectively determine priorities and focus.
- Capacity to develop and progress submissions is severely constrained by lack of appropriately skilled staff able to interpret and apply relevant international Sanitary and Phyto-Sanitary (SPS) standards, prepare market access submissions and access relevant data and research.
- Long market access approval process. Australian and New Zealand processes for imports are often detailed, lengthy and slow. The process, which can take 2-5 years, can also depend on the import country resources, which are often constrained.
- Capacity to complement export protocols. Many PICs have market access protocols in place but often lack the capability to implement operational requirements to meet those protocols.
- Lack of industry involvement. PHAMA works with industry to identify market access priorities.
- Lack of information on market access requirements. Access to regulatory information on operational procedures, SPS and food safety requirements are generally poor.

PUBLIC SECTOR CASE STORY TEMPLATE

PHAMA's approach

PHAMA is implemented in three parts, each with specific, albeit complementary, objectives. The first part deals with responding to country market access priorities ranging from specific technical assistance to preparation of detailed market access submissions. These priorities are determined by countries themselves, through national market access working groups (MAWG) consisting of industry and government. MAWGs identify and generate the main body of work for programming assistance.

A second part of PHAMA relates to strengthening existing market access services provided by Secretariat of the Pacific Community's (SPC) Land Resources Division, in particular the Biosecurity and Trade Services team (BATS). PHAMA funds 7 of the 8 designated positions within BATS. BATS has a wide remit for market access work which ranges from providing several information databases, advocacy at regional and international meetings and general market access assistance. SPC's involvement means some market access assistance can still be provided to all Pacific countries, including those not initially involved in the PHAMA program – regardless of whether countries have existing agribusiness exports.

The third part of PHAMA relates to assistance provided by Australia's Department of Agriculture. As Australia is an important export market for Pacific primary exports, the Department of Agriculture was provided funding to enable the Department to respond specifically to Pacific agricultural market access issues.

A PHAMA Program Coordination Committee, consisting of relevant Australian and New Zealand government stakeholders, provides strategic oversight. A key mandate of the Committee is approving annual work plans for the program.

Key findings

According to an independent report, PHAMA is generally effective in implementing technical market access activities. Key to its effectiveness have been a sustained focus on regulatory aspects of biosecurity, quarantine and research and development-related market access for high-value fresh and processed primary products; and a decentralised, evidence-based and industry-driven approach to identifying market access priorities. The report found significant results have been achieved during a relatively short implementation period.

One such achievement has been the successful establishment of MAWGs in Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu. MAWGs are officially endorsed by the governments concerned and their level of operation is remarkable considering that membership of the MAWGs is honorary. Additionally, as far as market access for non-commodity products is concerned, MAWGs constitute a new process of engagement between government and industry in most of these countries. MAWGs are widely acknowledged as effective mechanisms that strengthen connections between exporters and market access regulatory bodies. They facilitate evidence-based negotiation between government and industry, identifying export priorities for primary products. They help countries achieve greater coherence between their production capability and their export priorities. PIC governments regard MAWGs as a replicable model for other sectors and products.

Q4: Please add here web links to project/programme materials.

www.phama.com.au

PUBLIC SECTOR CASE STORY TEMPLATE

Q5: YOUR CONTACT DETAILS	
Name:	-
Ministry/Institution/Organization:	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Country:	Australia
Email Address:	aidfortrade@dfat.gov.au
Q6: FUNCTION	Public sector
Q7: FUNDING PARTNER Tick the appropriate box(es)	Bilateral donor
Q8: Additional information	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
Q9: START DATE OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME	2009
Q10: STATUS OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME	On-going
Q11: DURATION OR, IF ON-GOING, EXPECTED DURATION OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME	1-3 years
Q12: COST OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME	US\$10-20 million
Q13: Additional information	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
Q14: TYPE OF FUNDING FOR PROJECT/PROGRAMME	Grant

PAGE 6: C.2) ABOUT THE CASE STORY

Q15: PROJECT/PROGRAMME TYPE	Regional
------------------------------------	----------

PAGE 7: C.2) ABOUT THE CASE STORY

Q16: SINGLE COUNTRY/CUSTOMS TERRITORY	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
--	---

PAGE 8: C.2) ABOUT THE CASE STORY

PUBLIC SECTOR CASE STORY TEMPLATE

Q17: REGION(If the region does not appear in the drop down menu, please enter manually.)

Pacific Islands

PAGE 9: C.2) ABOUT THE CASE STORY

Q18: MULTI-COUNTRY(Enter all countries or customs territories)

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 10: C.4) ABOUT THE CASE STORY

Q19: CASE STORY FOCUSTick the appropriate box(es)

REDUCING TRADE COSTS FOR MERCHANDISE GOODS

,

Other border agency reforms,

Support for compliance with non-tariff measures (including standards)

PAGE 11: C.5) ABOUT THE CASE STORY

Q20: HOW SUCCESSFUL WAS THE PROJECT/PROGRAMME Tick the appropriate box(es)

Successful

PAGE 12: C.6) ABOUT THE CASE STORY

Q21: WHAT WERE THE OUTPUTS OF THE PROJECT/PROGRAMME Tick the appropriate box(es)

Officials trained,

New other border agency procedure,

Laboratory testing facilities,

New animal health measures or processes,

New plant health measures or processes,

New food safety measures or processes,

New quality assurance procedures or processes

Q22: Additional information(maximum 300 words)

Respondent skipped this question

PUBLIC SECTOR CASE STORY TEMPLATE

PAGE 13: C.7) ABOUT THE CASE STORY

Q23: WHAT WERE THE OUTCOMES OF YOUR PROJECT/PROGRAMME Tick the appropriate box(es)	Reduction in other border agency clearance time , Reduction in cost of other border agency clearance , Increase in merchandise exports, Increase in shipping volumes
Q24: Additional information(maximum 300 words)	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>

PAGE 14: C.8) ABOUT THE CASE STORY

Q25: WHAT WERE THE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT/PROGRAMME Tick the appropriate box(es)	Increase in domestic investment, Export market diversification
Q26: Additional information(maximum 300 words)	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>

PAGE 15: C.9) ABOUT THE CASE STORY

Q27: LESSONS LEARNT Tick the appropriate box(es)	Importance of good project design, Importance of alignment between different development partners in programming , Importance of engagement by private sector, Importance of political will and commitment by project partner
Q28: Additional information(maximum 300 words)	<i>Respondent skipped this question</i>
Q29: PROJECT OR PROGRAMME MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK Tick the appropriate box(es)	M&E framework used, Joint ex post evaluation conducted with partner