

PROGRESS REPORT ON PROJECTS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

PROJECTS FINISHED IN 2014 OR 2015 (UNTIL THE END OF MARCH 2015)

- **ZT(2015)1: Intensive Training Course on Food and Nutrition**
Sponsor: OHP and University of Khartoum, Sudan
Expenses: €2,499
Financial support: €1,655 (unexpected)
Brief description: In line with the MOU between OHP and the University of Khartoum, OHP offered to provide an intensive training course on food hygiene and safety for MSc students at the Faculty of Public and Environmental Health. The OHP trainers were HK and WdW. The training course program is outlined in document ZT(2015)1/A. The expected number of attendants was about 30-35. However, it appeared that interest for the course was very high and exceeded the capacity of the lecture room (70). Lectures were followed by interactive 'statement sessions' requiring input from the audience. In addition on 3 out of the 4 days work assignments were given which were evaluated and discussed at the end of the work session. Following the course and in order to keep the momentum the University management requested OHP to deliver within one year and to the same MSc students a series of in depth training courses on: (i) food hygiene and quality, (ii) food surveillance and compliance monitoring and/or (iii) food security, respectively.
The OHP training course was scheduled back-to-back with an Annual Conference on Medical and Health Sciences Studies. Both OHP Trainers gave plenary keynote lectures on: "Food security, safety and quality interrelationship" and "Food microbiology", respectively. Both also co-chaired a session of short oral presentations.
Document(s): ZT(2015)1/A; PRS/ZT(2015)1, MOU UoK
Lessons learned: The need for proper education in Sudan is very high; with a governmental budget of less than 6% of the overall country's annual budget (>90% for 'Defence'), facilities, equipment and staff salaries are very much below minimum for a proper university education. Hence, a one week training course is no more than a drop on a hot plate. The question is: should OHP no longer go there?
- **RT(2014)1: Awareness raising about food fortification in Indonesia**
Sponsor: GAIN and OHP
Expenses: €12,856
Financial support: €17,306
Brief description: A contract was signed with GAIN in early February 2014 for the development of 3 workshops (for government, producers and consumers) on "Good practice in regulatory monitoring of food fortification". The contract budget was €36,000. The work started with a 'scoping mission' to have a good understanding of the needs for training, the current governmental activities with respect to compliance monitoring, the level of detail of the training offered and practical, organizational issues. One OHP Expert (TO) went on this mission. From his mission report [RT(2014)1/R1] it appeared that: (i) the Indonesian authorities were not happy with the initiative, (ii) the authorities wanted to set the agenda of the workshops, (iii) claimed authorship of the course content and (iv) the timing should much later in the year. It was agreed with GAIN to postpone the workshops to May and later to November 2014. However, GAIN staff was unable to reach agreement with the authorities about the offered training and the mission was aborted in November 2014. Expenses already made were reimbursed.
Documents: GAIN-OHP contract 13GL02-IN; R/RT(2014)1/1;
Lessons learned: From the 2013 GAIN/OHP mission in Kenya [project RT(2013)2] it was clear that a thorough situation analysis before going into any country with food malnutrition problems is a prerequisite for any food fortification project or the evaluation of a running fortification project.
- **RT(2014)2: Development of a Guidance Document on QA/QC and Compliance Surveys**
Sponsor: GAIN and OHP
Expenses: provisionally none
Financial support: Not yet negotiated

Brief description: Project was postponed for budget reasons before the negotiations had started
Documents: none
Lessons learned: not applicable

- **RT(2014)3: Development of a Guidance Document on Best Regulatory Monitoring Practices**

Sponsor: GAIN and OHP

Expenses: €12,762

Financial support: €13,500

Brief description: Following a brief teleconference during which GAIN staff explained their need for a guidance document for government staff on the regulatory monitoring of food fortification a contract was negotiated for such a guidance document. Main expectations were: the identification of 3-5 key conditions of effective monitoring, a number of well documented good practice case studies and an overall quality of the document that allows publication in an appropriate scientific journal. Four OHP experts were involved in this project (BdB, HK, TO and WdW). A first outline was revised following further clarification of GAIN's expectations. However, the first extensive draft of the Guidance Document was considered too technical and too much focused on QA/QC tools considered essential for best monitoring practices. Following an extensive teleconference a second, rather different, draft was produced with emphasis on: (i) adequate regulatory structures, instruments and approaches, (ii) available resources and capacity, and (iii) constructive stakeholder involvement. This draft was accepted.

Documents: GAIN-OHP Contract: 12GL01-IN; R/RT(2014)3/1; PPT presentation

Lessons learned: A considerably larger number of working days was dedicated to this project, basically because of an inadequate mutual understanding of what exactly was requested from OHP. Although financially there was no loss, compensation of experts for the work done was marginal. From this experience it could be learned that in case of doubt about common understanding, further discussion is needed prior to starting the actual drafting.

- **RT(2014)4: EU-China Workshop on Food Risk Analysis**

Sponsor: AETS/European Commission and OHP

Expenses: €5,553

Financial support: €8,577

Brief description: this project was a sub-contract of OHP with AETS, a rather big French contract organization that had been awarded the EC framework program on better training for safer food (BTSF). The 5-days food risk analysis workshop was one of a series of food safety workshops in Eastern Europe and Asia. OHP was approached to participate by providing 2 senior experts on food safety (WdW and HK). Both prepared and gave 6 presentations, following a strict EC defined format. Three experts from Spain, the UK and France gave talks on pesticides management, risk communication and EU legislation, respectively. The OHP presentations were well received and discussions provided an opportunity to introduce OHP to relevant workshop attendants.

Documents: AETS-OHP Service Agreement: C14-47/OP/2013-174-EAHC-LOT3; R/RT(2014)4/1;

Lessons learned: Trainer fees were agreed at €450/day, including travel days. However, preparatory work was fixed at 3 days which was way too short to prepare and deal with Commission comments which were plenty, unreasonable and, often, unprofessional. Because the preparation time was a multiple of the 3 days set, OHP did not request to donate a percentage of the fees received. Lessons learned: negotiate better financial deals as organizations such as AETS don't have experts 'in house' and need outside support.

- **RT(2014)5: Training on Micronutrient Malnutrition in Senegal**

Sponsor: GAIN and OHP

Expenses: €6,614

Financial support: €8,936

Brief description: This project consisted of providing a moderator/speaker at a workshop organized by GAIN-Senegal to discuss and evaluate the success of the GAIN Fortification Assessment Coverage Toolkit (FACT), applied in Senegal. The OHP expert (BdB) was a retired senior WHO food fortification expert. The workshop was very successful and well-moderated by the OHP expert.

Documents: GAIN-OHP Contract: 13GL02-IN; R/RT(2014)5/1

Lessons learned: This small project was an example of good cooperation and mutual understanding between GAIN and OHP.

PROJECTS RUNNING OR UNDER DEVELOPMENT

- **RT(2010)6: Food Information Transparency Initiative (FITI)**

Sponsor: OHP and the Netherlands Government

Expenses: €17,666

Financial support: €20,000

Brief description: this project has been on hold for about a year. Following the negative attitude of the food industry towards the transparency aspect of the project, and the decision of the Caesar Group to abolish its smart phone application section for economical reasons (downsizing its operations), attempts have been made to find an appropriate other IT partner (Vignet'D , The Product Foundry) and cooperate with similar initiatives (ClearKarma). All unsuccessful. Another alley was also explored: a booth at the European Parliament which was successful in the sense that MEP's showed an interest to be kept informed but no material support. Finally, OHP registered as partner of the EC Healthy Ageing project and broadened the FITI approach to FaNaHa (Food and Nutrition assisted Healthy ageing). A meeting of involved OHP discussing further strategies did not result in a fresh, new proposal and the project was put on hold.

Documents: Several, as shared in recent years

Lessons learned: The lack of success need further analysis. The increasing numbers of food frauds reported in the newspapers may be an incentive to restart, the more so since other, regional or national food information apps are generally welcomed with enthusiasm (Qmark) but then got stuck because of a lack of independent reliable data.

- **RT(2014)6: Assisting Ukraine in Bringing Food Safety and Quality up to EU Standards**

Sponsor: OHP-Bureau Brussels

Expenses: €1,516

Financial support: no financial support yet

Brief description:The deep and comprehensive free trade agreement (DCFTA) between the EU and Ukraine requires full compliance with the EU food safety and control legislation. A substantial amount of money is involved including the multimillion project on Improvement of the Food Safety System in the Ukraine (IFSSU) which was awarded to the Grontmij (Denmark). The OHP-BB strategy was to arrange for meetings with high level government and private sector representatives and with the IFSSU project leader. A visit was made to Kiev in October 2014 to meet with the various relevant parties. Although all wanted input and assistance from OHP-BB, all referred to the IFSSU for financial support. The IFSSU has yet to come with an offer.

Documents: R/RT(2014)6/1; several letters

Lessons learned: Although the preparation of the Kiev mission was excellent thanks to an Ukrainian OHP expert with very good contacts, there has not been a follow-up. Time/capacity is lacking in OHP to lobby the various parties.

- **RT(2014)7: Advice and Lecturing on Better Science with Less Animals**

Sponsor: TNO

Expenses: €199

Financial support:€1,691

Brief description: This small project consisted of 2 presentations at scientific conferences, chairing a hands-on workshop at the 9th World Congress (WC9) in Prague, 2014 and chairing a session at the EUROTOX congress in Porto September 2015. For the work done in 2014 next to reimbursement of expenses, a fee of €1,500 was charged for OHP support

Documents: a PPT presentation

Lessons learned: Nothing in particular, other than that the time investment is always more than expected. However, the name of OHP is spread through these conference participations.

- **RT(2014)8: Development of Education and Training Modules on Nutrition, Food Fortification and Food Safety**

Sponsor: GAIN and OHP

Expenses: €136

Financial support: not yet negotiated

Brief description: at the request of GAIN an outline was made of a concept for a distance learning program in the area of food fortification. The objective of the project would be the development and operational functioning of a distance learning program aimed at improving and optimizing the efficacy and success of GAIN's various food fortification programs. The project would cover a series of education and training modules

Documents: R/RT(2014)8/1

Lessons learned: There is doubt about how serious GAIN considers OHP's proposals. Rumors circulate that our ideas and approaches may be shared with other parties who then are contracted to do the work. There is no proof of such misconduct, however.

TENDER ACTIVITIES

In January 2015 OHP took the initiative to respond to EU tender: EuropeAid/136201/DH/SER/MD on support and assistance to the National Food Safety Agency in Moldova in improving the legal framework for food safety, its further establishment as a food safety authority and in controlling food safety. A consortium of interested parties for this tender was established with the following members:

- OHP (Consortium Leader)- Belgium
- GAIN (Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition)- Switzerland/UK
- Jon Bell Associates - UK
- Nutricom Consultancy - The Netherlands
- Bureau Brussels - Belgium
- DeWit AgroConsult - The Netherlands

Administrative and technical support in producing the application was provided by Bureau Brussels and OHP (Katerina Tsakmakidou). Following 2 weeks of intensive communication, collection of data and the collation of the comprehensive application, the tender submission was sent by Posteltalienne as registered express mail on 29 January, well before the closing date of 6 February. A corrigendum (one minor omission corrected) was sent by DHL Express on 2 February. On 13 February a letter was received from the EU Delegation in Moldova requesting proof of the full application. On 14 February the requested proof of the full application as well as the proof of the corrigendum were sent (and received) by email. Following almost 2 months of silence, on 7 April a request for information about the selection process was sent to the EU Delegation in Moldova. A response was received the same day, saying that our submission was considered not eligible because the full application was not received before the deadline. In a letter of appeal sent on 9 April, we made reference to our earlier submitted proof of timely submission by Posteltalienne's registered express mail. However, in its response of 10 April the Commission declined the appeal on the grounds that at the closing date, only the corrigendum was received and that the full submission was received only on 3 March, 25 days after the deadline. As suggested by some of the consortium members a formal letter of complaint to Posteltalienne is currently being prepared claiming compensation of the actual costs made (time spent by all consortium members) and possibly more.

Documents: the full submission, the corrigendum, letters of 13 February, and 7, 9 and 10 April

Lessons learned: most importantly, we will not use Posteltalienne anymore for any mail with a deadline of receipt. Instead we will make use of a commercial express delivery service. Second, when we made the correction we should have resubmitted the full proposal rather than the corrigendum only.