

**Analysis of constraints for compliance** to Good Agricultural Practices by the horticultural sector in Indonesia

## BOCI Project BO-10-009-109

**Irene Koomen Dave Boselie Rara Dewayanti** Iskandar Zulkarnain **Ahmad Suleaman** 

For quality of life

# Project Report 2010









Wageningen UR Centre for Development Innovation (CDI) works on processes of innovation and change in the areas of secure and healthy food, adaptive agriculture, sustainable markets and ecosystem governance. It is an interdisciplinary and internationally focused unit of Wageningen University & Research centre within the Social Sciences Group.

Through facilitating innovation, brokering knowledge and supporting capacity development, our group of 60 staff help to link Wageningen UR's expertise to the global challenges of sustainable and equitable development. CDI works to inspire new forms of learning and collaboration between citizens, governments, businesses, NGOs and the scientific community.

More information: www.cdi.wur.nl



Secure & Healthy Food

Project BO-10-009-109: Impact assessment: incentives for Good Agricultural Practices

This research project has been carried out within the Policy Supporting Research for the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation, Theme: Robust systems, cluster: International cooperation.

## Analysis of constraints for compliance to Good Agricultural Practices by the horticultural sector in Indonesia BOCI Project BO-10-009-109

Irene Koomen Dave Boselie Rara Dewayanti Iskandar Zulkarnain Ahmad Suleaman

# Project Report 2010

September 2011 Project code 8141105200 Wageningen UR Centre for Development Innovation

## Analysis of constraints for compliance to Good Agricultural Practices by the horticultural sector in Indonesia

BOCI Project BO-10-009-109 - Project Report 2010

Koomen, I.<sup>1)</sup> Boselie, D.<sup>2)</sup> Dewayanti, R.<sup>3)</sup> Zulkarnain, I.<sup>3)</sup> Suleaman, A.<sup>4)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen University & Research centre, the Netherlands

<sup>2)</sup> LEI (Agricultural Economics Institute), Wageningen University & Research centre, the Netherlands

<sup>3)</sup> Horti Chain Centre, Indonesia

<sup>4)</sup> Bogor Agricultural University, Indonesia

September, 2011 Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen University & Research centre

The horticultural industry in Indonesia is progressively moving to apply Good Agricultural Practices with the aim of producing sustainably as well as guaranteeing food safety. While the ministry of agriculture has put a lot of effort in assisting farmers to comply to the national IndoGAp and become Si Sakti certified uptake has been slower than expected. This study has tried to identify the constraints for compliance to GAP such that with this knowledge incentives for GAP compliance can be formulated.

Through interviews and a key stakeholder workshop the following constraints were identified as the major bottlenecks for compliance to GAP:

- a) Lack of awareness by the consumer on food safety issues but also amongst other stakeholders;
- b) There is no clear coordination, cooperation and commitment between and from public as well as private stakeholders;
- c) Small holder farmers do find application of GAP rules difficult, educating and training these farmers in applying GAP is one of the ways forward.

#### Photos

Front cover: cover photo of promotional material, DG Horticulture, Indonesia All other photos by the authors

Orders + 31 (0) 317 486800 info.cdi@wur.nl

### Preface

Good agricultural practice (GAP) has been promoted within the Indonesian horticultural sector. Uptake is very low, partly because supermarkets and exporters do not demand nor pay extra for GAP produced vegetables. The benefits of GAP and Global GAP certification are not imbedded within the horticultural chain. This leads to food entering the local market while food safety is not guaranteed. Lack of certification also limits international trade of horticultural produce.

The current certification landscape is rather confusing, there is an increasing number of labels and certificates being communicated in the modern market segment. Exporters prepare for ASEAN GAP which is expected to be obligatory in 2012 and newly acquired high-end customers like Carrefour Middle East are likely to follow with food safety requirements. Seven international certifying bodies and six national certifying bodies currently operate in the Indonesian market for training, audits and certification inspections

In order to prevent competition between the various standards and scattered food safety initiatives this project aims to strengthen the capacity of Indonesian institutions to design and implement a food safety framework (including good agricultural practices and certification) for the domestic and export markets in such a manner that coherence and collaboration between the various certification schemes is guaranteed.

i

hin Woodliel

Dr. A.J. Woodhill Director Wageningen UR Centre for Development Innovation

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the people interviewed for their time, the workshop participants for their lively discussion and Mr. Jean Rummenie from the Embassy of the Netherland, Jakarta for his interest and support of this topic.

## Table of contents

Prefa	ace	i
Ackn	nowledgements	ii
Table	e of contents	iii
Exec	cutive summary	iv
List o	of abbreviations and acronyms	v
1	Introduction	1
2	Activities	<b>7</b> 7 9
3	Conclusions	.11
Refe	rences and resources	.13
Арре	endix 1 - List of interviewees and informants for fact finding	.15
Арре	endix 2 - Guidance questions for interviews	.17
Арре	endix 3 - Attendance list round table discussion	.19
Арре	endix 4 - Invitation round table discussion	.21

### Executive summary

The horticultural industry in Indonesia is progressively moving to apply Good Agricultural Practices with the aim of producing sustainably as well as guaranteeing food safety. While the ministry of agriculture has put a lot of effort in assisting farmers to comply to the national IndoGAp and become Si Sakti certified uptake has been slower than expected. This study has tried to identify the constraints for compliance to GAP such that with this knowledge incentives for GAP compliance can be formulated.

Through interviews and a key stakeholder workshop the following constraints were identified as the major bottlenecks for compliance to GAP:

- a) Lack of awareness by the consumer on food safety issues but also amongst other stakeholders;
- b) There is no clear coordination, cooperation and commitment between and from public as well as private stakeholders;
- c) Small holder farmers do find application of GAP rules difficult, educating and training these farmers in applying GAP is one of the ways forward.

## List of abbreviations and acronyms

ASEAN	The Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CDI	Wageningen UR Centre for Development Innovation
FAO	Food & Agricultural Organisation
GAP	Good Agricultural Practice
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
KAN	Accreditation Authority Indonesia
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
Si Sakti	Sistem Sertfikase Pertanian Indonesia
SME	Small & Medium sized Enterprises
SOP	Standard Operation Procedure
Wageningen UR	Wageningen University & Research centre
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

### Introduction

Ineffective or partly implemented Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) systems may lead to unsustainable market access for both regional and international markets. Better understanding of incentives and measures to increase compliance whilst remaining flexible and innovative to changes in production systems may lead to better compliance and resilience of small and medium sized enterprises (SME) based food production systems for rural communities.

Indonesia, with a population of 220 million, is a large consumer market for fruit and vegetables. Consumption of fruit and vegetables is an important component of Indonesia's diet and Indonesian consumers spend a higher proportion of their food budget on fruit and vegetables compared to other Asian countries. Even though Indonesia produces 25 million tonnes of fruit and vegetables (production figure for 2007) less than 1% was exported as fresh. Import of horticultural produce, mainly fresh fruit but also garlic and shallots is still increasing. The majority of produce is imported from China. There is also a consumer preference for imported fresh produce because its appearance is better.

Product	1995	2004	2007	2008	2009
Oranges	15,297	50,928	23,566	28,024	19,586
Mandarins	22,654	43,279	89,125	109,598	188,956
Grapes	6,326	28,715	27,395	25,671	34,961
Apples	44,158	114,031	145,301	139,818	153,511
Pears	18,845	74,277	94,518	86,687	90,390
Durian	689	11,087	23,149	24,679	28,935
Other Tropical Fruit	304	34,073	55,504	48,069	72,270
Total	109,239	359,935	463,140	466,292	593,662

#### Table 1: Indonesia Fruit Imports (Tonnes)

Source: BPS (Bureau of Statistics Indonesia), Catalog No.8202007

Horticultural production and marketing in Indonesia has seen many changes in recent years (Natawidjaja et al., 2006). So have wholesalers taken a much larger share of trade, more farmers switching to producing horticultural crops and increased market share by supermarkets (Johnson, Weinberger & Wu, 2008).

Globally the international horticultural sector has seen an escalation of standards dealing with consumer concerns like food safety, the environment, and social issues. To a large extend the development of these standards is driven by the private sector. Increasing demands of the market force producers to convert and comply with those standards, this poses a risk of exclusion of small producers who cannot make the required investments or cannot access the required knowledge (Amekawa, 2009; FAO, 2003; Swinnen & Maertens, 2007).

In Indonesia the main food safety issues on vegetables are pesticide residues and pathogenic microbes (Morris, 2008). While larger farms might lack the capacity to deal with these issues, priority for small scale farmers is raising awareness. Currently a number of initiatives in the Indonesian horticultural sector, initially funded by the WSSD (World Summit on Sustainable Development) trilateral partnership, have tried to enhance systems of good agricultural practices and food safety for both domestic and export markets. This has resulted in the implementation of a GAP program for horticulture, IndoGAP.

The three levels that can be attained in IndoGAP are certified through the Si Sakti scheme (Sistem Sertfikase Pertanian Indonesia, see figure 1).

#### Introduction

The control of these systems has their legal bases in various decrees i.e.

- Presidential Regulation No 24/2010 mandates the Agency for Food Security to control food safety of fresh produce;
- Government regulation No. 28/2004 regulates Food Safety, Quality and Nutrition;
- Agriculture Ministry Decree No. 48/2009 covers the GAP for Fruit and Vegetables, ammd. No. 61/2006 (GAP for Fruit).

Figure 1: The different levels (Primes) of the SI SAKTI Certification System of Good Agricultural Practice in Indonesia

Prima I	<ul> <li>Complete application of GAP</li> <li>Mandatory activities 100%</li> <li>Highly recommended 90 %</li> <li>Recommended 60%</li> </ul>			Almost Fully Compliant with GAP
Prima II	<ul> <li>Mandatory actvities 100%</li> <li>Highly recommended 70%</li> <li>Recommended 40%</li> </ul>		Mostly Compliant with GAP	
Prima III	<ul> <li>Mandatory activities100%</li> <li>Highly recommended 60%</li> <li>Recommended 20%</li> </ul>	Partly Compliant with GAP		

To certify and control the GAP application government established a Food Safety Competent Authority at district, provincial and central level. Until 2010 about 31 provincial competent authorities have been established. The Prime II and III certificates are issued by these Competent Authorities, Prime I certificates are issued by certification bodies.

DG Horticulture prepares farmers for registration – advice is free of charge as is the assessment which indicates if the farmer or group of farmers is ready for certification. When pre-assessment has been approved the farmer (group) can register for certification with the local competent authority => provincial departments.

Figure 2: Organisational structure IndoGAP and Si Sakti certification



Many provinces have already been successful in setting up implementation and compliance systems due to active support of the Provincial government, and willingness of farmers to maintain or improve market access. The collaborative research programme Hortin (Asandi et al. 2006) has shown that small scale vegetable growers can achieve the Prime III level. However, results are mixed and further implementation and uptake of the GAP program is slow (Sulasmi et al., 2006).

Production of horticultural crops for export will need to comply with GlobalGAP. Few farms are GlobalGAP certified, currently there is one horticultural producer of strawberries who is GlobalGAP certified. Efforts are underway for salang (snake fruit), mangosteen and mangoes, all export fruit.

#### Introduction

Commodity	The number of registered farm (farm unit)	
Fruits	4.713	15 Provinces 73 Districts
Vegetables & Biofarmaca	128	2 Provinces
Ornamental Plants	12	2 Provinces
Total	4.850	

#### Table 2: Number of IndoGAP registered farm (as per September 2010)

Source: Department of Horticulture, MoA, 2010

Based on experiences in other countries (Valk & Roest, 2009) and observations regarding the work on subsequently IndoGAP, national (public) Standard Operating practices (SOPs) per crop and the GlobalGAP standards, there is space for improvement in terms of synergy, efficiency and effectiveness of those efforts. While on paper Prima I should comply with EurepGAP (now Global GAP), the number of control points, major and minor musts differ substantially (see table 3). Another development is the establishment of ASEAN GAP which aims to harmonise GAP guidelines within the ASEAN region. In 2015 there should be a single window for the whole ASEAN region of which Indonesia is part. As far as can be established there is little progress regards ASEANGAP.

	Prima I	ASEANGAP	GlobalGAP (2011)
Control Points	100	226	233
Major Musts	14	Not available	95
Minor Musts	54	Not available	116
Recommendation	32	Not available	22
Compliance Criteria	100 % major must 60 % minor must 40 % recommendation	Not available	100% major must 95% minor musts

Table 3 – Differences in number of control points for level Prima II of IndoGAP, GlobalGAP and ASEANGAP

Compiled by A. Ruting, Q-Point, 2011

The objectives of this Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) impact assessment were:

- 1) To find and explore the facts and bottlenecks cq constraints of current GAP implementation through interviews to fresh fruit and vegetables exporters;
- 2) To recommend on the way forward.

## 2 Activities

The activities in 2010 consisted out of:

- 1. Fact finding through interviews with selected stakeholders of both IndoGAP and GlobalGAP;
- 2. Presentation of findings and round table discussion with key stakeholders.

### 2.1 Fact finding

Interviews were conducted with a range of stakeholders grouped into policy makers, those involved with IndoGAP and those involved with GlobalGAP/export (see Appendix 1 for those interviewed).

The interviews were conducted as semi-structured interviews (see Appendix 2 for guidance list for interviews) organised to ascertain interviewees' views on the following topics:

- Possible constraints that hinder GAP compliance:
  - o Implementation of GAP;
  - Market demand;
  - o Certification;
  - Institutional capacity;
- Possible solutions to enhance compliance to GAP.

The main findings are summarised below.

#### Implementation of GAP

- After 6 years introduction and promotion, the number of farmers or farmer groups who understand and implement the GAP system or obtain Prima certification is still very limited;
- There is a lack of capital for the necessary investment costs;
- GAP compliance only raises costs, there is no benefit such as a price incentive or reward system for those farmers who are Prima certified;
- There is a lack of knowledge of integrated pest management (IPM);
- Pesticides are used on crops for which there is no registration;
- Water quality for irrigation and product washing is not good;
- No upfront insight in costs and benefits from old and new production system (with SOPs);
- GAP is not sufficiently socialised;
- Unrealistic expectation with regards to yield increase after implementation of GAP;
- GAP certified produce is mixed with non-certified products in order to comply with required volumes.

#### Market demand

- Most of the Indonesian consumers, but also the market parties, are still not aware about products with GAP or Prima certification;
- The market does not demand IndoGAP;
- Middlemen (buyers & traders) only look at the price of produce not at quality;
- There is no obvious additional benefit. It is the middlemen that buy the majority of the produce produced by SME farmers, they do not pay a higher price for products that comply with GAP;

- The number of supermarkets who sell certified products is still very limited or not available at all;
- The problem in supplying isn't quality but supply quantity, due to weather factors, etc;
- Buying and pricing arrangement between growers and wholesalers or supermarkets are not always adhered to. For instance, supermarkets can demand certification but buy elsewhere if the price is more favourable;
- Food safety results in increased cost of processing. For example, the requirements by buyers to use special plastics of packaging or cold chain management;
- There are too many fluctuations in market demand;
- The buying system does not support attention to GAP implementation by farmers;
- Countries importing Indonesian demand GAP certification.

#### Certification

- Certification is not popular with SME farmers, the system is confusing partly due to the fact that, apart from IndoGAP, supermarket chains, exporters, hotels, restaurant all have their own standards;
- Multiple standards lead to increased costs of certification;
- The cost of administration, record keeping, laboratory tests and certification fee is perceived as high;
- IndoGAP only focuses on fresh produce, ideally there should be a certification for all the steps in the food chain (from farm to fork);
- GlobalGAP certification of the producer can lead to problems when the produce is sourced from partnership farmers' supplier. At times the farmers cannot deliver because produce has been sold elsewhere, orchard has been grubbed etc.
- IndoGAP is not aligned for benchmarking GlobalGAP
  - Benchmarking difficult: e.g. the 14 major musts of IndoGAP do not refer to maximum residue levels of pesticides;
  - Different level of detail: e.g. chemicals storage 6 control points in GlobalGAP, 1 or 2 control points in IndoGAP;
  - IndoGap has integrated product quality aspects;
  - o Difference in compliance criteria.

#### Institutional capacity

- Many government agencies are responsible for food safety but division of roles is not clear;
- BSN (SNI) 401 verification is not implemented;
- Decentralised certification by provincial departments means that conformity of implementation cannot be guaranteed;
- Not enough technical assistance available for farmers;
- Budget for MRL testing as part of IndoGAP registration is not sufficient for all farmers;
- Public Private roles and responsibilities are not clear;
- There is a lack of independent laboratories;
- Obtaining laboratory test results takes too long for fresh produce;
- Farmers are badly capitalized and lack collateral to duplicate the (greenhouse) systems; Farmers are not well enough organised;
- Limited enforcement in place e.g.:
  - Companies can relatively easily label their produce as organic, GAP, etc., however there is no control on whether it is really applied and certified;
  - For fresh products sold through the traditional (wet) market there is no obvious control.

### 2.2 Round table discussion

A Round Table Discussion, entitled Good Agricultural Practices and Food Safety Assurance in Indonesia's Horticultural Sector, was organised and attended by 36 representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture, National Agency for Drug and Food Control, Local Government, Universities, Research Institutions, Retail, Business Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Consumer Organizations, Exporters, Certifier Bodies, Farmers, Trades, NGO's, and Consultancy firms (see Appendix 3 for invitation and Appendix 4 for attendance list). The aim of the meeting was to give an up-to-date overview of the Good Agricultural Practices and Food Safety in Indonesia's horticultural sector. After short introductory talks (the presentations can be found on: <a href="http://e-library.hortichain.org">http://e-library.hortichain.org</a>) the participants were asked to prioritise the various constraints that were identified in the fact finding stage of the project and discuss ways forwards.

The assembled stakeholders agreed that the major constraint to GAP compliance were:

- a) Lack of awareness by the consumer on food safety issues but also amongst other stakeholders;
- b) There is no clear coordination, cooperation and commitment between and from public as well as private stakeholders;
- c) Small holder farmers do find application of GAP rules difficult, educating and training these farmers in applying GAP is one of the ways forward.

Several strategies to overcome the prioritised constraints were discussed. It was agreed to start four pilots in 2011 whereby the objective is to take away the constraints that make compliance to IndoGAP and GlobalGAP difficult. The same partners that hosted the event will work with stakeholders along several fruit and vegetable value chains to achieve this. In this process the harmonization between the national program of IndoGap and the international program of GlobalGap will be supported in order to enhance both domestic and international trade. It was decided that an advisory group would be formed to support and guide the project team in further activities.



## 3 Conclusions

Introduction of a good agricultural practice system for the horticultural industry in Indonesia occurred only in 2004. Implementation and certification of the IndoGAP system is developing, the importance, especially for food safety is recognised. However, both key-stakeholders and informants agreed that, for increased compliance to GAP concerted action between public and private players, assistance of farmers and awareness amongst market parties and consumers is required.

As a first step a committee operating under the name Food Safety Initiative Indonesia has been established (see <a href="http://www.hortichain.org/site/en/projects/bocifsii/rtd1.html">http://www.hortichain.org/site/en/projects/bocifsii/rtd1.html</a>)

In 2011 4 pilots will be run, two on IndoGAP and two on GlobalGAP, with the aim to learn lessons about overcoming some of the more practical constraints. Additionally relevant stakeholders will be asked to contribute towards seeking solutions for the more general constraints.

### References and resources

- Amekawa, Y. (2009) *Reflections on the Growing Influence of Good Agricultural Practices in the Global South.* J Agric Environ Ethics 22:531–557
- Asandi, A.A., Schoorlemmer, H., Adiyoga, W. Dibyantoro, L. Voort, M. van der, Nurhartuti & Sulastrini, I. (2006) *Development of a Good Agricultural Practice to improve food safety and product quality in Indonesian vegetable production*. PPO Wageningen pp. 90
- FAO (2003) *Incentives for the adoption of Good Agricultural Practices.* FAO GAP Working Paper Series no. 3 pp.34
- Johnson, G.I., Weinberger, K. & Wu, M. (2008) *The vegetable industry in tropical Asia: Indonesia an overview of production and trade*. AVRDC Publication 08-712 pp.72
- Morris, R. (2008) *Food safety research in Indonesia: a scoping study and ACIAR's response*. ACIAR Canberra pp. 67
- Natawidjaja, R.S., Noor, T.I., Perdana, T., Rasmikayati, E. Bachri, S. & Reardon, T. (2006) *Restructuring of agrifood chains in Indonesia*. See: http://www.regoverningmarkets.org/resources/se\_asia/restructuring\_of\_agrifood\_chains\_in\_indonesia
- Sulasmi, S., Tarwuati, D.N., Suleaman, A., Stoetzer, H., Roest, J. van der (2006) *Monitoring and evaluation* report horticultural produce. Rikilt, pp. 43
- Swinnen, J.F.M. & Maertens, M. (2007) Global supply chains, standards and the poor: some conclusions and implications for the government policy and international organizations. In. *Global Supply Chains, Standards and the Poor* (ed. J.F.M. Swinnen) CAB International Oxford
- Valk, O. van der & Roest, J. van der (2009) *National benchmarking against GlobalGAP; Case studies of Good Agricultural Practices in Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico and Chile*. LEI report 2008-079, pp.67

## Appendix 1

### List of interviewees and informants for fact finding

Name	Organisation		Interviewer
Ir. Sri Kuntarsih	DG Horticulture, MoA	Policy	Rara Dewayanti & Irene
(deputy DG)			Koomen
Ir. Pak Oka	DG Standardisation &	Policy	Rara Dewayanti & Irene
(DG)	Certification, MoA		Koomen
Mr. Langgeng Muhono, SP. MP.	DG Horticulture, MoA	Policy	Informant during round table
Ir. Hj. Lilis Irianingsih, MP	Badan Ketahanan Pangan		Ahmad Suleaman
	Daerah Provinsi Jawa Barat -		
	Bandung		
Ir. Joko Susilo, MMA	Badan Ketahanan Pangan		Ahmad Suleaman
	dan Penyuluhan Provinsi DIY -		
	Jogyakarta		
Ir. Dasih Tri Nurdiastuti,	Dinas Pertanian Provinsi		Ahmad Suleaman
MMA	Jawa Timur selaku OKKP-D -		
	Surabaya		
Ir. Sandredo	PT Bimandiri - Bandung	Supermarket supplier	Ahmad Sulaeman
Ir. Flora Chrisantie	Ranch Market/ PT Supra	Hypermaket for premium	Ahmad Sulaeman
	Boga Lestari – Kebon Jeruk	class	
	Jakarta		
Andi Nuraida	PT Carrefour Indonesia,	Hypermarket	Ahmad Sulaeman
	Lebakbulus Jakarta		
Ir. Hendro Tavip Nugroho	PT Saung Mirwan – Gadog	Supermarket	Ahmad Sulaeman
	Megamendung Bogor	supplier/exporter	
Mr. Yohannes Wibisono	PT Saung Mirwan	Exporter	Rara Dewayanti
Mrs. Ilyani A. Sudrajat	Yayasan Lembaga Konsumen	Consumer organization	Rara Dewayanti
	Indonesia (YLKI)		
Mrs. Ida Ronauli	Indonesia Berseru	Consumer organization	Rara Dewayanti
Mr. Komar Muljawibawa	PT Alamanda Sejati Utama	Exporter	Rara Dewayanti
Mr. Sumartono	PT Strawberindo Lestari	Exporter	Rara Dewayanti

### Appendix 2 Guidance questions for interviews

#### Basic requirements:

- 1. Market demand;
- 2. Certification scheme;
- 3. (Accredited) Certification Bodies (CB's);
- 4. Institutional capacity.

In The Netherlands all farmer related certification schemes are demand driven. The certification schemes are "a license to deliver". This means no farmer will carry out certification when there is no market demand for it. Certification schemes are developed by private companies, supermarkets and/or product board.

#### Market demand

- Do market parties have a role in the certification scheme (development, communication, etc.)?
- Do market parties are familiar with the certification scheme?
- Which market parties are demanding the certification scheme of suppliers?
- What is the background for their demand? (Why are they demanding the certification scheme?)
- What are the most important export products?
- What are the most important export markets for these export products?
- What are the market demands (regarding GAP) in these markets?

#### Certification scheme (in this case the SI SAKTI-system)

- Who is owner of the certification scheme?
- What is the goal of the certification scheme?
- Who is the subject in the certification scheme (target group)? (eg. Who needs to apply for the certificate?)
- Is the target group informed on the existence of the certification scheme?
- Is the certification scheme available to the target group?
- Can the target group be certified for the certification scheme?
  - No technical bottlenecks?
  - No financial bottlenecks?
  - No other bottlenecks, Etc.?

#### Certification bodies

- Who carries out the audits for the certification scheme (certification body (CB))?
- Does the CB suffice to the ISO Guide 65 for certification bodies?
- уу

#### Institutional capacity

- Is the institutional capacity sufficient?
  - Are there enough (certified) laboratories available for MRL testing (complying with ISO 17025)?
  - o Are there other institutes present for example for annual calibration of equipment?

## Appendix 3

### Attendance list round table discussion

	PERSON	POSITION
Directorate General Horticulture	Mr. Langgeng Munono, SP. MP.	Directorate of Fruit
Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands	Mr. Jean Rummenie	Food Quality. Accredited to Indonesia,
		Malaysia and Singapore
National Agency for Drug and Food Control	Mrs. Dian Putranti	
Association (AESBI)	Mr. Ir. Hasan Johnny Widjaja	Chairman
Indonesia Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Exporter &		
Importer Association (ASEIBSSINDO)	Mis. Penny Fransiska	Manager
Control Union	Mr. Winaryo Suyono	Certifier
PT Mutuagung Lestari	Mrs. Reny Rustianingsih	Agri Food & Fisheries Manager
PT Mutuagung Lestari	Mrs. Yuvia	
Sucofindo	Mr. Heru Riza	Vice President
Benelux Chamber of Commerce / INA	Mrs. Anindita Gayatri	General Manager
Benelux Chamber of Commerce / INA	Mr. Iskandar Zulkarnaen	Applied Technology - Manager
South Research	Mr. Dirk Van Esbroeck	Consultant
Indonesia Berseru	Mrs. Ida Ronauli	Manager
PT M.D.A.	Mr. Riza	
PT. Agung Mustika Agro Lestari	Mr. Budi Waluyo	Manager
PT Alamanda SejatiUtama	Mr. Komar Muljawibawa	Director
PT Corona Prayitna	Mr. Eric Solomon	Director
PT Kertosari Gemilang	Mr. Budimulyono Widyaatmadja	Director
PT Saung Mirwan	Mr. F. Deddy Hadinata	Manager
Cooperative Bina Usaha Insani (Mangosteen)	Mr. Nanang Koswara	Manager
Cooperative Bina Usaha Insani (Mangosteen)	Mr. Henny	Manager
Jakarta Province - Forestry and Agricultural	Mrs. Kristisasi Helenandari	Head
Product Certification & Quality Examination		
DG Processing & Marketing of Agricultural	Mr. Dedi Junaedi, MSc.	Head
DG Processing & Marketing of Agricultural		
Products	Mrs. Pujianti	
DG Processing & Marketing of Agricultural	Mrs. Siti Aminah	
Products		

Consumption and Food Safety	Mrs. Nita Riswari	Head of Food Safety
Consumption and Food Safety	Mr. Hari S. Akhmad	
Horti Chain Centre	Ms. Rara Dewayanti	Marketing & Business Development Manager
Tropical Fruit Research Institution (BALITBU)	Mr. Dr. Mizu Istianto	Researcher
Vegetable Research Institution (IVEGRI)	Mr. Dr. Nikardi Gunadi	Researcher
Ranch Market / PT Supra Boga Lestari	Mrs. Flora Chrisantie	Management Representative
PT Royal Sun Fruit	Mr. Sunandi Kertawijaya	Director
Satoe Indonesia	Mrs. Endang TR	Retail Management Service - Project Leader
IPB	Mr. Prof. Ir. Ahmad Sulaeman, MS. Ph.D	Researcher
CDI -WUR	Mrs. Irene Koomen, Ph. D	Project Leader
LEI -WUR	Mr. Dave Boselie, Ph. D	Researcher

### Appendix 4

Invitation round table discussion



Appendices

The horticultural industry in Indonesia is progressively moving to apply Good Agricultural Practices with the aim of producing sustainably as well as guaranteeing food safety. While the ministry of agriculture has put a lot of effort in assisting farmers to comply to the national IndoGAp and become Si Sakti certified uptake has been slower than expected. This study has tried to identify the constraints for compliance to GAP such that with this knowledge incentives for GAP compliance can be formulated.

Through interviews and a key stakeholder workshop the following constraints were identified as the major bottlenecks for compliance to GAP:

- a) Lack of awareness by the consumer on food safety issues but also amongst other stakeholders;
- b) There is no clear coordination, cooperation and commitment between and from public as well as private stakeholders;
- c) Small holder farmers do find application of GAP rules difficult, educating and training these farmers in applying GAP is one of the ways forward.

#### More information: www.cdi.wur.nl











Centre for Development Innovation Wageningen UR P.O. Box 88 6700 AB Wageningen The Netherlands