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INTRODUCTION TO FOOD INDUSTRY ASIA

THE VOICE OF THE FOOD INDUSTRY IN ASIA
GENERAL INTRODUCTION
• The Asia-Pacific region is expected to become the biggest F&B region for consumption worldwide by 2030.

• Food safety in Greater Mekong Sub-Region will be essential to ensure that the six countries have the potential to reap the benefits of these developments.

• A proactive approach, including development of local farmers, food business operators, retail sector, government regulatory, and consumer awareness will support the rapid development of the sector.

• A few imperatives with regard to the sector shall be focused which are food safety and quality (legislative framework/Good Agriculture Practice), laboratory and facilities, and traceability.
FOOD SAFETY LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK/STANDARDS

🔍 Current Status

❓ Needs and Gaps

💡 Priorities for Future
Cambodia
- The principal food safety legislative measure is IMP 868, while a new draft Food Safety Law is still under the reviewing stage.
- CamGap was approved by the MAFF dated 2010. Various efforts such as deliver related info to local farmers and public were performed.

China
- After the milk scandal, China decided to reform its food safety legislation through introducing a basic law integrating all existing food safety-related rules.
- Two GAP programmes (Green Food Standard & ChinaGap) are intended to stimulate agriculture, reduce the risks linked to food safety, coordinate various sectors of the supply chain of agricultural products and stimulate the development of international good agricultural practice standards and relevant certification and accreditation activities.

Lao PDR
- National Food Safety Policy was enacted to ensure food safety and product quality in Lao PDR. Other food related laws, legislations were promulgated to govern different food aspects.
- Lao PDR has introduced Lao GAP (voluntary) since 2004.

Thailand
- Two main authorities directly responsible for food safety control throughout the country namely, the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC) and the Ministry of Public Health (MOPH).
- The GAP system (QGAP & ThaiGAP) developed by the government have a number of participants and the government has been successful in the extensive implementation of the scheme, although the quality of implementation requires more efforts.

Vietnam
- Food Safety Law (2010) was promulgated to address the country’s growing concern on food safety risks and problems that impact on trade and human health.
- VietGap was launched by government to produce safe and quality produce.

Myanmar
- National Food Law (1997) and its amendment (2013) is currently under revision.
- Myanmar has national GAP framework for helping farmers to produce safe and quality produce.

Vietnam
- Food Safety Law (2010) was promulgated to address the country’s growing concern on food safety risks and problems that impact on trade and human health.
- VietGap was launched by government to produce safe and quality produce.

Thailand
- Two main authorities directly responsible for food safety control throughout the country namely, the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC) and the Ministry of Public Health (MOPH).
- The GAP system (QGAP & ThaiGAP) developed by the government have a number of participants and the government has been successful in the extensive implementation of the scheme, although the quality of implementation requires more efforts.

Myanmar
- National Food Law (1997) and its amendment (2013) is currently under revision.
- Myanmar has national GAP framework for helping farmers to produce safe and quality produce.
## Needs & Gaps

### Priorities for Future

### For food safety legislative framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Needs &amp; Gaps</th>
<th>Priorities for Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Lack of coordinated food safety policy</td>
<td>Government shall establish comprehensive food safety legislative frameworks with standards (if there is no) through co-operating with stakeholders in the supply chain from Public and Private sector, for discussing the measures shall be included under the legislative framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of inter-ministerial coordination and overlapping responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Lack of coordination across the agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Insufficient human resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Underdeveloped in terms legislative framework, and standards</td>
<td>Develop a comprehensive strategy for coordinating among different agencies for avoiding duplication of work; this should be coupled with constant trainings to enhance the human capability among various government agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of coordination across the agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Lack of comprehensive food safety law and system</td>
<td>Assessment shall be performed to assess the needs in terms of manpower in developing the capacity in human resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Lack of clarification in terms of legislations</td>
<td>Constant review to align the practices with the regional/international food safety practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of comprehensive food control management system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priorities for Future Needs & Gaps

#### For Good Agriculture Practices (GAP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Needs &amp; Gaps</th>
<th>Priorities for Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cambodia    | • Lack of regulatory framework to facilitate domestic adoption and compliance with ASEAN GAP standard.  
          |   • Lack of understanding of GAP  
          |   • Limited resources (manpower, laboratories)  | • Promote GAP through increasing pilot areas, conducting training workshop to educate farmers, inspectors and public  
          |                                                                 | • Gradually harmonise with ASEAN GAP  
          |                                                                 | • Funding for capacity building |
| China       | • Limited number of Chinese farmers will be able to become certified for First class certification | • Strengthening the training of practitioners  
          |                                                                 | • Strengthening international cooperation and exchange |
| Laos        | • Lack of understanding of GAP  
          |   • Limited resources (manpower, laboratories)  | • Promote GAP through increasing pilot areas, conducting training workshop to educate farmers, inspectors and public  
          |                                                                 | • Set up strategy roadmap in implementing GAP  
          |                                                                 | • Funding for capacity building |
| Myanmar     | • Limited for domestic consumption  | • Focus implementation of GAP in domestic field through conducting workshops and training to the local farmers.  
          |                                                                 | • Funding for capacity building |
| Thailand    | • Potential conflict of interest in QGAP  | • Constant review to ensure alignment and avoid potential conflict of interest |
| Vietnam     | • Lack of consumer trust  | • Provide credibility scheme |
Cambodia
Both government laboratories (Camcontrol Testing Laboratory (CTL), Industrial Laboratory Centre of Cambodia (ILCC), National Agricultural Laboratory (NAL), etc.) & non-government laboratories are involved in food control in Cambodia.

China
On 2008 report reported that there are more than 3913 food testing laboratories were accredited by the China National Accreditation Service for Conformity Assessment. More recent research reports (2013) more than 6,000 laboratories, and staffing numbers of around 60,000.

Laos
Multiple food testing and inspection laboratories are in place: Food and Drug Department and the Food and Drug Quality Control Centre (FDQCC), National Animal Health Laboratory (NHAL), etc.

Thailand
The laboratory setup in Thailand consists of laboratories under the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Ministry of Public Health, Ministry of Industries, other government Ministries and Departments, University labs and private laboratories.

Vietnam
Thai MOH, MARD and MOIT are mainly involved in food safety testing. Each ministry has its own network of food safety related laboratory systems. The Vice Prime Minister through MOH is in charge of the overall laboratory structure.

Myanmar
The FDA has three food laboratories based in Nay Pyi Taw, Yangon and Mandalay. These laboratories support the food inspection program and carry out chemical and microbiological testing of food as part of the FDA post-market surveillance program.

Vietnam
Thai MOH, MARD and MOIT are mainly involved in food safety testing. Each ministry has its own network of food safety related laboratory systems. The Vice Prime Minister through MOH is in charge of the overall laboratory structure.

Cambodia
Both government laboratories (Camcontrol Testing Laboratory (CTL), Industrial Laboratory Centre of Cambodia (ILCC), National Agricultural Laboratory (NAL), etc.) & non-government laboratories (The Pasteur Institute of Cambodia (IPC), Intertek Testing Services) are involved in food control in Cambodia.
## Needs & Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Needs &amp; Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>• Lack of clear laboratory’s mandates (Overlaps found)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor facilities and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of trained manpower (High cost of training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of concrete data for food safety monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>• Inadequate equipment (rapid test-kits) or only available to better-resourced areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited research on facilities for food safety testing exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>• Poor equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of experienced and qualified staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>• Poor equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of experienced and qualified staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited resources for market testing and surveillance of foods on the domestic market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of accredited laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>• Lack of information sharing system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>• Lack of coordinated laboratory network at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of resources (equipment and fund)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Priorities for Future

1. **Comprehensive study** shall be performed to clearly understand the current status and needs of the country.
2. To clearly delineate the scopes of mandates for different laboratories to avoid overlaps and allocate resources more effectively.
3. To strengthen laboratory capacities in terms of:
   - Improving equipment and facilities
   - Conducting training for the laboratory scientists and inspectors
   - Establishing robust data system for information sharing and monitoring
4. To advocate laboratory accreditation
5. Monitoring
TRACEABILITY

🔍 Current Status

❓ Needs and Gaps

💡 Priorities for Future
Cambodia
• Pre-mature to expect food companies to have full-fledged traceability systems.
• On regulatory, if Cambodia follows neighbouring countries, government might start to explore stricter requirements which also include traceability.

China
• On regulatory, several standards/statements were released to guide the traceability activities in food chain.
• In overall, food traceability progress is slow due to institutional reform (from FDA to SMRA). MoA is responsible for promoting agriculture food traceability while MoC is active in coordinating and promoting the national traceability system too.

Laos
• As foreign retailers enter the market, there will be new requirements on suppliers such as barcoding, electronic data sharing, and traceability.
• No direct reference to traceability or recall in the policy under The National Food Safety Policy (Ministry of Public Health 20:2009).

Vietnam
• The Prime Minister has recently approved of a traceability scheme and national traceability portal to be developed by 2020.
• Several regulatory frameworks (circular, standards, decree) cover traceability perspective to guide various activities involved in traceability system.

Thailand
• High level of adoption of barcoding in Thailand. Food industry is self-regulating in order to comply with export country requirements. Specialised requests for traceability also exist from retail chains.
• On regulatory, Thai FDA is drafting law on food traceability while ACFS has been driving national traceability system based on 2D barcodes. Article 3.2.2 from TAS 9028-2008 (issued by ACFS) also explain the scope should be covered under traceability.

Myanmar
• Myanmar is at the process of developing its national food safety law, and the draft has included a clause on product recall.

Cambodia
• Pre-mature to expect food companies to have full-fledged traceability systems.
• On regulatory, if Cambodia follows neighbouring countries, government might start to explore stricter requirements which also include traceability.
### Needs & Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs &amp; Gaps</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Priorities for Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get farmers organized</td>
<td>Myanmar, Laos</td>
<td>• Government must lead the development of the legal framework, develop national procedures and policies, co-operating with stakeholders in the supply chain from Public and Private sector, for each selected product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure infrastructure and connectivity supports exchange of traceability and enables supply chains</td>
<td>Myanmar, Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia</td>
<td>• Government must implement the regulatory measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise industry awareness of food safety, food chain management, certification, traceability information</td>
<td>Myanmar, Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia</td>
<td>• Develop national level, traceability system, with low cost of ownership for large number of farmers and entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the required regulatory framework to support traceability implementation</td>
<td>Myanmar, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand</td>
<td>• Government should assist in the organization of farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance consumer education</td>
<td>Myanmar, Cambodia, Thailand</td>
<td>• Stakeholder briefings and capacity building should be held, in order to create awareness about traceability amongst all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a plan for national traceability system – nationwide roll out, or harmonization of existing regional systems, and alignment with other similar initiatives</td>
<td>China, Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar</td>
<td>• Government could use traceability to help farmers to reach new markets and promote country brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support by experts to implement the traceability system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional GMS alignment of traceability systems to ensure compliance with national requirements and easy cross border trade facilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

FIA - GMS countries – ADB
FIA presented recommendations on increasing the safety and quality of food products from GMS in terms of legislation, laboratory capacity building, harmonised food safety standards, traceability, and risk communication.

Phase 1 (Training in methods of determination for mycotoxins) was held in Singapore through public-private partnerships (ADB, FIA, Nestle, AVA (current SFA), Waters Corporation, IFSTL) for all GMS participants.

Vietnam was selected as pilot country to conduct the in-country training for Phase 3 (Reproduction of training in GMS countries).

Project of for food safety: laboratory capacity building (Train the trainer) in GMS was proposed. 4 phases are involved in the project.

Phase 2 (Training of trainers) was held in Singapore through public-private partnerships (ADB, FIA, Nestle, AVA (current SFA), Waters Corporation, IFSTL) for all GMS participants.

Phase 4 (Proficiency testing) will be carried out in Vietnam to assess the capacity of the participants to perform analysis within the ISO17025 accreditation scheme.
FIA presented recommendations on increasing the safety and quality of food products from GMS in terms of legislation, laboratory capacity building, harmonised food safety standards, traceability, and risk communication.

Stakeholder Consultations were held in Phnom Penh, Vientiane, Hanoi, Nanning, Nay Pyi Taw.

Natural Garden in Cambodia was selected as the first pilot company. Pre-pilot preparation was performed.

A traceability project was proposed with the support from GS1 (FIA industry partner who experts in food chain traceability). A series of different activities were planned under this project.

Capacity building were carried out for the selected participants from Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, China, and Myanmar.

GS1 and FIA continue working closely with governments and the engagement with the pilot company will be ongoing to explore how to include other relevant stakeholders for potential cross border pilots.

There is potential to carry out wider range of initiatives boosting the traceability for food chains in GMS countries.
CONCLUSION
&
WAY FORWARD
In conclusion, the needs and future initiatives are different in each of the GMS countries, however, in overall, some similarities still found in between the countries. Apart from specific in-country initiatives, collaboration among GMS countries will be critical to improve the regional food safety management while facilitating cross-border trade. Public-private partnership is the key strategy in commencing the collaboration.

Several key actions from the Public-private partnership are suggested as follow:

- To provide technical support towards harmonisation of standards related to food safety and quality assurance, certification (GAP practices & Traceability), laboratories systems.

- To enhance the capacity in certification and establishing quality assurance system (laboratory & human resource) for promoting compliance with food safety standards in both domestic and regional trade along with an overarching food safety communication plan.

- To facilitate information sharing and education to food chain players (farmers, manufacturers, suppliers, customers, etc.) on the knowledge related to policy, practices, and food risk communication (involved not only food safety communication, but crisis preventative measures and interventions, precautionary advocacy for healthy lifestyle, and trust building system)

- Moving forward, FIA would like to continue the ongoing work on lab training (phase 3 & 4) for the rest of the GMS countries as it’s a proven scalable and sustainable model through the partnership. Moreover, FIA would like seek for the collaboration opportunity for operating the traceability initiative in the remaining GMS countries. Last but not least, FIA would like to seek for the opportunity in launching food risk communication toolkit to serve as a reference material in promoting food risk communication in GMS countries.
THANK YOU
1. What are the key challenges for your country/organization in addressing **food safety and quality standards, certification and traceability**, from the perspective of enabling policies, capacities and investments in infrastructure?

2. What are the current efforts of your country/organization in terms of policies, building capacities and mobilizing investment for infrastructure? Are there any best practices that could be replicated more widely in the GMS to address such challenges?

3. Can you suggest 3-4 key priorities for action that could mobilize more support from the private sector (through public-private partnerships), development partners, research institutions, and civil society? What can be done differently from the way we are addressing these challenges? Please give concrete examples of specific policies, or types of skills that need to be enhanced, or types of infrastructure investments that should be promoted.

4. Are there any major advantages or disadvantages in adopting a regional approach to address these transboundary challenges? What can be done by ADB and other development partners to promote more regional cooperation in this area?