

## **MOBILIZING AID FOR TRADE FOR SPS-RELATED TECHNICAL COOPERATION IN EAST AFRICA**

**Kampala, Uganda, 28-29 May 2008**

### **CONCLUSIONS**

#### **Overview**

1. Within the framework of the Aid for Trade Initiative, on 28-29 May 2008 the STDF brought together representatives from the East African Community (EAC) member states as well as officials from bilateral donor organizations, regional and multilateral institutions to discuss the mobilization of capacity building resources in the area of food safety, animal and plant health (collectively known as sanitary and phytosanitary or SPS measures). A list of participants is attached in **Annex I**.<sup>1</sup>
2. The workshop was the culmination of a year long project to synthesize the results of existing SPS capacity evaluations, to develop an inventory of technical assistance and identify "gaps" where priority SPS need are not being addressed. It specifically built on the results of an Aid for Trade event held in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, on 30 September 2007.
3. The workshop reviewed "balance sheets" which compared SPS needs for Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda with an inventory of SPS related technical co-operation. Needs at regional level were similarly considered. From the comparison, outstanding priority SPS needs not met through current assistance were identified. Participants recognized the value of the workshop as an important effort to co-ordinate and mobilize the future request and offer of SPS-related assistance.
4. The following key conclusions emerged from the activity:
  - **Participants recognized the value of the STDF work as a basis on which to mobilize the future provision of SPS-related assistance.**
  - **For EAC countries, the STDF research promoted a common vision of outstanding needs. It was a useful basis on which to base co-ordination structures so as to integrate the positions of different national actors active in the SPS area into a single common vision. A particular point stressed by the private sector was that the voice of the business community had to be heard in this dialogue, both for domestic and export markets.**
  - **For development partners, the analysis of outstanding SPS needs provided a good platform from which to mobilize the provision of future resources in this area. The prioritization by beneficiaries of their SPS needs provided a clear basis from which development partners, regional and multilateral organizations could prepare bankable projects and argue for the future provision of resources to address SPS issues.**
  - **It was considered essential that follow-up actions should be monitored in a systematic way so as to ensure that implementation of priority SPS actions is undertaken. In this context, disappointment was expressed by some that a higher degree of commitment had not been shown by development partners at the workshop to take the conclusions forward.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Project documentation can be found at: [http://www.standardsfacility.org/East\\_Africa.htm](http://www.standardsfacility.org/East_Africa.htm)

- **Sustainability was recognized as a key consideration. Raising awareness of the importance of SPS issues both nationally and among development partners was considered essential. Various suggestions were made as to how to ensure that results of this STDF exercise were not lost, for instance through the creation of a knowledge network and a repository for training materials and other training tools generated by projects.**
- **The private sector stressed that the final impact of the STDF research and its follow-up should be judged in trade creation, rather than funds disbursed or projects established.**

### **Outstanding priority needs**

5. Standards are a passport for trade. The ability to control SPS risk and meet international standards is a key element determining participation of developing countries in the trading system. It was agreed that to meet poverty reduction and economic development targets, greater attention needed to be paid to this policy area.

6. Outstanding SPS priority needs were considered at both national and EAC level. Priorities listed in the balance sheets were those not fully addressed through either on-going or planned technical co-operation activities. Needs were listed at an aggregated level in the balance sheets. Additional specific detail was added by participants during the workshop. Overviews of needs for Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, as well as a regional balance sheet at EAC level, are provided in **Annex II**. Overviews of needs for Burundi and Rwanda are provided in **Annex III**.

7. It was agreed that the profile of SPS issues had to be raised nationally, and greater awareness generated of the positive impacts of addressing them on market access, agricultural productivity (by tackling emerging pest and disease threats) and public health. National coordination mechanisms were recommended involving key relevant stakeholders, in particular the private sector, to lead the formulation of SPS policies and action plans, track assistance received, promote the integration of SPS issues into broader Government planning and budgetary frameworks, remove overlapping mandates and make better use of limited resources. The importance of raising awareness among parliamentarians was underlined.

8. The private sector cautioned against an overly prescriptive approach to legislative reform. Where the private sector had enjoyed considerable success, it was often on the basis of self-regulatory models which created common incentives for all actors in the supply chain. Legislative modernization should not remove these incentives through an overly restrictive attitude to regulatory enforcement. A partnership between the public and private sector was required.

9. Regional integration initiatives such as the East African Community (EAC), the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the African Union (AU) were referred to as important "drivers" for future SPS assistance, notably the development of SPS protocols and the strengthening of research institutions. However, it was agreed that attention had to be given to ensure that these initiatives were trade focused, complimentary and avoided creating contradictory approaches.

### **Future supply of technical assistance**

10. Appreciation was expressed of the efforts made to bring greater transparency and clarity to the provision of technical assistance in the SPS-related area. The importance of co-ordination in the provision of assistance and the need to avoid duplication of effort, both on the side of development partners and beneficiaries, were underlined.

11. Consideration was given as to how to mobilize technical co-operation funds to address outstanding SPS priority needs. One point made was how SPS-related assistance had evolved over-time. The degree of sophistication in assistance programmes in this area was steadily on the increase from basic training to a systems approach, e.g. multiple activities designed to build a plant health system.

12. It was agreed that outstanding SPS needs could be met from a mixture of on-going, planned and new assistance. A distinction was made between funding specific to the SPS-area (e.g. to improve the food and feed safety situation, and to control animal diseases and plant pests) and assistance which was more general in nature (e.g. general and sector budget support, private sector or agriculture development, or trust funds tied to the Integrated Framework).

13. A series of underlying structural issues related to endemic animal diseases and plant pests were noted. There was general agreement that there were no easy short term solutions to these issues and that they would require long term commitment. Continued support should be given to strengthening general capabilities of veterinary and plant health services as a "public good". Cross border management of pests and diseases was highlighted as a promising area for regional collaboration.

14. It was noted that one way to obtain "additionality" in SPS-related technical assistance was through increased access to general funds, where SPS competed with other demands and thematic areas. For this access to occur, SPS had to be prioritized by both national authorities and development partners.

15. In Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, the potential of general trust funds and funding mechanisms to address outstanding SPS priority actions was recognized, notably in relation to private sector development and associated training needs. Also at a regional level, multi-donor trust funds were identified as potential sources of funding, for instance the East African Community Partnership Fund and the African Multi-Donor Trust Fund for trade and development (to be established by the World Bank).

16. The interim Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) signed in 2007 between the European Community and the EAC was recognized as a major driver in the mobilization of resources at national and regional level. Funds should become available to accompany the EPA process, partly through the 10<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund (EDF) where trade and SPS issues are expected to figure prominently. Support to key SPS policy objectives, primarily implemented through the USAID regional trade hubs, under the African Global Competitiveness Initiative (AGCI) was also highlighted.

17. In Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda, the Integrated Framework was recognized as a potential source of funding for SPS priority needs. In Tanzania, the creation of a multi-donor basket fund aimed at supporting the implementation of the Diagnostic Trade Integration Studies (DTIS) was highlighted. A similar initiative was under discussion in Uganda. Additional funding for all four countries should also become available through the enhancement of the IF. A variety of other initiatives, whether at national or regional level, were also identified.

18. A key question raised in the discussion was how to bridge the gap between the needs expressed by EAC countries and the eventual mobilization of funds to address them. Development partners noted that specific "bankable" projects with achievable goals helped to obtain funds. Beneficiaries stressed the complexity of complying with different application and eligibility criteria. Initiatives to assist in the development of good ideas into projects were encouraged. It was recalled that funding offered by the STDF for the preparation of projects was one possible option.

### **Next steps**

19. It was decided that further efforts were needed to bring the supply and demand of SPS-related technical co-operation into better balance and co-ordination. Development partners and beneficiaries were encouraged to address outstanding priority SPS needs through the actions identified in **Annex II and III**.

20. It was recommended that the results of STDF research should be taken into account in the design of future programmes of assistance, both SPS-specific and general. Beneficiaries were encouraged to use the research to raise the profile of SPS issues within their national administrations. Development partners were encouraged to use the research to programme further assistance in this area.

21. It was agreed that the STDF would monitor the implementation of actions to address outstanding priority SPS needs. For this purpose, it was recommended that the Secretariat review progress in implementation after 12 months. It was also suggested that the African Union and its specialized bodies (AU-IBAR and AU-IAPSC) and regional economic commissions, notably the East African Community and COMESA could play a role in this regard. The results of the review would then be reported to participants and national authorities.

22. It was decided that the STDF and participants should relate the outcomes of the research and workshop in future Aid for Trade events, in particular those held in the African region. Consideration was also given to the addition of SPS issues to the forthcoming Aid for Trade knowledge network. Suggestions were made as to how to encourage the broad dissemination of project outputs (training materials, codes of good practice etc.) through the STDF website and other electronic fora.

23. For Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda, the IF and related national trust funds were identified as an important avenue for implementation of outstanding priority SPS needs. It was considered essential that the conclusions of the event be adequately taken into account by the IF and associated local structures.

24. It was recalled that the STDF could assist in the preparation of "bankable" projects. The STDF Working Group was encouraged to give positive consideration to funding requests arising from **Annex II and III**.

25. The workshop took note of forthcoming research in the area of good practice in SPS-related technical co-operation. There was consensus that this research should inform further technical co-operation activities in the SPS area.



## Annex I

### List of participants

Name	Position, institution	Contact details
<b>UGANDA</b>		
H.E. Professor Ephraim KAMUNTU	Minister of State, Industry and Technology (MP), Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry (MTTI)	
Mr Silver OJAKOL	MTTI, Agriculture Commissioner/External Trade	+256 414 314280 sojakol@mtti.go.ug
Mr Elly KAMA HUNGYE	First Secretary Permanent Mission of Uganda (Geneva)	Tel: +41 78 746 88 27 Fax: +41 22 792 89 54 eekkaamm@yahoo.com
Mr Emmanuel MUTAHUNGA	MTTI, Senior Commercial Officer	+256 41 314280 +256 77 621403 emutahunga@mtti.go.ug
Mr David Oule EPYANU	MTTI, Senior Commercial Officer	+256 414 413946 +256 772 327958 oulepyanu@yahoo.co.uk
Mr H. NYAKOOJO	MTTI, Advisor (IF)	+256 414 314283 hnyakoojo@mtti.go.ug
Mr Rwekuuta REUBEN	MTTI, Commercial Officer	+256 772 433087 rrwekuuta@mtti.go.ug
Mr Francis ODONG	MTTI, Senior Industrial Officer	fodong@mtti.go.ug
Mr Daniel WADADA	MTTI, Personal assistant to Minister of State for Trade	wadadadaniel@hotmail.com
Mr Joshua MUTAMBI	MTTI, Principal Industrial Officer	jmutambi@yahoo.com +256 782679830
Mr Komayombi BULEGEYA	MAAIF, Commissioner, Department of Crop Protection	+256 772 421132 kbulegeya@yahoo.co.uk
Mr Robert KARYEIJIA	MAAIF, Principal Agricultural Inspector	+256 712 985542 robertkaryeija@yahoo.ca
Mr Samuel BALAGADDE	Uganda National Bureau of Standards (UNBS), International Liaison Officer	+256 772 406425 samuel.balagadde@unbs.go.ug
Mr Philip BOREL	Greenfields, Managing Director & Chairman Uganda Fish Processors and Exporters Association (UFPEA)	+256 752 764764 pborel@greenfields.co.ug
Mr Steven KUMUKAMA	MTTI, Programme Officer TRACE (IF project)	skamukama@mtti.go.ug +256 772524846
Mr Agaba RAYMOND	MTTI, Commissioner/Internal Trade	ragaba@mtti.go.ug +256 772618794
Mr Atwine	MTTI, Commercial Officer	eatwine@mtti.go.ug



## Standards and Trade Development Facility

EMMANUEL		+256 782001835
Mr Ovia Katiti	CEO, Uganda Fish Processors and Exporters Association (UFPEA)	ufpea@infocom.co.ug oviakk@yahoo.com +256 414347835
MATORU		
Mr Deo KAMWEYA	MTTI	
Mr George OPYO	WTO TBT Enquiry point	george.opyo@unbs.go.ug
Mr Ojamuge	MTTI	+256 782 015143
NORMAN		nojamuge@mtti.go.ug
Dr Agaba E. FRIDAY	Ministry of Health	agabafriday@hotmail.com +256 772691236
<b>TANZANIA</b>		
Ms Mwanaidi	Ministry of Livestock Development and Fisheries (MLDF), Assistant Director Fisheries Department	+255 784 909292 mrmlolwa@yahoo.com
Ramadhan MLOLWA		
Mr. George Ambilikile	MLDF, OIE Contact Point	Tel: (+255-22) 286 1908
MWAKASUNGULA	Principal Veterinary Officer, Head Zoosanitary Inspection Service, Directorate of Veterinary Service	Fax: (+255-22) 286 2538 <a href="mailto:georgemwaka86@yahoo.com">georgemwaka86@yahoo.com</a>
Mr Zavery D. MDEMU	Ministry of Industry, Trade and Marketing (MITM), Principal Trade Officer,	davidzavery@yahoo.com +255 22 2180075 (tel.) +255 744 947079 (mobile) +255 22 2180371 (fax)
Mr Didas K. MUTABINGWA	Tanzania Food & Drugs Authority (TFDA), Quality Manager	Cell: +255 754 80 78 87 Tel: +255 22 2450512/2450751 Fax: +255 22 245 0793 didasmuta@yahoo.co.uk
Ms Theresia KESSY HUBERT	MTTI, Principal Standards Officer, Tanzania Bureau of Standards (TBS)	Tel. (+255-71) 331 9981 Fax: (+255-22) 245 0959 <a href="mailto:theresia.hubert@tbstz.org">theresia.hubert@tbstz.org</a> , <a href="mailto:siangicha2001@yahoo.co.uk">siangicha2001@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Dr Roshan ABDALLAH (Mrs)	Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security & Cooperatives (MAFC), Director Technical Services, Tropical Pesticides Research Institute (TPRI)	Tel. +255 754 276 737 Fax. +255 27 250 8217 <a href="mailto:raifa52@yahoo.com">raifa52@yahoo.com</a>
<b>KENYA</b>		
Mr Elijah MANYARA BIKUNDO	Ministry of Trade and Industry (MOTI), Senior Assistant Director, External Trade	Tel:+254 20 251830 Fax:+25420315011
Dr. Stephen Mbithi MWIKYA	CEO, Fresh Produce Exporters Association Kenya (FPEAK)	Tel.+254204451488/4450442 Fax:+254-20-4451489 <a href="mailto:chiefexecutive@fpeak.org">chiefexecutive@fpeak.org</a> <a href="mailto:info@fpeak.org">info@fpeak.org</a>
Mrs. Bethsheba Akinyi WAGUDE	Executive Officer, Kenya Fish Processors & Exporters Association (AFIPEK)	Tel:+254-20-4440858 Fax:+254-44-0858 <a href="mailto:beth.wagude@afipek.org">beth.wagude@afipek.org</a>
Dr. Washington OTIENO	General Manager, Inspection Operations, Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service	+254 20 3536171/2 +254 722516221/ 733874274/ 722



## Standards and Trade Development Facility

	(KEPHIS)	427097 <a href="mailto:wotieno@kephis.org">wotieno@kephis.org</a>
Dr Bernard MUGENYO	M. Deputy Director of Veterinary Services	<a href="mailto:mugenyomaina@yahoo.com">mugenyomaina@yahoo.com</a> +254 20 2700705 +254 733794006 <a href="mailto:skimani@dvskabete.go.ke">skimani@dvskabete.go.ke</a> +41 22 906 4050 <a href="mailto:annekamau621@hotmail.com">annekamau621@hotmail.com</a>
Ms Anne A. KAMAU	First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office at Geneva	Tel: +254 20 315 001 Fax: +254 20 315 011 <a href="mailto:bramahlito@yahoo.com">bramahlito@yahoo.com</a>
Mr Bramah KALEVE	MOTI, Trade Development Officer/ External Trade	Tel: +254 20 374 2320 Fax: +254 374 3699 <a href="mailto:monorgv@gmail.com">monorgv@gmail.com</a>
Mr Godfrey Vincent MONOR	Ministry of Fisheries Development, Deputy Director of Fisheries	Tel: +254 20 273 3840 Fax: +254 20 244 064 <a href="mailto:pgichohi@kdb.co.ke">pgichohi@kdb.co.ke</a>
Mr Machira GICHOHI	Ministry of Livestock Development Managing Director, Kenya Dairy Board (KDB)	Tel: +250 585 053 or 55 102 618 Fax: +250 585 057 <a href="mailto:lhakizamungufr@yahoo.fr">lhakizamungufr@yahoo.fr</a>
<b>RWANDA</b>		
Mr Leon HAKIZAMUNGU	Ministry of Agriculture & Animal Resources (MINAGRI), Head of Crop Protection Unit, Rwanda Agricultural Development Authority (RADA)	Tel: +250 08306290 Fax: +250 584 644 <a href="mailto:byany38@yahoo.com">byany38@yahoo.com</a>
Ms Martha BYANYIMA	MINAGRI, Rwanda Horticulture Development Authority (RHODA) & RHESI Coordinator	
<b>BURUNDI</b>		
Mr. Dieudonné SIMBAKIRA	Chef de Section Parasitologie Département de la santé animale Ministère de l'Agriculture et Elevage	Tel. (+257) 22 22 20 87 +257 78826271 Fax: (+257) 22 22 28 73 <a href="mailto:minagrie2007@yahoo.fr">minagrie2007@yahoo.fr</a> , <a href="mailto:nidieu2002@yahoo.fr">nidieu2002@yahoo.fr</a>
Mr Bernard NIZIGIYIMANA	Chef adjoint de service Département de la formation et assistance technique Ministère du Commerce, de l'Industrie et du Tourisme	Tel: +257 78 84 37 15 Tel: +257 22 25 54 17 <a href="mailto:nizigiyimanab@yahoo.fr">nizigiyimanab@yahoo.fr</a>
Mr Déogratias NIZIGAMA	Chef de Service Laboratoires et Production Département de la Pharmacie, du Médicament et des Laboratoires Ministère de la Santé Publique et de la Lutte contre le Sida	Tel: +257 7880 7840 Fax: +257 2222 9196 <a href="mailto:nizdeo2007@yahoo.fr">nizdeo2007@yahoo.fr</a>
<b>REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS</b>		
<b>AU-IBAR</b>		
Dr. Medhat EL-HELEPI	Economist, African Union Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR)	Tel: +254 20 3674 203 (Direct) or +254 20 3674 000 (Switchboard) Cell: +254 0736161034



## Standards and Trade Development Facility

		Fax: +254 20 3674 341 <a href="mailto:medhat.elhelepi@au-ibar.org">medhat.elhelepi@au-ibar.org</a>
<b>AU-IAPSC</b>		
Mr Yemi AKINBAMIJO	Director, African Union Interafrican Phytosanitary Council (AU-IAPSC)	Tel: +237 742 68 265 Fax: +237 222 11 967 <a href="mailto:yemi.akinbamijo@au-appo.org">yemi.akinbamijo@au-appo.org</a>
<b>COMESA</b>		
Dr Bruce MUKANDA	SPS Expert, COMESA Secretariat	Tel +260 211 229 725 Fax: +260 211 227 318 Cell: +260 977800638 <a href="mailto:bmukanda@comesa.int">bmukanda@comesa.int</a>
<b>EAC</b>		
Dr Khadijah Cherotich KASSACHOON	Regional Coordinator Department of Trade East African Community (EAC) Secretariat	Tel: +255 27 250 42 53 Fax: +255 27 250 42 55 <a href="mailto:kassachoon@eachq.org">kassachoon@eachq.org</a>
<b>AfDB</b>		
Dr Tonia KANDIERO	African Development Bank (AfDB)	+216 71 10 27 54 <a href="mailto:t.kandiero@afdb.org">t.kandiero@afdb.org</a>
Mr Henri MINNAAR	African Development Bank (AfDB)	h.minaar@afdb.org +216 71103477
<b>FAO</b>		
Dr Mike ROBSON	Secretary Biosecurity IDWG Food and Agriculture of the United Nations (FAO)	Tel: +39 06 5705 4439 <a href="mailto:mike.robson@fao.org">mike.robson@fao.org</a>
Mr W. MISIKA	FAO representative (Uganda)	Tel: +256 414250578 Fax: +256 414 250579
Ms Susanne MUNSTERMANN	ECTAD Regional Manager Regional Animal Health Centre Botswana, FAO	Tel.: (+267) 395 3100 (+267-72) 110 509 Fax. (+267) 395 3104 <a href="mailto:susanne.munstermann@fao.org">susanne.munstermann@fao.org</a>
<b>WHO</b>		
Dr Patience Atswei MENSAH	Regional Adviser for Food Safety, World Health Organization (WHO) WHO Regional Office for Africa (Congo)	Tel: +47 241 39 775 Fax: +47 241 39 501/3 <a href="mailto:mensahp@fro.who.int">mensahp@fro.who.int</a>
<b>UNIDO</b>		
Ms Muge DOLUN	Associate Industrial Development Officer TCB Branch United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)	Tel: +43 1 26026 3035 Fax: +43 1 21346 3035 <a href="mailto:u.dolun@unido.org">u.dolun@unido.org</a>
<b>OTHER</b>		
Mr Roger DAY	CABI Director, CABI Africa	Tel: +254 20 7224450/62 Fax: +254 20 7122150 or 7224001 <a href="mailto:r.day@cabi.org">r.day@cabi.org</a>
Ms Rachel Kaggwa SEBUDDE	Economist, World Bank (Uganda)	Tel: +256 414 -302201 Fax: +256 414 -230231 <a href="mailto:rsebudde@worldbank.org">rsebudde@worldbank.org</a>
Mr Milton AYOKI	Executive Director	Tel: +256 414235006





## Standards and Trade Development Facility

Ms Christiane KRAUS	Institut de Recherche et d'Analyse Politique (IPRAA) Chief Coordinator, IF (Geneva)	Fax: +256 41235079 Milton.ayoki@ipraa.org Tel: +41 22 739 6577 <a href="mailto:christiane.kraus@wto.org">christiane.kraus@wto.org</a>
<b>DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS</b>		
Ms Tracy HATHORN	Resident Representative Nortura (Norway)	Tel: +256 782 300 191 Fax: +256 414 222 560 <a href="mailto:tracy_hathorn@yahoo.com">tracy_hathorn@yahoo.com</a>
Mr Tom VENS	First Secretary - Head of Section Economic, Trade and Regional Integration, Delegation of European Commission (EC) to Uganda	Tel: +256 414701074 Fax: +256 414233708 tom.vens@ec.europa.eu
Ms Celine PRUD HOMME	EC Delegation to Uganda	Tel: +256 414701081f celine.prudhomme@ec.europa.eu
Mr Razi LATIF	EC Delegation to Tanzania	Tel: +255 222117473 Mob: +255 754603763 Fax: +255 222113277 www.deltza.cec.eu.int +256 414 701000 sanne.verheul@ec.europa.eu
Ms Sanne VERHEUL	EC Delegation to Uganda	Tel: +254 20 253904/ 340520211659 Fax: +254 20219765 Mob: +254 722 821968 m.orina@gtzpsda.co.ke psda@gtzpsda.co.ke
Ms Margaret ORINA	Programme Officer, GTZ, PSDA (Private Sector Development and Agriculture)	Tel: +256 414340400/ 4347984 cate.nujjuma@dfa.ie
Mrs Cate NAJJUMA	Irish Aid (Uganda)	Tel. +1 202 720 1818 <a href="mailto:joe.hain@fas.usda.gov">joe.hain@fas.usda.gov</a>
Mr Joe HAIN	USDA Senior Advisor Office of Scientific and Technical Affairs	Tel: +254 20 862-2322 Mobile: +254 (0) 728 608 442 Fax: +254 20 862 2680/1/2 <a href="mailto:lgarcia@usaid.gov">lgarcia@usaid.gov</a> <a href="mailto:lloyd.garcia@gmail.com">lloyd.garcia@gmail.com</a>
Mr Lloyd GARCIA	USAID Regional SPS Advisor	Tel: +202 6900707 Fax: +202 6903982 Jennifer.maurer@usda.gov
Ms Jennifer MAURER	USDA SPS Program Adviser Trade and Scientific Capacity building Division	john.nakedde@foreign.ministry.se
Mr John Nakedde SEMPANYI	Embassy of Sweden	+254 20 4450137 julia.seevinck@minbuza.nl
Ms Julia Seevinck	Embassy of the Netherlands (Nairobi)	Tel: +256 312 351600 Fax: +256 312 351620
Ms Rilla NORSLUND	Senior Adviser Agriculture Sector Programme Support, DANIDA	Tel: +256 414 320 722
Mr James JOUGHIN	Adviser (DANIDA)	



## Standards and Trade Development Facility

Mr Lars RIMMER	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries PO BOX 102 Entebbe- Uganda Counsellor, Danish Embassy, Uganda	Mob: +256 774 643173 Fax: +256 414 320986 james.joughin@apdmaaif.or.ug jj@4ard.co.uk +256 312263211 larrim@um.dk +256 312 263211/212 johohw@um.dk
Mr John OLWENY	Program Officer, Denmark	
<b>WTO OFFICIALS</b>		
Mr Michael ROBERTS	STDF Secretary	+41 22 739 5747 michael.roberts@wto.org
Mr Melvin SPREIJ	Economic Affairs Officer	+41 22 739 6630 melvin.spreij@wto.org
Mr Panos ANTONAKAKIS	Economic Affairs Officer	+41 22 739 5644 panos.antoniakakis@wto.org
<b>CONSULTANT</b>		
Mr Mulat ABEGAZ	Consultant	mulatabegaz@yahoo.com

**Annex II: Outstanding priority SPS needs for Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, and at regional level**

**KENYA**

**OUTSTANDING PRIORITY SPS ACTION AREAS**

Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline
<p>Addressing the SPS limitations in agriculture especially by addressing cost and complexity of compliance to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. pest</li> <li>2. disease</li> <li>3. sanitary issues</li> </ol>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enhancement of an effective early warning system on agricultural pests and diseases</li> <li>2. Enhancing diagnostic capacity at both public and private sector levels</li> <li>3. Enhancing capacity for self regulation especially among small scale producers</li> <li>4. Enhancing self regulation in domestic markets by encouraging public private partnership in standards enforcement e.g. KenyaGAP in supermarkets</li> <li>5. Support to establish an effective systems approach in compliance (limiting end-point inspections and enhance on farm compliance structures)</li> <li>6. Creating pest-free areas of production</li> <li>7. Development and implementation of effective sanitary standards control systems (pesticide-crop combination control systems, sanitary standards certification, compliance structures)</li> </ol>	<p>2008-2011</p> <p>2009-2011</p> <p>2009-2014</p> <p>2008-2011</p> <p>2008 – 2011</p> <p>2008 – 2011</p>

Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline
<p>- Address disease problems limiting export of livestock, meat and dairy products through focused investment programs.</p> <p>- Proper documentation of breeding activities/germplasm</p> <p>-Address safety issues caused by unhygienic handling</p> <p>-Product processing &amp; packaging</p>	<p>Animal health status is primary constraint but actions to address disease situation depend greatly on capability of national veterinary services. Results of OIE evaluation (2006, not in public domain) should be used to identify more specific actions. Consideration should be given to different possible methods for the development of bigger processing capacity producing quality products e.g. through disease free zones, compartments, or commodity based approaches.</p>	<p>Build capacity of Veterinary Department in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Human resources (nos. &amp; skills)</li> <li>• Early warning systems (Emergency preparedness in response to Diseases &amp; other disasters)</li> <li>• Disease Surveillance &amp; control systems.</li> <li>• Capacity in lab. Diagnosis &amp; quality assurance</li> </ul> <p>Dairy &amp; beef sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a registration system for farmers &amp; animals.</li> <li>• Cataloguing of local animal genetics</li> <li>• Developing a quality traceability system for animal products.</li> <li>• Massive awareness &amp; sensitization on the need to observe SPS issues.</li> <li>• Strengthen capacities in regulatory agencies to play identified roles on SPS issues e.g. KDB, KVB, KEBS</li> <li>• Comprehensive linkage producers, players, consumers.</li> </ul>	<p>By 2011</p> <p>End 2009</p> <p>End 2012</p> <p>By 2012</p> <p>By 2010</p> <p>By 2012</p> <p>By 2010</p>
<p>Maintain SPS compliance in inland fisheries sector, assess development of fisheries in Lake Turkana, and assess SPS risks involved in coastal fisheries and aquaculture. Improvement of fish</p>	<p>Sector going through rationalization phase. Challenge is to keep up with evolving EU requirements and implement recommendations of latest FVO report (2006). Concerns exist over water quality and stock sustainability of fisheries in Lake</p>	<p>Development of a linked computerized data management system encompassing traceability, health certification, data generation information hub.</p> <p>Develop a focal office for monitoring</p>	<p>1 year</p>

Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline
quality for the domestic market	Victoria.	emerging issues along the value chain and a rapid alert mechanism	3 months
	Outstanding constraints relate to continuing capacity building (awareness raising and training) and investment in infrastructure (boats, landing sites).	Strengthening inspection staff in performing official controls	4 years
	Limited private public sector involvement	Support for monitoring and surveillance unit for fish slot sizes	2 years
	Regulations developed harmonized with the EU regulations leading to high cost of compliance	Continue assistance to industry associations training member companies on emerging food safety issues and risk analysis and	2 months
	Deficient laboratory for specialized tests	Support for harmonization of associations codes of practices regionally	1 month
		Develop manuals, guidelines and the necessary SOP's inline with new fisheries regulations and harmonized within the region	2 years
		Support for self regulation initiatives through public private partnerships	3 years
		Continue education of the fishers on sustainable fishing practices and fish handling	6 months
		Establishment of fish auction market in 6 beaches and upgrading of the landing sites	1 year
		Developing of domestic market handling support.	4 years

Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline
		<p>Attract funds to develop the Lake Turkana fishery</p> <p>Development of infrastructure for Histamine analysis</p> <p>Conduct feasibility study to explore potential of aquaculture and EEZ fisheries – including SPS requirements and develop policy package and guidelines to attract investment</p>	<p>2 months</p> <p>6 months</p> <p>1 year</p>
<p>Kenya proposes improvement of holistic domestic standards both for local consumers and tourists. We would be opposed to an approach that distinguishes any of the two.</p> <p>Provide food safety training in tourism sector and integrate local suppliers</p>	<p>Baseline evaluation outlining the status in terms of current practices and management systems, hotel/restaurant inspection, and needs for training and technical assistance. Strengthen backward linkages through development of "quality vendor" programme on pilot basis linking local fresh producers with hotels/restaurants/ supermarkets.</p>		
<p>Organize awareness raising and training activities on good practice and SPS compliance, amongst others through trade associations</p>	<p>Awareness of basic food safety, animal and plant health issues is still limited at all levels (farmers, processors, street vendors, consumers) - with exception of export fisheries – and needs to be improved</p>		

Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline
Offer training for trade associations on SPS compliance strategies and strengthen SPS diplomacy	Training should be offered to trade and industry associations on SPS strategies relevant to their member companies and efforts should be encouraged to obtain proactive government services in support of their sectoral needs. A close relationship between Government and the private sector is key when it comes to monitoring and reacting to changes in SPS measures of trading partners (SPS diplomacy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Identify relevant associations in the livestock sector e.g. KENDAPO, KLBO, KLMC, KDGA,</li> <li>-Conduct massive training and awareness</li> <li>-Develop standard training modules on SPS issues.</li> <li>- Drive the SPS issues to a target of having the Dairy sector ISO certified by year 2015.</li> </ul>	<p>Immediately</p> <p>End Of 2009</p> <p>End Of 2008</p> <p>Start 2009, end 2015</p>
Enhancing effective public private sector coordinating mechanisms on SPS implementation	Establishment of national level coordination mechanism involving all key relevant stakeholders to better mainstream SPS into broader Government planning and budgetary frameworks and into supply chains, remove overlapping mandates, make better use of limited resources, and generally raise the profile of SPS issues nationally	<p>Domestication of international SPS (public and private) measures</p> <p>Fast tracking implementation of SPS measures (i.e. developing compliance and certification tools in parallel with legislative reviews</p> <p>Implemented through establishing national SPS/TBT committee (public-private) coordinated through the Ministry of Trade</p>	Immediate (2008)

## TANZANIA

## OUTSTANDING PRIORITY SPS ACTION AREAS

S/N	Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline/ priority
1.	Develop National SPS policy	There is no SPS policy at the moment	MITM to be the custodian and the coordinator of the development and the implementation of the policy	1
2.	Develop/Review Legal and Institutional Framework	The institutional framework is fragmented and are not coordinated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertake strategic and detailed review process of existing of legislation and institutional arrangements by taking stock of who is doing what and what legislation is in place</li> <li>• Establish/review relevant legislation in place at the sectoral levels as per the national/regional/international requirements</li> <li>• Establish responsibilities to the institutions</li> <li>• Establish national level coordination mechanism involving all key relevant stakeholders to better mainstream SPS into broader Government planning and budgetary frameworks and into supply chains, remove overlapping mandates, make better use of limited resources, and generally raise the profile of SPS issues nationally</li> <li>• Establish National SPS committee/enhance Tanzania Quality and Safety of Agro-commodity committee</li> <li>• Enhance capacity of Local Government Authorities to enforce implementation of SPS measures</li> <li>• Early warning and emergency responsibilities</li> </ul>	1



S/N	Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline/ priority
3.	Establish National SPS Enquiry Point	There is lack of a central coordinating institute as one stop shop for SPS compliance. The Enquiry point will coordinate better utilization of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish/strengthen a national SPS enquiry point at MITM</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
4.	Train and create awareness to regulators and stakeholders	Awareness of basic food safety, animal and plant health issues is still limited at all levels (Regulators, Decision makers, farmers, fishers, processors, street vendors, consumers, hoteliers, SMEs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training and awareness will be conducted for the different stakeholders as per their responsibilities and mandates</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
5.	Harmonize SPS standards for pesticides registration and control of horticultural crops (regional)	Harmonization of pesticides registration and control for horticultural crops are not complete which delays import of registered pesticides from the region	EAC to speed up the process of harmonization	<b>1</b>
7.	Enhance implementation of regional (EAC) harmonized SPS Standards at national level	There are harmonized regional SPS standards that are yet to be implemented to facilitate trade.	Capacity building for implementation of the harmonized SPS standards	<b>2</b>

S/N	Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline/ priority
8.	Strengthen capacity to negotiate SPS issues at international level (SPS diplomacy)	Participation in international meetings on standard-setting is not effective	Enhance capacity on participation and negotiations	2
9.	Infrastructure development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerous laboratories are in place with limited ability to undertake microbiological/chemical analyses but overall diagnostic capacity is weak;</li> <li>• Very limited capacity to analyze pesticide and veterinary drug residues, mycotoxins, heavy metals and microbial food contaminants;</li> <li>• Exporters often use services of foreign laboratories</li> </ul>	Develop appropriate infrastructures to comply with SPS requirements.	2
10.	Support research institutions to implement the SPS components	Research institutions have limited capacity to handle SPS requirements	Strengthen capacity for research on SPS issues	2
11.	Engage with the Ministry of Education to develop curriculum for SPS issues	There is little understanding of basic SPS issues in schools and learning institutions	Capacity building in curriculum development	2
12.	Develop capacity on risk analysis, traceability, GAP,	Limited awareness of basic food safety issues at all levels (farmers,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen technical support to all stakeholders and regulators</li> </ul>	1

S/N	Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline/ priority
	GMP, HACCP, and SPS related standards	slaughterhouses, processors and manufacturers, street vendors, tourist sector, general public etc. (exception: export fish and fishery products)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity Building in risk analysis, traceability, GAP, GMP, HACCP, and SPS related standards</li> <li>• Increase regular training courses on GAP (farmers), GMP and GHP (smaller processors and street vendors) and HACCP (larger and medium-sized processors)</li> </ul>	
13.	Accredit Laboratory and Certification of food export products	Numerous laboratories are in place with limited ability to undertake microbiological/ chemical analyses but overall diagnostic capacity is weak; Very limited capacity to analyze pesticide and veterinary drug residues, mycotoxins, heavy metals and microbial food contaminants;	Facilitate the accreditation process of food control laboratories.	<b>1</b>
14.	Establish and implement traceability systems	Lack of commodity based traceability system on SPS related activities	Establish traceability system and build capacity on implementation of the system	<b>2</b>
15.	Improve pest surveillance and monitoring system, tackle pest problems and assist SPS compliance by smallholders	Horticulture sector has growth potential but is hampered by number of constraints including shortcomings in surveillance and monitoring, and plant pest situation, notably fruit fly. Other challenges relate to pesticide registration and integration of smallholders into supply chains (following Kenyan model) through specific programmes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop pest free areas for fruit flies;</li> <li>• Review and update quarantine pest list for Tanzania;</li> <li>• Develop pest risk analysis for specific commodities as per importing countries;</li> <li>• Enhance harmonization of pesticide registration and control in the EAC</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>

16.	Address disease problems limiting export of livestock, meat and dairy products through public-private investment programme	Animal health status is primary constraint but actions to address disease situation depend greatly on capability of national veterinary services. Results of forthcoming OIE evaluation should be used to identify more specific actions. Further constraints relate to shortcomings in animal disease monitoring and management system, poor hygienic conditions in slaughterhouses and processing plants, low quality of animal feed, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish disease free zones and compartments;</li> <li>• Strengthen animal quarantine facilities for disease control purposes</li> <li>• Strengthen disease surveillance and reporting;</li> <li>• Capacity building of livestock inspectors and other regulators</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
15.	Maintain SPS compliance in marine, inland fisheries and aquaculture	Sector going through rationalization phase. Challenge is to keep up with evolving EU requirements and implement recommendations of latest FVO report (2006). Concerns exist over sustainability of fisheries in Lake Victoria. Outstanding constraints relate to continuing capacity building, investment in infrastructure (boats, landing sites), and high transport costs. Growth potential for coastal fisheries and aquaculture (notably Zanzibar)	Study need for specific aquaculture legislation	<b>1</b>

**SPS PRIORITY NEEDS FOR UGANDA**

Details	Timeframe		
	Short term	Medium	Long term
<p align="center"><b>DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL SPS POLICY</b></p> <p>1. Stock taking – establishment of existing gaps and Policy development following a consultative approach</p> <p>2. Policy implementation – include regulations development, legal reforms, institutional development and rationalisation, awareness creation</p> <p>3. Training on Pest risk analysis</p> <p>4. Monitoring &amp; Evaluation- for the SPS policy</p>	<p>&lt;1yr X</p>	<p>1-2yrs  X  X</p>	<p>&gt;3-5yrs   X   X</p>
<p align="center"><b>LIVESTOCK SECTOR</b></p> <p>1. Awareness creation</p> <p>2. Conformity assessment and establishment of certification system</p> <p>3. Infrastructure systems</p> <p>4. Establish disease free zones</p> <p>5. Cattle movement routes</p> <p>6. Research on breeding</p> <p>7. Good Handling Practices (GHP)</p> <p>8. Capacity building in animal husbandry</p> <p>9. Traceability</p>	<p>X     X</p>	<p>  X X</p>	<p>X    X X X</p>
<p align="center"><b>ANIMAL DISEASE</b></p> <p>1. Policy enforcement surveillance mechanisms for cross boarder animal disease – Regional aspect</p> <p>2. Awareness creation</p> <p>3. Proper information flow</p> <p>4. Strengthening existing control mechanisms</p> <p>5. Capacity building in risk assessment and mitigation measures for quarantining, holding and pest risk analysis</p>	<p> X X</p>	<p>  X</p>	<p>X    X</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>FISHERIES</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Awareness creation on GHP across the entire chain</li> <li>2. Improve fish handling methods and the design of fishing boats for proper hygiene</li> <li>3. Build capacity in Monitoring Control and Surveillance</li> <li>4. Provision of adequate upstream infrastructure at landing sites</li> <li>5. Harmonise traceability system regionally</li> <li>6. Approve other lakes and upgrade the landing sites</li> <li>7. Infrastructure development in laboratories/accreditation and capacity building</li> <li>8. Strengthening research institutions</li> <li>9. Development of infrastructure for aquaculture</li> <li>10. Environmental Monitoring programming</li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>HORTICULTURE</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Creation of awareness amongst the farmers</li> <li>2. Creation of export groups/critical mass of small scale exporters</li> <li>3. Standard pack houses</li> <li>4. Training quality controllers</li> <li>5. Improvement of the cold chain infrastructure</li> <li>6. Production Marketing Distribution and Transportation infrastructure</li> <li>7. Pesticide residue monitoring plan for fruits and vegetables</li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>FOOD SAFETY</b></p> <p><b>Safe water supply and its impact on SPS (water policy)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implementation of National Food Safety Strategic Plan</li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: center;">X</p>		

2. Improvement of policy framework for food safety	X		
3. Streamlining institutional responsibility framework		X	
4. Food safety and handling infrastructure including Training of enterprises and food inspectors.	X	X	X
5. Certification for enterprises		X	
6. Awareness creation including on the demand side (food safety in education system)			X
7. Development of Codes of Practices (COPs) on good agricultural practices, good manufacturing practices and mycotoxine detection in foods, food safety management systems		X	
<b>CROSS CUTTING ISSUES</b>			
1. Bolstering the enforcement capacity including training of responsible enforcement agencies		X	X
2. Strengthening of national notification systems/information flow		X	
3. Building capacity for sustained compliance with SPS/sustainability.	X		X
4. Awareness of SPS issues by policy makers and politicians	X		
5. Development of Codes of Practice	X		

**REGION (EAC)**

**OUTSTANDING PRIORITY SPS ACTION AREAS**

Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline
Further harmonize standards in selected product areas	Most "harmonized" standards relate to product specifications. Only limited number cover sampling and testing methods, labelling or other matters that might truly affect trade. Only few "harmonized" standards have been formally adopted as national standards. In selected product areas, further harmonization might be beneficial to trade (examples are standards being developed within COMESA for maize and dairy products). Private sector is best positioned to identify these areas and it is thus critical that a stronger demand-driven element be introduced in the ongoing process of harmonization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coordination between EAC, COMESA, SADC standardization committees and activities</li> <li>- RECS two way communication with International Standards Setting Organizations (ISSOs) committees – informing member NSBs and bringing new items for international standardization regional</li> <li>- Representation of RECS in ISSOs, choice of type of membership and funding (funding could be secured through various means such as ongoing technical assistance, fee-waivers and contribution from regional associations)</li> </ul>	
Streamline regulations and create a system of mutual recognition of conformity assessments in EAC member countries.	Complementary to the harmonization process is the need to establish systems of mutual recognition on the implementation side. Systems need not feature equivalent capacities, yet over a broad range of areas there is scope to introduce common - standard-operating - procedures, record-keeping, auditing, etc. In addition, unnecessary regulations should be eliminated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNIDO/EAC/NORAD is focusing on the development of the model on food safety legislation, but assessment needed for animal and plant health model.</li> <li>- Improvement of SPS protocol draft to indicate on what needs to be harmonized and its translation for countries without the capabilities to meet the requirements.</li> <li>- Ensure no contradiction and mutual support between EAC and COMESA SPS protocols</li> <li>- Assessment and upgrading of regulations dealing with SPS</li> <li>- Encourage member states to have a national SPS committee to be</li> </ul>	



Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline
	as much as possible. The possibility of developing "model" legislation (e.g. a basic model food safety law) should also be further examined.	<p>responsible for coordinating all SPS issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Members to be signatories to all SPS conventions.</li> </ul>	
Create economies of scale and cooperation through establishment of centers of excellence and a regional accreditation body	Different institutions and countries are currently duplicating analytical, testing and other capacities. There is evidently much to be gained from establishing single "centers of excellence" in specialized areas (training, testing of pesticides, regional PRAs, etc.), leading to more effective use of research capacity, equipment and staff. This also applies to the creation of a regional accreditation body (in accordance with the EAC SQMT Protocol). There is also scope for joint programs in a number of fields such as applied research, pilot programs (e.g. food safety and backward linkages in tourism sector), stakeholder training etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Each country to have a minimum capacity to handle SPS issues, an inventory of capacity to be done and program to build capacity</li> <li>- identify center of excellence by use of scientific criteria and develop business plans</li> <li>- Specify role of centers i.e. to develop analysis methods, rules and guidelines,</li> <li>- Establishing a regional accreditation body. Highlight pros and cons of establishing a regional body vis a vis a national body specialized organizations to member states to get consent.</li> </ul>	
Increase collaboration in the management of transboundary risks, notably the movement of plant pests and animal diseases	National bureaus of standards seem to have put more efforts in the regionalization process than other government agencies, research institutes, etc. If collaboration occurs, it is often forced by an event or a crisis, notably outbreaks of diseases or infestation by pests. There is scope to develop a variety of regional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implement a traceability system for all products covered under SPS auspices and especially on products of animal origin affected by trans-boundary diseases.</li> <li>- Establish a regional surveillance system for diseases and undertake a cost benefit analysis at national levels for need of this system</li> <li>- Coordinate with other institutions in the region i.e. AU, COMESA to be able to use their data</li> <li>- Have a SPS committee drawn from national SPS committees.</li> </ul>	

Title of action	Background	Specific details to be covered	Timeline
	<p>surveillance and contingency planning initiatives to better manage selected priority risks. Regional information alert systems and joint planning and monitoring would help to prevent the spread of pests and diseases through largely uncontrolled borders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify and keep a data base of regional experts/research institutions.</li> <li>- Have a coordination mechanism that allows CODEX, IPPC, OIE country representations meet and consult</li> </ul>	
<p>Finalize the development of the EAC SPS Protocol and establish joint SPS management mechanisms</p>	<p>The EAC (and COMESA and SADC) trade agreement calls upon its members to harmonize SPS measures with international standards and to seek synergies in building up regional capacities in SPS management. Within the EAC, progress on SPS has been modest to date - apart from interlinked developments in SQMT (Protocol adopted 2001). The planned SPS Protocol should be finalized and further thought should be given to establishing joint management mechanisms and developing regional positions (e.g. coordination of EAC delegations in Codex, OIE and IPPC sub-committee meetings, etc.).</p>	<p>As discussed above</p>	

## **Annex III: Outstanding priority SPS needs for Burundi and Rwanda**

### **Actions SPS prioritaires au Burundi**

#### Au niveau national :

- Sensibilisation auprès des législateurs et décideurs.
- Mettre en place une équipe de coordination des normes SPS
- Mettre en place un cadre législatif efficace sur les normes SPS
- Mettre en place les responsabilités pour chaque entité, selon leurs domaine de compétence (santé animale, végétale, alimentaire) afin de limiter les chevauchements
- Adopter des normes internationales ou régionales au niveau national.
- Formation des cadres selon leur rôle retenu.
- Mise en place des infrastructures de qualité (SQMT). Mettre l'accent sur la certification, l'accréditation, l'inspection et les laboratoires.

#### Exemples d'actions au niveau sectoriel :

- Besoin de combattre les maladies transfrontalières pour les cuirs et peaux.
- Besoin de renforcer les capacités et les méthodes d'inspection qui sont actuellement faites à l'œil nu.
- Besoin de contrôler l'importation de pesticides et autres produits nuisible à la santé humaine.
- Renforcer les capacités pour contrôler les établissements touristiques (restaurant, buvettes, etc.)

#### Lien avec donateurs :

En règle générale, l'assistance technique fournie pour les questions de normes SPS ne représente pas une priorité pour la majorité des donateurs au Burundi. Dans certains cas, les priorités des donateurs s'imposent au détriment des besoins nationaux. Les besoins SPS sont souvent mal articulés, et ne résultent pas d'un processus de coordination interne rigoureux. En effet, il manque aujourd'hui au Burundi une stratégie ou un plan d'action SPS, et cela reflète la vision fragmentée des normes au niveau national.

Le manque de coordination entre les différents ministères impliqués sur les normes ne permet pas d'obtenir des propositions de projet cohérentes qui reçoivent l'aval de tout le gouvernement. Un exemple est un projet formulé par le FANDC suite à une demande du Bureau Burundais de Normalisation, sans l'aval des Ministères de Santé et d'Agriculture et élevage. Le projet actuellement demeure sans financement, malgré les efforts du BBN et du FANDC pour assurer un financement auprès du STABEX.

Un autre exemple concerne l'application de l'outil d'évaluation de santé animale de l'OIE qui a été mise en œuvre en 2007 sans que ces recommandations reçoivent un suivi ou un financement.

#### Propositions :

Financement d'un atelier national de sensibilisation sur les normes SPS. Cet atelier pourrait se baser sur les priorités élaborées dans le projet FANDC. La coordination interministérielle va assurer la production d'un document de projet ayant l'aval de tous les partis prenants dans le domaine des normes.

### SPS PRIORITY NEEDS FOR RWANDA

Title of action	Specific details to be covered	TIMELINE
Tackle pest problems limiting expansion in horticulture and floriculture sectors and expand small-holder certification schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build capacity of national plant protection organization and other agencies:- training on monitoring and surveillance, pest diagnostics; - enforcement of inspection and certification; - training public and private sector on good practice.</li> <li>• The STDF project in Rwanda (RHESI) generated results and hopes (development of NPPO capacities, implementation of pesticides law, plant health law,etc.) that need to be sustained.</li> </ul>	Urgent
Address disease problems limiting export of livestock, meat and dairy products through focused investment programme	Rwanda Animal Resources Development Authority to identify needs in this area. Further consultation required to formulate a coherent priority need.	
Offer training for trade associations on SPS compliance strategies and strengthen SPS diplomacy	Enhance capacity of private and public stakeholders to meet SPS compliance, SPS requirements at regional level.	
Update existing regulatory and institutional frameworks with the establishment of generic SPS/food laws and umbrella regulations	Food safety risk assessment. Need to set up food safety law and implement it. Biosecurity law is in place but needs to be reinforced.	
Provide food safety training and promote integration of local suppliers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training on monitoring and surveillance on food borne diseases.</li> <li>• Building the national capacity in terms of food safety risks, good hygiene practices.</li> <li>• Improve existing infrastructures (laboratory capacities).</li> </ul>	

**REGION**

**RWANDA COMMENTS**

Title of action	Specific details to be covered
Further harmonize standards in selected product areas	Rwanda would support further harmonization of standards at EAC and COMESA level. Priority should be given to the commodities most commonly traded in the region.
Streamline regulations and create a system of mutual recognition of conformity assessments in EAC member countries.	Care should be taken to avoid duplication in accreditation and mutual recognition systems between EAC and COMESA. Priority should be given to the system which offers maximum commercial advantage for its member countries.
Create economies of scale and cooperation through establishment of centers of excellence and a regional accreditation body	Centre of excellence is needed but at national level there are also needs to be a minimum capacity for initial diagnosis, testing, etc.  Centre of excellence needs a committee drawn from the region.
Increase collaboration in the management of transboundary risks, notably the movement of plant pests and animal diseases	Need for a two-tier surveillance network for early warning (farmers, field schools, extension workers) and for confirmed observations to be shared in timely manner, and to inform policy and regulatory reforms at regional and national level.
Finalize the development of the EAC SPS Protocol and establish joint SPS management mechanisms	Attention should be given to ensuring that the EAC and COMESA SPS protocols are mutually supportive and not contradictory. In particular, the COMESA protocol should not be overly-prescriptive on national SPS systems, but rather allow for different approaches to SPS management and institutions at national level between COMESA and EAC members.  Attention should be given to devising maximum value from existing infrastructure resources, both at national and regional level, before decisions are taken to create new infrastructure. Particular attention should be devoted to enhancing existing capacity and skills so as to avoid duplication and dispersion of effort. Ensuring an appropriate mixture of capacity between public and private laboratories is essential, along with a clear division of labour between the two. A comprehensive audit of laboratory infrastructure at national and regional level should be undertaken and form the basis of an action plan to inform future donor support in this area.