

International Workshop

GLOBALGAP Group Certification:

A challenge for smallholders in Europe and developing countries

**28 and 29 April 2008
in Frankfurt/Main, Germany**



Table of Contents

1	<i>Introduction and Background</i>
2	<i>GLOBALGAP Certification</i>
3	<i>Lessons Learned from GLOBALGAP Certification in Africa and Europe</i>
4	<i>The challenges of GLOBALGAP Certification for Smallholders</i>
4.1	The GLOBALGAP Control Points and their need for revision to reflect the needs of smallholders
4.2	The General Regulations and their need for revision to reflect the needs of smallholders
4.3	The participation of producer associations in the standard-setting process
4.4	The QMS and the question of how producer associations can be supported during the implementation
5	<i>Summary and Further Steps</i>
5.1	Workshop results and further steps
5.2	Results of the evaluation of the Smallholder Taskforce and further steps
Annex 1:	The Agenda
Annex 2:	The Participants
Annex 3:	GLOBALGAP certification (Frederik Callens)
Annex 4:	The Presentations of Lessons Learned in
Annex 4.1	Kenya (Steve Homer)
Annex 4.2	Ghana (Kofi Biney)
Annex 4.3	Senegal/Kenya (Tom Kuipers)
Annex 4.4	Belgium (de Blaiser)
Annex 4.5	South Tyrol (Georg Warasin)
Annex 4.6	Turkey (Belit Balci)
Annex 5:	The Presentations of Working Groups
Annex 5.1	Working Group 1: The revision of the GLOBALGAP Control Points to reflect the needs of smallholders
Annex 5.2	Working Group 2: The revision of the General Regulations to reflect the needs of smallholders
Annex 5.3	Working Group 3: The participation of producer associations in the standard-setting process
Annex 5.4	Working Group 4: The QMS and the question of how producer associations can be supported during the implementation
Annex 6:	Recommendations referring to GR and CPCC
Annex 7:	The Africa-Observer Project: Results of the call for proposals (Johannes Kern)
Annex 8:	Photo Gallery

1 Introduction and Background

Scandals in connection with agricultural production systems, for instance regarding pesticide residues, enhance consumer awareness of the quality of the products they consume. As a consequence, retailers and multinational food companies seek to assure their customers that the agricultural and food products they sell are being produced in line with internationally agreed good agricultural practice.

These global food safety concerns have led to an increasing number of both public and private standards and import regulations. Among private food standards, GLOBALGAP has emerged as the leading standard-setter for African agricultural exports to Europe. GLOBALGAP is made up of retailer and producer members who meet regularly in different committees to set GLOBALGAP standards. GLOBALGAP started in 1997 as a pre-competitive initiative of retailers belonging to the Euro-Retailer Produce Working Group (EUREP). GLOBALGAP's Option 2 (group certification) is a means for smallholders to achieve certification as a member of a farmer group, decreasing certification costs. Group certification under option 2 requires the implementation of an Internal Control System with a documented Quality Management System (QMS).

Experience shows that private sector standards have both advantages and disadvantages for smallholders all over the world. On the one hand private standards can deliver an important opportunity for agricultural producers to participate in high value (export) markets and to introduce sustainable agricultural practices. On the other hand, the implementation of private standards can be a threat for many small farmers, as compliance with the standards is connected with additional costs and non-compliance may lead to their exclusion from certain markets. Besides the direct cost of auditing which amounts to a few hundred US dollars per farmer, there are also the indirect costs of on-farm modifications and management changes such as implementing a thorough recordkeeping system. All these compliance costs have to be covered, while no specific price premium forms part of the standard as prices are negotiated by the supply chain partners individually, and GLOBALGAP is viewed as a minimum standard.

In developing countries, thousands of small-scale farmers have developed the farm management skills needed to reach the high standards of agricultural practice required. Yet in view of the certification-related costs described above it is not clear whether small-scale farmers can continue to meet these standards without sustained donor or other external support. In the development context, the challenge faced is to integrate or maintain small-scale farmers in export-driven high-value chains and to derive significant levels of income. Hence development agencies such as USAID, DFID and GTZ have become involved in projects to link smallholder farmers to these potentially lucrative markets by focusing on compliance with GLOBALGAP or other standards.

The ***Smallholder GLOBALGAP support project in developing countries***, funded by DFID, GTZ and GLOBALGAP, aims to identify specific ways in which the GLOBALGAP standard can be more inclusive for smallholder farmers from developing countries and to assist GLOBALGAP members to develop/adjust appropriate technical standards and tools.

Currently, the project is financing an expert located in the GLOBALGAP Committee ([Africa-Observer](#)). His main tasks are to

- review existing research and case study evidence about GLOBALGAP standard,
- identify issues of key relevance to poor farmers in developing countries and opportunities for influencing GLOBALGAP standard,
- develop an informal network of key stakeholders and identify opportunities for engagement (e.g. meetings and seminars) during 2007 and 2008 for the provision of feedback,
- brief the sector committee (SC) Chair in advance of each committee meeting on the issues identified and to observe the fruit and vegetable (FV) and flower and ornamental (FO) sector committee meetings of GLOBALGAP.

Within this project, a [Smallholder Task Force](#) made up of six experts from different organisations in Africa and Europe has recently been established. Its objective is to incorporate all different stakeholder views and concerns related to GLOBALGAP implementation in smallholder agriculture worldwide and to consider options for the next revision of the GLOBALGAP standard in 2011. Issues of key concern are GLOBALGAP Control Points and Compliance Criteria (CPCC), GLOBALGAP General Regulations (GR) – especially certification options 1, 2 and possibly further options relevant to producer groups – and the Quality Management System requirements of Option 2 certification.

The Smallholder Task Force started a call for innovative proposals to improve certification for smallholders in February. The team received input from stakeholders world-wide and evaluated the proposals in a remote process (see chapter 5 and annex 7). The main findings and most adequate proposals were discussed during the workshop.

Besides discussing the proposals received in response to this call, the main objective of the workshop was to exchange experience gathered with GLOBALGAP group certification in Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America. Representatives from African and European Producer Marketing Organisations, development agencies, GLOBALGAP, as well as governmental and non-governmental organisations participated and developed approaches to improve certification processes for smallholders at the next GLOBALGAP standard revision in 2011. The results of the call for proposals and the workshop will assist GLOBALGAP members to develop and adjust appropriate technical standards and procedures to facilitate the compliance of smallholder farmers with GLOBALGAP standards. Proposals and recommendations will be presented at the GLOBALGAP Conference on 15-17 October 2008.

2 GLOBALGAP Certification

GLOBALGAP is a single integrated standard with modular applications for different product groups, ranging from plant and livestock production to plant propagation materials and compound feed manufacturing. The checklist includes major and minor musts and recommendations regarding the applicable scopes and sub-scopes.

The documentation of the system is organised into five major blocks, each with a set of complementary elements ([GLOBALGAP](#)):

- system rules referred to as **General Regulations (GR)**,
- GLOBALGAP requirements referred to as **Control Points and Compliance Criteria (CPCC)**,
- inspection documents referred to as **Checklists (CL)**,
- national interpretations of the GLOBALGAP requirements referred to as **Approved National Interpretation Guidelines**,
- harmonisation tools referred to as **Benchmarking Cross Reference Checklist (BMCL)** and other guidelines.

GLOBALGAP has several certification options (see Annex 3):

Option 1: Individual certification GLOBALGAP

The individual farm applies for GLOBALGAP certification. The individual farmer is the certificate holder, once certified. The Certified Body (CB) carries out an annual external inspection of compliance with all CPCCs on the farm. Two special forms under Option 1 are multi-site operations either with or without QMS. The prerequisite is that the multi-site operation acts as one legal entity and one trading entity. While all sites are inspected externally under the multi-site option without QMS, the QMS and a sample of all sites is inspected under the multi-site option with QMS. However, unlike Option 2 certification, where producers who do not take part in GLOBALGAP can be excluded from the certificate, there is **no** possibility for a multi-site member with QMS to exclude some of the production areas of the certified produce. The specifications of Option 1 are seen as a gain in scope for manoeuvre for smallholder producers regarding certification options.

Option 2: Group certification GLOBALGAP

A producer group applies for GLOBALGAP certification. Under this option, the farmer group's internal control system is audited and a randomly selected number of individual farmers are audited. This measure aims to reduce the cost of compliance with the standards. The producer group is a legal entity that manages a QMS. The producer group carries out one annual internal inspection of each member.

Option 3 and Option 4: Individual or group certification benchmarked standard

The scheme applying for benchmarking is assessed for equivalence by comparing General Regulations and Compliance Criteria against GLOBALGAP. There are two options for Benchmarking:

- Full Benchmarking: Standard owners shall implement their benchmarked standard via their own EN 45011/ISO/IEC 65 accredited certification system. Benchmarked

certificates shall be issued through GLOBALGAP certification Options 3 (individual producer) and 4 (producer group)

- The Approved Modified Checklist (AMC): Standard owners will go through an assessment for equivalence against the Control Points and Compliance Criteria but will use the GLOBALGAP General Regulations.

For more information on benchmarking please see: GLOBALGAP General Regulations Part IV (www.globalgap.org).

3 Lessons Learned from GLOBALGAP Certification in Africa and Europe

Various experiences gained with GLOBALGAP group certification in Europe (Belgium, South Tyrol and Turkey) and Africa (Kenya, Senegal and Ghana) were presented, ranging from bottom-up approaches with strong focus on farmer group capacity development (Ghana [Annex 4.2 Presentation Kofi Biney] and South Tyrol [Annex 4.5 Presentation Georg Warasin]) to approaches in which farmers are closely linked to exporters (Kenya [Annex 4.1 Presentation Steve Homer], Senegal [Annex 4.3 Presentation Tom Kuipers], Turkey [Annex 4.6 Presentation Belit Balci] and Belgium [Annex 4.4 Presentation Raf de Blaiser]).

“Top-down” approaches

Lessons learned from GLOBALGAP group certification where farmer groups are closely linked to exporters show that high value export market product quality requirements and GLOBALGAP certification can hardly be achieved by smallholder groups alone. In contrast, intense support from exporters is one core element of success. “Without the participation of an exporter or donor, a smallholder would hardly be able to get certification”. The advantages of strong exporter support are that standard implementation is performed quickly and effectively. On the other hand, central control is linked to high costs and creates dependency of producers on exporters. Modes of collaboration between smallholders and export businesses such as contract farming and outgrower schemes appear to be viable options worth considering.

Experiences from Kenya show that the fluctuation of smallholders is a core problem. Especially the costs of sustaining certification and meeting the requirements lead to smallholders dropping out. “Smallholders enter thinking that GLOBALGAP is a ticket to extra cash, but actually it is only a ticket to a party with an opportunity to earn extra cash.”

Multi-sites operations in Kenya and Senegal show that costs for external certification can be reduced significantly. The question raised was whether smallholders lose their independence within a multi-site option. This can be avoided by only participating with some of the respective plots, e.g. only those plots where export crops are grown.

“Bottom-up” approaches

Experience from the GLOBALGAP Option 2 project in Ghana, funded by GTZ and USAID, shows very strong involvement of the groups concerned. The most important challenges identified are capacity development at both individual farmer level and farmer group level, a

smallholder-friendly version of CPCCs, and strong engagement in group cohesion (see below). Therefore, for sustainable group certification the focus is placed on group selection and group development.

In South Tyrol groups had already been in place for several years because of the existing cooperative law there. Hence, group certification was easy to implement. Cooperatives merged to become producer organisations and market their produce collectively. One essential asset is the certification to ISO 9000 that is legally required if the cooperative wants to receive subsidies. The ISO 9000 certified quality management system is a sound basis for attaching any other standard required by clients.

Group cohesion as one core success factor

The social cohesion of the respective groups involved in group certification is one key success factor for sustainable certification and concurrently one of the core challenges for group certification, in both Europe and Africa. Sometimes groups are put together artificially, but they do not naturally coexist as a group. "It's like putting together a football team, it does not always work." "If you leave the groups alone they will disintegrate." Hence, capacity development is essential. A common need must be identified within the group, especially in small groups of 15-20 producers. This can be common marketing, common production, common training – but never certification as the only purpose. Farmers' reluctant attitude to long-term commitments can undermine groups. The bigger the group becomes the more important long-term relationships between the group and the exporter become.

4 The Challenges of GLOBALGAP Certification for Smallholders

Standard integrity - in particular audit frequency, Option 2 modalities and sanctions - is one of the topics for the upcoming revision in 2011 (GLOBALGAP V4.0). Modifications of the general regulations – already introduced or under discussion – can be interpreted as a response to the criticism of some retailers and accreditation bodies who have put group certification into doubt. Critical points in this context are e.g. the sampling size (which is considered not high enough), the desire to see all farms inspected at least once, the types of legal entities that would be acceptable, sourcing from members others than the registered GLOBALGAP farmers, the reliability of internal inspections, and sanctioning of non-compliances etc. Taking this into consideration, the working groups discussed problems related to the GLOBALGAP General Regulations, CPCCs and QMS with a view to identifying solutions that reflect both the needs of smallholders and legitimate concerns with the credibility of certification options. "The biggest challenge is to maintain food safety while being pragmatic at the same time".

4.1 The GLOBALGAP Control Points and their need for revision to reflect the needs of smallholders

The group dealt with the most important (in terms of relevance from the group's viewpoint) 32 of the 64 proposals submitted (see chapter 5) that refer directly to the revision of CPCCs. During discussions the group analysed the problems smallholders may have with

compliance, feasible modifications of those points, and conditions that would support compliance with CPCC.

Several of the results the group came up with deal with a lack of **clarification of definitions**. “It seems that different things are being interpreted by different people in different parts of the world.” The group was aware that too many and too narrow definitions often overload the standard and make it inflexible. Nevertheless, in some areas the group expects the introduction of clear-cut definitions to be favourable for smallholders:

The term “worker” who shall have access to hand washing facilities and own living quarters (AF 3.5.4 / 3.5.5) should be clearly distinguished from family farm members. Given that most agricultural land has traditionally been used, the term “new sites”, where a risk assessment is supposed to take place, should be clarified (AF 2.2.1). The group furthermore raised the following question: if several producers share the same site, is it enough if just one producer conducts the risk assessment? Finally, the term “qualified personnel” needed for training (AF 3.2.6) also lacks clarification. What makes a trainer qualified? According to the group, a definition should also reflect practical knowledge through experience and not only formal training.

Other CPCCs were discussed, for which the group came to the conclusion that certain requirements should be **related to the level of risks**. The requirement of traceability (CB 1.1) cannot be complied with in absolute terms. A degree of traceability that is practical should be considered. Regarding certification option 2, traceability would outreach to the group level. Concerning aid assurance, the contents of first aid kits should reflect the level of risk of the particular production technology rather than national regulations (AF 3.3.4). Furthermore, the storage of plant protection products (CB 8.7) should be related to the risk level, too. For instance, it should depend on the materials used in constructing the store.

The group additionally discussed **explicit changes of requirements**. The authorisation of protective clothing and equipment should not depend on the authorisation of a competent authority (AF 3.4.1), because auditors could introduce a cleaning schedule leading to unnecessary documentation. Rather, a complete set of protective equipment should be ensured, clean before and after usage. The prohibition of reuse of plant protection product containers (CB 8.9.1) should be rephrased. There are non-food reuses that are helpful for smallholders without having any negative impact. The case of residue testing should also be revised (CB 8.6.1). As lab testing involves particularly high costs for smallholders, this procedure should be modified, too. The group proposes that lab experts should take samples themselves or in conjunction with field staff. Sampling should be risk-based and based on the QMS. Finally, the group also discussed the monitoring of re-entry times (CB 8.8.3). Written documentation, for instance, makes no sense for a farmer who is doing all the work by himself. No clear proposal for improvement was formulated on this point.

Besides the discussion on control points, one **general recommendation** was that the standard should focus on G.A.P. issues instead of on social issues.

4.2 The General Regulations and their need for revision to reflect the needs of smallholders

One issue discussed within the group concerned **unannounced inspections** covering the producer group's Quality Management System – recently imposed by the new standard version on a minimum of 10% of all certified producer groups (GLOBALGAP V3-GR 6.2.2). This implies additional costs. The same is valid when the sample size is increased as a result of unannounced inspections (GLOBALGAP V3-GR 6.1.2 vi).

Connecting the sample size to the results of previous audits would reward good practice. When the CB is not local, additional inspections are associated with high travel costs. In those cases the acceptance of documents and/or single inspections of a larger sample size might replace unannounced inspections. Alternatively, connecting unannounced QMS audits with farm inspections is seen as a possible way of decreasing costs. Interestingly, the same discussion on the appropriateness of the square root formula in defining the sample size seems to have taken place for organic certification. Their solution is to improve the quality of the QMS to make it more robust, rather than to carry out more controls. In any case, market inclusion should be balanced against food safety risks on the basis of data and hard facts, rather than on reactions to scared retailers. According to GLOBALGAP, field data available from the Certification Integrity Programme (CIPRO) will be used to determine the frequency of audits in a more risk-based fashion. More efforts should be devoted to exploring actual risks. If the number of MRL interventions is low, this can be a result of intense inspections, but it can also prove that there is only a low risk.

Another issue discussed was the **definition of legal entity**, as types of legal entities vary to a considerable extent between countries. As certification bodies interpret this requirement differently, it is unclear what types are accepted by GLOBALGAP. Is a Self Help Group in Kenya a legal entity? What role does ownership of land / ownership of produce play? How do large organisations with multiple sites fit into the existing certification options? It was clearly said that the definition of a legal entity is based on national legislation.

Through its programmes in Kenya and Senegal, Dutch Development Cooperation has essentially contributed to initiating the recently introduced Option 1 multi-site option as an additional certification option for smallholder farmer groups. However, it has not been fully understood by the working group members why this option works in Senegal, but not in Kenya. This could be due to the fact that agronomic, administrative and geographical rules have not yet been defined for Option 1 multi-site, resulting in questions such as definition of "site" (are we talking about multi-site or multi-plot?); determination of field sizes or distances between villages; the question of whether centralised storage of paperwork characterises a multi-site scheme, etc. As a consequence, clearer definitions of the different certification options are needed, written e.g. by National Technical Working Groups in a language that is understandable by the farmers, so that producer groups can make informed decisions, independently of exporters. Agreement with Accreditation Bodies on how to define legal entities is urgently needed to avoid complications, as demonstrated for Madagascar in this workshop.

As regards **internal auditors**, the issue of the competences required of them was discussed. Particularly in larger farmer groups, the resources represented by the few qualified internal auditors are stretched to visit and inspect all of the farms as required by the standard. While it is uncontested that internal auditors must have similar competencies to CBs as they are doing "part of their job", more flexibility is needed regarding the manner of acquiring and proving the necessary skills. Lowering formal qualification requirements, accepting internal training and recognition of practical experience as proven competencies are recommended.

With reference to **registration procedure and fees**, it was mentioned that double registration of producers and difficulties in handling unknown data (e.g. address, export destination etc.) in the database threatens the integrity of the system. A change of Certification Body in the event of sanctions is difficult to trace, the invoicing of registration licence fees is not transparent enough, and with double registration the cost of the database is increasing. Possible solutions that are being discussed within GLOBALGAP are the introduction of unique legal identifiers (VAT No., Grower Number, field code or equivalents) and the reconciliation of new data with already existing data. As a further step to improve the integrity of the system, GR Part III, 1.9 requires that "a mass balance exercise must be carried out to demonstrate compliance within the legal entity". This requirement is good, but actually difficult to enforce, for example because a considerable portion of sales goes to the cash market without any declaration to avoid taxation. In large extensive farmer groups with more than 5000 members, even relatively small registration fees start to look large. The group proposed introducing a cap for large groups and scaling fees in accordance with the risk. Large groups would be more inclined to join GLOBALGAP if the system was more adapted to low-risk situations with lower requirements on QMS or control points.

4.3 The participation of producer associations in the standard-setting process

The working group began by examining to what extent smallholders and their interests are already reflected in the standard setting process. The group identified three **institutional channels of smallholder involvement**: the National Technical Working Group (NTWG), the Sector Committees and the Africa Observer. The discussion within the group focused on the idea of formulating interpretation guidelines, making the complex standard requirements at least understandable for smallholders. NTWGs exist in 21 different countries so far; some of them have a national interpretation guideline available.

Above all, the group discussed four different kinds of proposals for strengthening **smallholder participation through interpretation guidelines**. The first kind of proposals included the idea of smallholder-friendly national interpretation guidelines through existing NTWGs. Thus, country-specific situations would be reflected and CPCCs could be interpreted in a smallholder-friendly way. Nevertheless, most affected countries do not have NTWGs, and even if they had, synergies would be lost if each country had to formulate a guideline on its own. A second proposal contained the idea that states should share approved national interpretation guidelines with neighbouring countries. This would avoid the "reinvention of the wheel" mentioned above, but countries would still face certain costs of establishing and approving their own NTWGs. The third kind of proposals included a regional approach to formulating and sharing interpretation guidelines. Assuming that countries within

a region usually share more or less similar smallholder situations, synergies could be achieved. Difficulties may occur regarding the costs of the coordination procedure and the legal situation which remains different for each country. Finally, a fourth and most radical approach discussed was the establishment of a separate supranational “Smallholder interpretation guideline”. Advantages connected with this idea would be twofold: the transparency of one unique approach worldwide as well as the broader scope. The smallholder interpretation guideline would be an official document that is valid even in countries without NTWGs. Problems would relate to the legal situation. There cannot be a second official GLOBALGAP document beside the main integrated farm assurance standard.

Finally, the group dealt with the question of **how the term “smallholder” should be defined**. Various kinds of definitions exist. As the average size of a farm varies from country to country, a definition based on this factor is not helpful. The managerial structure of the farm would be more decisive. The formulation of CPCCs is designed for a farm with hired employees, no matter what their number. In view of the millions of farmers operating their farm completely on their own, various CPCCs should be addressed differently.

4.4 The QMS and the question of how producer associations can be supported during implementation

The group recognised that discussions on the QMS and their related problems are very closely linked to capacities at farm and group level. It was not clear or not easy to distinguish between issues relating to certain CPCCs and the QMS itself. As most of the QMS is not directly linked to the individual farmer, but refers more to a management level, it was recommended that the complexity of QMS documents be reduced in communication with farmers and that the focus be critical issues instead. In general, the documentation needed by the GLOBALGAP QMS was said to be too complex. Often producers and groups do not understand the necessity for the QMS. Additionally, access to an adequate manner of establishing a QMS is often difficult and linked with additional costs and work.

Simple guidelines on how to establish a QMS for producers and farmer groups as well as simple training material were recommended for support. Requirements should be broken down into easily digestible parts, e.g. through manuals. The GLOBALGAP Smallholder Manual project funded by GTZ and GLOBALGAP in cooperation with the GfRS has developed a manual that will help farmer groups to establish their internal control system. The draft Smallholder Manual includes operational procedures and recording forms for a fictional farmer group and can be adopted by producer associations as a starting point. The draft generic version was tested in pilot farmer groups in Thailand, Ghana, Kenya and Macedonia. In the light of the experience gained in these pilot projects, the generic manual will be revised and updated by the end of 2008.

A key issue is capacity development, both for producers and farmer groups. Support concerning management issues and making documents understandable could be provided via consultancy services for groups. This could, for example, be promoted by sharing internal inspectors amongst groups.

In general, a need to raise the understanding of farmers and farmer groups about QMS (in general) and CPCC was identified. Requirements and benefits e.g. for record keeping should be more strongly linked. During discussions, the group also stressed that smallholders are capable enough of complying with the standard requirement in general, but that the overwhelming number of documents is a major problem for farmers and internal inspectors, who are often farmers themselves. Additionally, aligning the GLOBALGAP QMS with other QM Systems (e.g. QS and GLOBALGAP) was recommended. A clarification of terms and definitions for each QMS is needed to reach common understanding of terms used in the respective group.

5 Summary and Further Steps

5.1 Workshop results and further steps

All proposals and suggestions elaborated during the workshop were summarised in a closing session using a traffic-light system (Annex 6). Recommendations that can realistically be integrated in the standard revision 2011 were marked green, those which need improving to be integrated in the standard revision were marked yellow, and those that have very little likelihood of being integrated in the standard revision were marked red.

Recommendations referring to various stakeholders involved

The **Africa-Observer** was asked to organise a second call for proposals. The next activities of the Africa-Observer will be to:

- Communicate evaluation results of the first call for proposals to the Sector Committee Meetings at the end of June 2008;
- Inform the public of the evaluation results;
- Organise a second call for proposals;
- Further moderate the Smallholder Task Force.

The primary role of **donors** is seen in providing neutral discussion platforms (e.g. workshops, Africa Observer Project), rather than in bringing farmers into the scheme or even paying for certification. Donors might support the creation of National Technical Working Groups and particularly smallholder involvement within these groups. Donors may also assist public authorities in creating arbitration bodies for the informal settlement of disputes between small farmer groups and their buyers (complaints about "side-marketing", unjustified rejection of produce etc.).

Public extension services would have to provide an enabling environment for smallholder group certification through e.g. incentives for preparation for certification, introduction of basic national good agricultural practices, provision of infrastructure (laboratories, packhouses, etc.), information management etc.

Certification Bodies can reduce the burden of multiple audits to a significant extent through offering combined audits (example AfriCert).

Standard owners should intensify efforts to harmonise and mutually benchmark their standards and to align QMS requirements and terminology.

Although **GLOBALGAP** is starting to drift towards the public domain with several retailers advertising their produce as "GLOBALGAP certified", the standard remains a B2B label so that the role of consumers is considered as somewhat limited.

GLOBALGAP should clarify the applicability of some CPCCs according to the respective situations prevailing, simplify the language, and remove duplications in the standard.

5.2 Results of the evaluation of the Smallholder Task Force

The objectives of the public call for proposals prior to the workshop were to obtain innovative proposals for improving the GLOBALGAP standard for smallholders, to gather feedback on best practices from projects around the globe, and to prepare high score proposals for the Sector Committee Fruit and Vegetables.

The proposal sheets were divided into three parts: the area being addressed (General Regulations or CPCC), a rationale, and an impact assessment. In total, 64 proposals from various stakeholder groups throughout the world were submitted. The main issues addressed were:

General Regulations

- Ratio of internal auditors and farmers; number of inspections; relationship between internal and external audits
- Farmer group vs. individual farmer as certificate holder
- Option 1 for smallholder groups
- Registration and certification fees

CPCC

- Capacity development on food safety issues
- Number of CPCCs
- Practicability of some CPCCs
 - *Storage facilities for fertilisers and plant protection products; pesticide residue analysis*
 - *Capacity development on first aid*
 - *Demand for personal protective equipment kits including training; proper use of personal protective clothing*
 - *Housing and toilets*
 - *Traceability*
 - *Waste and pollution action plans*

QMS

- Harmonisation (mutual recognition) of producer QMS/ICS across various standards
- Capacity development concerning QMS
- Functioning of sanctioning system

The proposals were evaluated independently by the Smallholder Task Force. First, the proposals were separated into two groups. Then, each of the task force members performed a remote evaluation on the proposals. After the workshop in Frankfurt, the Smallholder Task Force discussed its results. Both groups reached a consensus on the evaluations in their meetings after the workshop. Results were summarised in five categories:

- 17 out of 64 proposals were evaluated as being in **category 1** (maximum chance of success – accept)
- 27 out of 64 proposals were evaluated as being in **category 2** (more detailed work required by the GST - provisional acceptance)
- 3 out of 64 proposals were evaluated as being in **category 3** (over-ambitious – reject)
- 16 out of 64 proposals were evaluated as being in **category 4** (does not meet the call – reject)
- 1 out of 64 proposals was evaluated as being in **category 5** (more information needed to categorise - decision deferred).

The proposals in category 1 were forwarded to the interface members of the Smallholder Task Force for discussion and further evaluation. Persons who submitted proposals will be informed about acceptance or rejection of their respective proposals. After this evaluation step, the Africa-Observer will present the proposals in category 1 at the next Sector Committee Meetings (Flowers and Ornamental, Fruits and Vegetables). Concurrently, **ALL** proposals will be handed over to the members of the Sector Committees for further consideration. As a last step, the proposals will be discussed at the GLOBALGAP conference in autumn.

Some participants of the workshop somehow asked for a more transparent evaluation process and a **second call for proposals**, including also more informal proposals and different languages, especially French and Spanish, in order to obtain an even broader feedback from stakeholders all over the world. Integrating farmers' perspectives more strongly into the proposals was seen as one important factor for a more participatory approach. Where producers are overtaxed by the proposal form, which was said to be "somehow too academic", middlemen such as COLEACP should ensure that smallholders' suggestions are forwarded. The second call for proposals should highlight critical issues and the respective timetable of the evaluation process should be published on the Africa-Observer website.